



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Thursday, February 11—Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Legislature of Ontario
Debates

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature of the Province of Ontario

INDICES

TOPICAL

AGRICULTURE:

PAGES

Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	4
	1301
Noden, W. G.	63
Grummett, W. J.	178
Root, John	759

AUTHORITY, ONTARIO TELEPHONE:

Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	5
	1300
Challies, Hon. G. H.	37
	72
	146
	934
	981
Janes, C. E.	76
Root, J.	82
Wardrope, G. C.	82
Hunt, S. J.	84
Murdoch, W.	85
Grummett, W. J.	85
	934
Salsberg, J. B.	86
	936
Frost, Hon. L. M.	146
	932
Oliver, F. R.	146
	933

BUDGET:

Frost, Hon. L. M.	490
Nixon, H.	562
Grummett, W. J.	604
Herbert, A. R.	608
Kerr, D. McM.	611
Edwards, J. F.	672

Child, Arthur	675
Cowling, A. H.	677
Nickle, W. M.	680
Brandon, W. E.	685
Fishleigh, H. F.	748
Dempsey, J. S.	751
Wren, Albert	752
Root, John	758
Myers, R. M.	782
Challies, Hon. G.	1009
Leavine, S. F.	1091
Pryde, T.	1094
Lyons, C. H.	1097
Hunt, S. J.	1106
Salsberg, J. B.	1207
Downer, A. W.	1219
	1227
Elliott, R. E.	1257
Frost, A. (Bracondale)	1262
Sandercock, E.	1264
Beech, W. G.	1267
Morningstar, E. P.	1275
Chartrand, A.	1278
Dunbar, Hon. G.	1283

EDUCATION:

Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	5
	1300
Dunlop, Hon. W. J.	17
	730
Noden, W. G.	62
Frost, Hon. L. M.	114
Brandon, W. E.	187
	688
Leavine, S. F.	283
Edwards, J. F.	674
Child, Arthur	676
Oliver, F. R.	732
Salsberg, J. B.	733
	736
Chartrand, A.	734
	737
Roberts, A. Kelso	735
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	736
Kerr, D. McM.	736

ELECTION ACT, SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT OF:

Collings, W. H.	124
Frost, Hon. L. M.	127
Grummett, W. J.	128
	134
Porter, Hon. D.	129
	131
Dunbar, Hon. G. H.	129

	PAGES
Davies, Hon. M. C.	129
Salsberg, J. B.	130
Oliver, F. R.	130
Leavine, S. F.	132
Yaremko, J.	130
Nixon, H. C.	131
	135
	137

HANSARD:

Frost, Hon. L. M.	13
	123
	202
Oliver, F. R.	14
	121
Salsberg, J. B.	14
	122
Grummett, W. J.	15
Porter, Hon. D.	122
Hamilton, Hon. W.	123
Roberts, A. Kelso	145

HEALTH:

Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	4
	1300
Jolley, A. C.	54
Cowling, A. H.	203
Wren, A.	214
Phillips, Hon. Mack.	765
	771
	797
Stewart, W. J.	767
Grummett, W. J.	767
	798
Nixon, H. C.	767
	772
Gordon, G. T.	768
	797
Salsberg, J. B.	773
	798
	801
	804
Morrow, D. H.	799
Oliver, F. R.	800
Roberts, A. Kelso	801
Cowling, A. H.	801

HIGHWAYS:

Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	4
	1300
Frost, Hon. L. M.	30
	110
	498
Oliver, F. R.	31
	101
	476

Grummett, W. J.	34
	179
	604
Salsberg, J. B.	34
	245
Wren, Albert	36
	212
	753
Noden, W. G.	62
Macaulay, R.	186
Brandon, W. E.	191
	686
Beech, W. G.	240
Leavine, S. F.	280
Frost, A. C. (Bracondale)	295
	1263
MacOdrum, C. G.	302
Dempsey, J. S.	375
Doucett, Hon. G. H.	425
Collings, W. H.	437
Manley, P.	443
Connell, R.	464
Morningstar, E. P.	474
Edwards, J. F.	673
Nickle, W. M.	684
Root, John	758
Daley, Hon. C.	853
Downer, A. W.	1227
Cecile, Hon. L.	1240
Dunbar, Hon. G. H.	1286

HOUSING:

Noden, W. G.	63
Oliver, F. R.	97
	476
Frost, Hon. L. M.	112
	115
	496
Macaulay, R.	185
Beech, W. G.	237
Leavine, S. F.	284
Yaremko, J.	289
Frost, A. C. (Bracondale)	296
Fishleigh, H. F.	371
Stewart, W. J.	395
Manley, P.	443
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	456
Beckett, H. E.	461
Child, Arthur	676
Myers, R. M.	782
Daley, Hon. C.	853
Warrender, Hon. W. K.	1029
Salsberg, J. B.	1037
Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	1301

HYDRO:

Jolley, A. C.	53
Noden, W. G.	63
Janes, C. E.	80
Murdoch, W.	85
Salsberg, J. B.	87
	248
	1210
Wren, A.	211
Wardrope, G. C.	234
	665
MacOdrum, C. G.	303
Villeneuve, O. F.	347
Robarts, J. P.	367
Dempsey, J. S.	375
	376
Manley, P.	442
	663
Connell, R.	465
Morningstar, E. P.	474
Frost, Hon. L. M.	500
	1214
Porter, Hon. D.	554
Nixon, Harry	571
	666
Challies, Hon. G.	572
	661
	1009
	1077
	1222
Kerr, D.	611
Robson, R.	664
Brandon, W. E.	685
Dempsey, J. S.	752
Root, John	760
Downer, A. W.	1222
Frost, A. (Bracondale)	1263

IRREGULARITIES—Department of Highways:

Frost, Hon. L. M.	30
	106
	479
	781
Oliver, F. R.	31
	101
	476
	618
	649
	781
	821
Grummett, W. J.	34
	179
Salsberg, J. B.	34
	828
	1208

INDICES—Continued

PAGES

Wren, Albert	36
	215
	755
Doucett, Hon. G. H.	47
	594
	619
	649
	818
Macaulay, R.	186
Brandon, W. E.	191
Wardrope, G. C.	226
	825
Leavine, S. F.	280
MacOdrum, C. G.	302
Dempsey, J. S.	377
	752
Porter, Hon. Dana	387
	481
	594
Nickle, W. M.	781
Downer, A. W.	434
	1228

LANDS AND FORESTS:

Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	5
Noden, W. G.	59
Gemmell, Hon. W. S.	149
	905
	923
	924
	930
Wren, Albert	158
	215
	912
	926
Frost, Hon. L. M.	160
	917
	919
Salsberg, J. B.	918
	930
Oliver, F. R.	921
	928
Grummett, W. J.	923
Nixon, H. C.	926
Fishleigh, H. F.	930

PETITIONS:

County of Frontenac	25
Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital	25
Town of Fergus	25
City of Hamilton	25
Town of Mimico	25
The Home for the Friendless and Infants' Home	25
Town of Hespeler	25

	PAGES
Township of Toronto	25
City of London	25
Town of Paris	25
Board of the Royal Botanical Paris	25
City of Niagara Falls	25
Town of St. Marys	25
Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited	25
City of St. Catharines	26
City of St. Thomas	26
St. Michael's College	26
City of Peterborough	26
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec	26
City of Ottawa	26
City of Toronto	26
Walter Juxon Blackburn, Verschoye Philip Cronyn, Roy Watt Robertson, et al	26
Township of Sandwich West	26
Town of Palmerston	26
The Town of Fort Erie	67
The Township of Scarborough	93
Corporations of Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association	169
Ross Memorial Hospital	225
Town of Oakville	225

PROBATION:

Stewart, W. J.	398
Oliver, F. R.	403
	706
Morrow, D. H.	410
Downer, A. W.	412
	414
Nickle, W. M.	576
Pryde, Thos.	580
Porter, Hon. D.	703
Salsberg, J. B.	705
Nixon, H.	707
Grummett, W. J.	713

REPORTS—Annual:

Public Accounts to March 31, 1953	17
Provincial Auditor	17
27th, Liquor Control Board	17
7th, Liquor Licence Board	17
Minister of Education—1952	37
Teachers' Superannuation Committee to October 31, 1953	37
Ontario College of Art	37
Board of Governors, University of Toronto	37
45th, The Hydro-Electric Power Commission	37
7th, Research Council of Ontario	37
67th, Niagara Parks Commission	46
Re: Registrations of Births, Marriages and Deaths	46
Commission on Agricultural Loans	46
Financial Statement—Settler's Loan Commission	46

1952 Statement—Section 235-241 Municipal Act	95
36th, Civil Service Commission	95
33rd, Public Service Superannuation Board	95
Of Provincial Auditor on Public Service Superannuation Fund	95
Of Provincial Auditor on Public Service Retirement Fund	95
8th, Department of Travel and Publicity	95
Minister of Agriculture to March 31, 1953	119
Statistics Branch, Department of Agriculture	119
Ontario Food Terminal Board	119
Ontario Stockyards Board	119
Ontario Veterinary College	119
Minister of Agriculture re co-operative marketing loans	119
27th, Ontario Agricultural College	119
Department of Reform Institutions	197
3rd, Alcoholism Research Foundation	276
Inspector of Legal Offices	454
3rd, Workmen's Compensation Board	454
Ontario Provincial Police, 1953	1074
Secretary and Registrar of Ontario, March 31, 1953	1074
Re: Companies' Act, Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act	1075
Re: Extra Provincial Corporations Act	1075
Minister of Lands and Forests to March 31, 1953	1155
46th, Ontario Municipal Board—1951	1204
47th, Ontario Municipal Board—1952	1204

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES:

Re: Personnel of Standing Committees	26
On Privileges and Elections	26
On Education	26
On Private Bills	26
On Standing Orders	27
On Public Accounts	27
On Printing	27
On Municipal Law	27
On Legal Bills	27
On Agriculture	27
On Game and Fish	28
On Labour	28
On Mining	28
On Government Commissions	28
On Lands and Forests	28
On Travel and Publicity	28
On Health	28
On Conservation	28
On Standing Orders, 1st	45
On Standing Orders, 2nd	169
On Standing Orders, 3rd and Final	335
On Legal Bills, 1st	124
On Legal Bills, 2nd and Final	777
On Private Bills, 1st	170
On Private Bills, 2nd	225
On Private Bills, 3rd	365
On Private Bills, 4th	452
On Private Bills, 5th	554
On Private Bills, 6th	587

	PAGES
On Private Bills, 7th	617
On Private Bills, 8th	777
On Private Bills, 9th	845
On Private Bills, 10th	873
On Private Bills, 11th	943
On Private Bills, 12th and Final	989
On Municipal Law, 1st,	489
On Municipal Law, 2nd	747
On Municipal Law, 3rd	845
On Municipal Law, 4th and Final	943
On Lands and Forests, 1st and Final	527
On Agriculture, 1st	587
On Agriculture, 2nd and Final	671
On Health, 1st	617
On Health, 2nd and Final	1073
On Education, 1st	67
On Education, 2nd	645
On Education, 3rd and Final	748
On Mining, 1st	645
On Mining, 2nd	747
On Mining, 3rd	777
On Mining, 4th and Final	990
On Printing, 1st and Final	989
On Conservation, 1st and Final	990
On Game and Fish, 1st and Final	990

RESOLUTIONS:

By Hon. Mr. Dunlop	638
By Hon. Mr. Porter	638
	638
	639
	639
By Hon. Mr. Goodfellow	638
	639
By Hon. Mr. Doucett	639
By Hon. Mr. Frost	639
No. 13 and 14	899
No. 15	900
By Hon. Mr. Goodfellow	1149
By Hon. Mr. Welsh	1149
No. 7 by Hon. Mr. Frost	1187
Re: Committee on Highway Safety	1187
Personnel of Committee	1187
By Hon. Mr. Frost	1256
Re: Loan on Credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund	1256

SALARIES:

Frost, Hon. L. M.	69
Oliver, F. R.	70
Grummett, W. J.	175
	405
Stewart, W. J.	395
Wren, Albert	914

SEGREGATION:

Stewart, W. J.	397
Oliver, F. R.	402
Morrow, D. H.	410
Downer, A. W.	413
Pryde, Thos.	580
Dempsey, J. S.	581

SELECT COMMITTEES—Reports by:

On Election Act—Mr. Collings	124
On Companies Act—Mr. Roberts	143
On Cemeteries Act—Mr. J. N. Allan	307
	547
On Water Levels—Mr. Villeneuve	345
On Reform Institutions—Mr. Stewart	387
	1179
Re: Bill No. 78	873
On Indian Affairs—Mr. Goodfellow	875
	1088
On Allowances for members of Select Committees—Mr. Welsh	1203

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE:

Hon. L. O. Breithaupt, Opening	3
Closing	1299
Jolley, A. C.	50
Noden, W. G.	58
Oliver, F. R.	95
Frost, Hon. L. M.	106
Grummett, W. J.	174
Macaulay, Robert	180
Brandon, W. E.	187
Cowling, A. H.	202
Wren, Albert	209
Wardrope, G. C.	226
Beech, W. G.	235
Salsberg, J. B.	240
Leavine, S. F.	279
Yaremko, John	285
Roberts, A. Kelso	292
Frost, A. G. (Bracondale)	293
MacOdrum, C. G.	299
Chartrand, A.	319
Myers, R. M.	324
Child, A. J.	326
Robarts, J. P.	366
Fishleigh, H. F.	370
Dempsey, J. S.	375
Nickle, W. M.	429
Collings, W. H.	436
Manley, Peter	439
Allan, J. N.	444
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	456

	PAGES
Beckett, H. E.	460
Connell, Ray	463
Gordon, G. T.	468
Morningstar, E. P.	472
Porter, Hon. D.	480

WELFARE:

Breithaupt, Hon. L. O.	4
	1300
Jolley, A. C.	55
Oliver, F. R.	97
Grummett, W. J.	177
	1137
Brandon, W. E.	190
Goodfellow, Hon. W. A.	1127
	1135
	1137
	1143
Salsberg, J. B.	1135
	1138
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	1136
Chartrand, A.	1143

BY SPEAKERS

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
ALLAN, J. N. (PC Haldimand-Norfolk):		
Re: Report of Select Committee—Cemeteries Act		307
Re: Regret at passing of W. B. Harvey		307
Re: Good work by communities		307
Re: Neglected cemeteries		308
Re: Appreciation of work of Committee		308
Cemeteries should be memorials		308
Care must be provided		308
Must not be charge in communities		308
Recommendations should not change present proper practices		308
Re: Perpetual care		308
Re: Appointment of Supervisors		308
Duties of		308
Assistance will be educational		308
Re: Recommendations		309
Repairs to neglected cemeteries		309
Re: Establishment of new cemeteries		309
Re: Religious and municipal cemeteries most desirable		309
Re: Advisory Board		309
Re: Recommendations drastic		309
Not injurious		310
Re: Provincial licences		310
Bar to "high-pressure" selling		310
Cemetery lots not articles of trade		310
Personal sales permitted		310
Mandatory use of prescribed contract forms		310
Re: Re-sale of unused lots		311
Re: Lots must be clearly indicated		311
Re: Supervision of perpetual-care fund		311
Should be adequate		311
Re: No plots sold in undeveloped areas		311
Monuments, etc. permitted		311
Re: Controlled service charges		311
Re: Creation of perpetual care funds		311
Mandatory in all cemeteries		311
Supervised by province		312
Invested under provisions of 'Trustees' Act		312
Re: Custody of		312
Municipal and religious cemeteries excepted		312
Re: Audited reports of—annually		312
Re: Taxation of cemeteries		313
Is not possible		313
Substitution for		313
More a service charge		313
On Speech from the Throne		444
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker		444
Re: Traffic accidents		444
Re: Attendance at President's Safety Conference at Washington, Feb. 1954		445
Purpose of		445
All States requested to participate		445
Translation of knowledge into action		445
Re: Ontario's Highway accident problem		445
Roads similar to U.S. roads		445
Laws must be supported by public opinion		445

Re: Ontario Good Roads Association	445
Extract from address by A. H. Rowan	445
Each member of House should be a safety ambassador	446
Should support Department safety campaign	446
Re: Type of driver education	446
Appointment of civilian observers	446
To warn traffic violators	446
Individuals must determine to drive safely	446
Congratulatory to Minister of Highways	447
Increased limit of reportable accidents	447
Re: Other "Safety First" campaigns	447
Re: Speed limits in other jurisdictions	447
Re: Good winter conditions of Ontario's highways	447
Present records must be improved	447
Ontario has foundation for safety campaign	447
Drivers should drive safely	447
Pedestrians should walk safely	447

BECKETT, H. E. (PC York East):

Re: Report on Lake Levels	358
Congratulatory to Chairman	358
Congratulatory to Secretary	358
Re: Toronto "green belt"	359
Re: Construction of groynes	359
Difficulties in	359
Due to low water	359
Re: Scarborough Bluffs	359
Re: Legal responsibility in reconstruction of groynes	359
Re: Tilting of earth	359
Re: Adverse criticism re hockey team re Russian team	455
On Speech from the Throne	460
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	460
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	460
Re: Bill 80—1953	460
Every effort to make it workable	460
Metropolitan Council	460
Metropolitan Planning Board	460
Transit Commission	460
Re: Formation of Metropolitan area	461
Re: Riding of East York	461
Extent of	461
Population in	461
Housing subdivisions	461
Re: Installation of services	461
Re: Agreement to by-law	461
Re: Co-operation between townships	461
Re: New industries in	461
No industrial assessment 1932-33	462
Re: Former defaults by municipalities	462
Reasons for	462
People desire to live in own communities	462
Annexation by negotiation prior to 1939	462
Changed by legislation in 1939	462
Amendment desired	462
To provide for vote in each municipality	462

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Tribute to Minister of Municipal Affairs	463
	East York indebted to	463
	Congratulatory to Deputy Minister and Chief Supervisor	463
	Re: Housing development	463
	Extent of permits issued	463

BEECH, W. G. (PC York South):

On Speech from the Throne	235
Re: Praise for government deserved	235
Re: Township of York	235
Application for city charter	235
Re: Metropolitan Area	235
Re: Spadina Road extension	235
Re: Barrie Highway	236
Bill 80 (1953) very flexible	236
Re: Rent Control	236
A great shortage of houses	236
Fears increased rentals	236
Re: Housing	237
Federal Government Bill 102	237
Present legislation not studied sufficiently	237
Must assist low-income population	237
Re: Provincial grants for repairs and furnishings	237
Re: Community Hall in South York	237
Re: Possibility of building low-cost homes	237
Re: Labour's expenditure at Timmins strikes	238
Re: Suggestion by Canadian Legion	238
Re: Bad features of rent control	238
Re: Poor workmanship in Scarborough buildings	238
Re: Undermining confidence in government	239
Statements made in House	239
Government not given proper credit	239
Re: Cemetery in York South	239
Handicap to surrounding community	239
Re: Highways	240
Barrie Highway	240
Re: Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	240
Legislation has too much "red tape"	240
Regulations of	240
Are impractical	240
On the Budget	1267
Appreciation to Prime Minister for attendance at opening of auditorium	1267
Appreciative to Minister of Municipal Affairs re amendment	1267
Re: Substantial surplus	1267
Re: Prime Minister not over-optimistic	1267
Re: Criticism of Highways contracts not justified	1267
Re: No report from Committee on Provincial-Municipal relations	1267
Re: Dominion-Provincial Conference	1267
Re: Historic ridings	1267
Should not be disturbed	1267
Re: Annexations	1267
Authority unquestioned	1267
But is it morally right?	1267

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Promiscuous annexation undesirable	1267
	Re: Grants to municipalities	1267
	Re: Charter of freedom to municipalities	1267
	Re: Municipal roads	1268
	Rightfully a charge against property	1268
	Province should pay for widening, etc.	1268
	Time to set municipalities up in business	1268
	Re: Fire protection	1269
	Re: Compulsory insurance	1269
	Re: Improvements to property	1269
	Re: Increased assessments	1269
	Re: Education	1269
	Re: Health	1269
	Health Insurance	1269
	Should be paid for all	1269
	Re: Workmen's Compensation Board	1269
	Re: Criticism of Bill 80—1953	1269
	Increase of taxes in York	1269
	Re: Interim tax bills	1269
	Re: Progress depends on municipal development	1269

BRANDON, W. E. (PC York West):

On Speech from the Throne	187
No new taxes anticipated	187
Re: Education	187
Re: Operation of business college	187
Fill a community need	187
Re: Vocational guidance	187
Re: Difference in beginning of courses	187
Re: Provincial Educational Programme	187
Grants for Education	188
Contemplated increase in pupils' registration	188
Education for new Canadians	188
Many adults desire education	188
Re: Increased Municipal Costs	188
No increased sources of taxation	188
Stores not same as formerly	189
Re: Metropolitan Toronto	189
Legislation re	189
Expenditures for	189
Programme not immediate	189
Expenditures debentured	189
Unconditional grants	189
Re: Welfare	190
Re: Children's Aid Society	190
Re: Deserting husbands	190
Incident of	190
Re: Highways	191
Irregularities in connection with	191
Re: Departmental inspections	191
Matters now sub judice	191
All details will be available	191
Government will do all necessary things in regard to	191
Re: Improvement in all highways	191
Re: Central Registry	192

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Problem of Purchase of cars with liens	192
	Re: Examination of drivers	192
	Should be at least every three years	192
	Physical check-up imperative	192
	Re: Accident near Morrisburg	192
	Licences should only be issued at applicants' residence	192
	Re: Train-motor car collisions	192
	Royal York Road and Dundas	192
	Re: Elimination of grade crossings	192
	Re: Grade-crossing accident	192
	Re: Labour	193
	Ontario strikes	193
	Has improved standards of living	193
	Street railway strike in Toronto	193
	Re: Right to strike	193
	Re: Labour-Management co-operation	193
	Re: Legislation for compulsory arbitration	193
	Where Public Utilities are concerned	194
	Re: Results of Labour-Management co-operation	194
	Re: Good government assured by full co-operation	194
On Bill No. 79—Second Reading		543
	Pleased at legislation	543
	Re: Park on Lake Simcoe	543
	Purchased by York County—1950	543
	Should be made a provincial park	543
Re: Article, <i>Globe and Mail</i> , March 16th		594
	Remembrance Day Holiday	594
	Re: Article only correct in part	594
	Re: Should be more reverently observed	595
	Should be a holy day	595
	Not so considered by many	595
	Purpose should be taught in schools	595
On the Budget		685
	Re: No increase in taxation	685
	No new taxes	685
	Re: Increase in expenditures	685
	Re: Rural Hydro	685
	Re: Hydro cut-offs	685
	Grants for	685
	Will benefit province	686
	Re: Visit to Cobalt	686
	New Smelter at	686
	Re: Highways	686
	Estimates for	686
	Central Registry of motor cars	686
	Re: Judgment by Court of Appeal	686
	Re: Contract for motor truck	686
	Re: United States Common Registry	687
	Re: Mileage of—in Ontario	687
	Re: Gasoline tax less in Ontario	687
	Re: Riding of York West	687
	Death-trap intersection in	687
	Re: Brown's Line—Highway 27	688
	Must be widened	688

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Education	688
	Estimates for	688
	Congratulatory to Prime Minister and Minister of Education	688
	Number of students in Ontario	688
	Number of teachers	688
	Re: New Canadians	689
Re: Municipalities		689
	Acquainted with problems of	689
	Re: Earlier grants	689
	Re: Present unconditional grants	689
	Re: Estimates for	689
Re: Department of Health		690
	Re: Sewage disposal plant—Etobicoke	690
	No communications between councils re	690
Re: Department of Agriculture		690
	Re: Competition in milk transportation	690
	Re: Licences should mean something	691
	Re: Licencing system should be on proper basis	691
Re: Municipal Board		692
	Is over-worked	692
	Should only deal with matters requiring judicial function	692
	Ontario better than ever	692

BREITHAUPT, Hon. L. O. (Lieutenant-Governor):

On Speech from the Throne (Opening)	3
Re: Korean Truce	3
Re: Economic growth of Ontario	3
Re: St. Lawrence power project	4
Re: Natural gas lines	4
Re: Highways	4
Re: Welfare legislation	4
Re: Provincial Parks policy	4
Re: the Health Situation	4
Re: Committee Work	4
Re: Agriculture	4
Re: Rural Telephone Systems	5
Re: Ontario Telephone Authority	5
Re: Forest Management Policy	5
Re: Redistribution of membership	5
Re: Select Committees	5
On Companies Act	5
On Election Laws	5
On Indian Affairs	5
On Cemeteries	5
On Water Levels	5
On Reform Institutions	5
Re: Consolidation of Acts re Education	5
Re: Pending legislation	5
Re: Public Accounts	5
On Prorogation	1299
Appreciation of work performed	1299
Many enactments passed	1299
Promotion of industrial expansion	1299
Creation of employment opportunities	1299

INDICES—*Continued*

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Fair Accommodation Practices Act		1299
A notable advance		1299
Series of anti-discrimination Acts		1299
Re: Report Select Committee on Indian Affairs		1299
Right of Indians to vote		1299
Will improve status of Indians		1299
Re: Clear recognition of human rights needed		1299
Inherent dignity of mankind retained		1299
Re: Grants increased for Charitable Institutions		1300
Increase in Homes for the Aged		1300
Advances in field of health		1300
Re: Education		1300
Consolidation of Acts		1300
Amendment to Teachers' Superannuation Act		1300
Increased capital and maintenance Acts		1300
Re: Expansion of Provincial Parks System		1300
Re: Improvements in rural Telephone services		1300
Re: Extension of highway construction programme		1300
Re: Expansion of markets for natural gas		1300
Establishment of Ontario Fuel Board		1300
Re: Select Committees		1300
Indian Affairs		1300
Reform Institutions		1300
Cemeteries		1300
Companies Act		1300
Lake Levels		1300
Voters List and Redistribution		1300
Commended for conscientious endeavours		1300
Re: Select Committee on Cemeteries		1300
Made valuable recommendations		1300
Re: Administration		1300
Re: Perpetual care		1300
Re: Sale of lots		1300
Re: Committee on Lands and Forests		1300
"White Paper" on Forestry		1300
Amendment to Crown Timber Act		1301
Re: Committee on Agriculture		1301
Consolidation of		1301
Milk Control Act		1301
Dairy Products Act		1301
Milk and Cream Act		1301
Farm Products Marketing Act		1301
Farm Products Grades and Sales Act		1301
Re: Other agricultural Acts amended and revised		1301
Re: Committee on Redistribution		1301
Increase in constituencies		1301
Re: Activities of Standing Committees		1301
Re: Amendment to Labour Relations Act		1301
Re: Amendment to Municipal Act		1301
Re: Amendment to Assessment Act		1301
Re: Amendment to Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act		1301
Re: Amendment to Theatres Act		1301
Re: Strengthening Financial administration of Government		1301
Re: No new forms of taxation		1301

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Increased grants to municipalities, school boards, and public general hospitals	1301
	Re: Housing	1301
	Re: Appropriation of public funds	1302
	Re: Blessing of Divine Providence	1302

CATHCART, BRYAN L. (PC Lambton West):

On Report, Select Committee on Indian population	888
In agreement with Chairman's statement	888
Congratulatory to Chairman	888
Not the "Schoolmaster" type	888
Was of considerate type	888
Education	888
To bring Indians and non-Indians together	888
Re: Visits of Committee to Reserves in Lambton County	888
Re: Sarnia Reserve	888
Within limits of Sarnia	888
Amassed some wealth	888
From dealings with chemical plants	888
Re: Attendance of Junior Chamber of Commerce	888
Provided park facilities	888
Organized boys' work	888
Re: Citation from member Sarnia J.C.C.	889
Re: Recruiting football players from Indians	889
Re: Indian children attending public schools	889
Extract from <i>Canadian Observer</i>	889
Re: Association of Indian children with others	889
Re: Indians' right to vote	889
Not compulsory	889
Re: Voting no effect on Indian rights	889
Educational programme essential	889
Re: Indians' right to purchase liquor	890
Should be permitted packaged goods	890
Re: Originally requested restrictions	890
Re: Now want them lifted	890
Re: Discrimination to refuse request	890
Re: Should have disability pensions as soon as possible	890
Extract, <i>London Free Press</i> , March 26, 1954	890
Re: Indians should receive all welfare benefits	890
At expense of Federal Government	890
Re: Provincial Government not shirking its responsibility	890
Re: 80 per cent. attendance of Committee meetings	890
Re: No avenue left unexplored	891
Re: Payment of Old-Age Pensions	891
Re: Legislation requires unanimous moral support	891
Not an Indian, but "inoculated"	891
Proud of Indians in Riding	891
Re: The sooner they are made equal, the better	891

CECILE, HON. LOUIS P. (Minister of Travel and Publicity):

On Estimates, Department of Travel and Publicity	1239
Work of Department important to people	1239
Estimates not increased, 1954-55	1239
Re: Rentals Administration	1239
Now resolved	1239

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Department Terms of Reference, 1946		1239
No need for alterations in 8 years		1240
Ontario only jurisdiction to promote vacation business		1240
Division of 1946, still sound		1240
Re: Annual increase in volume of tourist business		1240
By co-operation and joint efforts		1240
Credit shared by many		1240
Part played by Highways		1240
Re: Highways because demanded		1240
Re: Tourists exploring highways		1240
Re: Modern hotels attracting tourists		1240
Re: Attraction of private capital		1240
Re: Traffic over new road to Atikokan		1240
Re: Benefits from tourist dollars		1240
To food producers and processors		1240
To manufacturers of equipment		1241
Re: Hunting and Fishing Licences		1241
Re: Indirectly by Federal excise and other taxes		1241
Re: Canadian tourists to other countries		1241
Spent more than is spent in Canada		1241
United States principal market		1241
Re: Vast total potential		1241
Re: Ontario has the products		1241
Requires advertising and promotion		1241
Re: Merchandising Campaign		1241
Regional organizations		1241
Chambers of Commerce		1241
Boards of Trade		1241
Municipalities		1241
Group in Essex County		1241
Re: Promotion of travel and vacationing		1242
Not spectacular		1242
Re: "All year Club of California"		1242
Re: Miami Beach		1242
Sand bar, 50 years ago		1242
Re: Tourist business in		1242
Re: Increasing competition		1242
Re: Potential market		1242
\$8 billion annually		1242
From Research Department of Curtis Publishing Co.		1242
Re: Views Ontario's future with confidence		1242
Extract from <i>U.S. News and World Report</i>		1242
Extract from <i>Fortune Magazine</i>		1242
Extract from <i>Bulletin of Commerce</i>		1242
Re: Advertising and promotion must continue vigorously		1243
Re: Summer schedules to Gravenhurst		1243
Re: New north-south express highway in U.S.		1243
Re: Department has no capital expenditure		1243
Re: Salary Schedules		1243
Re: Travelling Expenses		1243
Re: Maintenance Items		1243
Re: Expenditures		1243
One-half on promotional activities		1243
One-half in Services		1243

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Chain of reception centres	1243
	500,000 visitors annually	1243
	Re: Inspectorate	1244
Re: Advertising publicity and promotion		1244
	An integral necessity	1244
	One-half for paid advertising	1244
	In Ontario and Quebec	1244
Re: Annual good-will tour of Ontario		1244
Re: Appreciation to officials and staff		1244
Re: Northern Great Lakes area Council		1245
Re: Expenditure re "Holiday"		1246
Re: Advertising agencies used		1246
	Locke Agency	1246
	McKim's	1246
	McConnell Eastman	1246
	Amount spent in United States	1246
	Ontario expenditures small	1246
Re: Reinstatement of Grade system		1246
	Many glad Department out of it	1246
Re: Number of reception centers		1247
Re: Hours of "Guest Days" in hotels and motels		1247
	Great variation in	1247
	Few complaints re	1247
	Depending on train schedules in larger centers	1247
	Doubtful if legislation would serve good purpose	1247
Re: 21 Lombard St., Toronto		1248
	Now vacated	1248

CHALLIES, HON. G. H. (Minister without Portfolio) :

Re: Establishment of Telephone Authority	37
Transference of functions from Municipal Board	37
On Bill No. 51—Second Reading	72
Initiation of consideration—1947	72
Present at first meeting	72
Originally under Department of Municipal Affairs	72
Technical staff not available	72
Various Departments interested	72
Re: Independent Telephone Companies—1947	72
Re: Review of entire situation	73
Report—1948	73
Large amount of research work	73
Re: Personnel of Committee	73
Including Bell technicians	73
Report of—1953	73
Work of	73
Re: Services problem in Northeastern Ontario	73
Re: Some rural companies indifferent	73
Re: Establishment of Telephone Authority	73
Powers of—very wide	74
Re: Committee's efforts at assistance	74
Many companies desire improvement	74
Many contacts effected	74
Re: Personnel of Authority	74
Re: Transference of duties from Municipal Board	74
Re: Telephone Authority	75
Duties, obligations and rights of	75

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Extract from <i>Daily Star</i> , Feb. 20, 1954	146
	Re: Repeating telephone conversations	146
	In Statutes since 1917	146
	Re: Authority to do no policing	146
On Bill No. 79—First Reading		421
	Re: Purpose of new policy	421
	Section 2—new Bill	421
	Re: Need for enlarged Provincial Park Policy	421
	Reasons for	422
	Re: Policy two-fold	422
	Re: Must keep future needs in mind	422
	Re: Aims of enlarged policy	422
	Protection of natural advantages	422
	Care in selecting sites	422
	Recreation facilities required	422
	Historical features	422
	Park museums	422
	Control and supervision	422
Re: Principles and Embodiment		423
	In Provincial Parks Act	423
	Requires long-term planning	423
	Over-all classification necessary	423
	Class I	423
	Examples of	423
	Class II	423
	Examples of	423
	Class III	423
	Location of	423
	Near urban centers	423
	Class IV	423
	County or Municipal	423
	Re: Factors to be considered	423
	Three are most important	423
	Population pressures	423
	Avoidance of over-crowding	423
	Of sufficient size	423
	Re: Acquisition of land	424
	Not to interfere with private enterprise	424
	Re: Administered by Commission or Superintendent to be decided	424
On Bill No. 79—Second Reading		537
	Purpose to provide more parks	537
	More time to enjoy parks	537
	Re: "Ontario people to see Ontario"	537
	Re: Providing facilities for people	537
	Re: Combination of number of Acts	538
	Re: Algonquin, Quetico, Timagami and others	538
	Under jurisdiction of Department of Lands and Forests	538
	Re: Parts 2 and 3	538
	Re: Commission form of administration	538
	Re: Sites for summer cottages	538
	Re: Approved audits	538
	Re: Provision for improvements	538
	Re: Part 3—administered by Superintendent	538

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Part 4		539
The general part		539
Re: Fish and Game		539
Re: Planning for future		539
Re: New Park on Lake Simcoe		539
Re: Costs of Conversion		572
If economy remained static, original estimate would have covered		572
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture		661
Re: Rural Hydro development		661
Is continuing operation		661
Re: Cost of major betterments		662
Re: Hydro now a necessity		662
Re: Table of expenditures		662
Re: Increase in rural power lines		662
Re: List of electrical equipment in use		662
Re: Hydro firm policy of rural betterments		663
Re: Extension programme of maintenance		663
Re: Provincial Grant-in-aid		663
Re: Value of electrical services to rural communities		663
Elimination of fire hazards		663
Re: Extension of rural Hydro		663
Re: Small added cost of guaranteed contracts		664
Re: Hydro sold at cost		664
Rules are flexible		664
Rates less than decade ago		664
Re: Refunds to Hydro		664
Re: Construction of towers on private property		666
Destruction of roads by Hydro trucks		666
Grants for		666
Have been increased		667
Should be transmission of energy without poles or towers		667
On Bill No. 51—In Committee		933
Re: Sec. 96, Municipal Board Act		933
Section permissive		933
Re: Section 3		934
Re: Expropriation of Municipal Telephone System		934
Re: Section 10		935
Only initiating petition		935
On Bill No. 51—In Committee		981
Re: Amendments to		981
To Section 40—subsection 2		982
To Section 40—subsection 3		982
To Section 54		982
On Budget		1009
Re: Hydro		1009
Review of activities		1009
Re: 10 years progress and prosperity		1009
Re: Inheritance of Hydro problems		1010
Letter, Prime Minister of Ontario to Prime Minister of Canada, 1938		1010
Re: Doubles in size in 10 years		1011
Re: Engineering achievements		1011
Re: Amalgamation of systems		1011
Re: Development of Rivers		1012
Plant developments in 10 years		1012

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Fuel-electric generation	1013
	Summary	1013
	Other developments	1013
	Re: Research and planning	1013
	Re: High-speed sequence recorders	1013
	Re: Use of hydraulic scale models	1013
	Re: Frequency standardization	1014
	Re: Change-overs	1014
	Re: "Guesstimates"	1014
	Re: Administrative changes	1015
	Rural	1015
	Municipal wholesale rates levelled	1015
	Regional offices	1015
	Commission's Employees	1015
	St. Lawrence Power	1015
	Re: Ontario Hydro looking ahead	1017
	Conclusion	1017
	Re: Accident at Hearn Steam Generating Plant	1077
	Report of	1077
	Re: Second Explosion, R. L. Hearn Generating Plant	1185
	No change-over to 60-cycle power	1185
	Cause undetermined	1185
	Unit totally destroyed	1185
	Being investigated by experts	1185
	Plant closed to prevent further damage	1185
	Re: Use of tie-lines	1185
	No insurance coverage	1186
	On the Budget	1212
	Re: Hydro	1212
	Should be left alone outside province	1212
	Auditors of	1213
	Appointed by Provincial Government	1213

CHARTRAND, A. (L Ottawa East):

On Bill No. 41—Second Reading	163
Re: Verification of signature of person administering affidavits	163
Re: Impersonation	163
On Bill No. 48—Second Reading	164
Re: Salaries of Surrogate Court Judges	164
On Speech from the Throne	319
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	319
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	320
Re: Public Health	320
Increase in life expectancy	320
Further research in	320
Future of unknown	320
Compulsory Hospital Insurance	320
Re: Quebec situation	320
Re: Acceptance by other provinces	321
Re: Suggested Ontario Plan	321
Re: Costs of	321
Causing delay	321
Re: Existing company plans	321
Increase in Blue Cross rates	321

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Aid to pensioners	322
	Re: Indigents and Uninsurables	322
	Re: Would improve hospitals financially	322
	Re: General hospital costs	322
	Re: Over-charging and extravagance	322
	Should be supervised	322
	Re: Appointment of Select Committee re Health plans	323
	Re: Sessional Indemnity	323
	Should be increased	323
	To attach proper men	323
	Re: Public Servants	323
	Not adequately provided for	323
	Re: Re-examination positions of members and public servants	323
	Important from political standpoint	323
	Suggestions actuated by proper motives	324
On Bill No. 76—Second Reading		516
	Differentiation between “broker” and “salesman”	516
On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General		711
	Re: Legislative Counsel	711
	Re: Salaries of	711
	Maximum and Minimum	711
On Vote 29, Item 12		713
	Re: Salaries of Magistrates	713
	Re: Situation in Ottawa	713
	Re: Court reporters	713
	Difficulty in obtaining	713
	Re: Vote 34	719
Re: Third Judge, County of Carleton		719
	Re: Letters from Clerk-Registrar	719
	Re: Article in <i>Ottawa Citizen</i>	720
	Extract from	720
	Re: Visiting judges not satisfactory	720
On Estimates, Department of Education		734
	Re: Schools for the Deaf	734
	Re: Correspondence courses	734
	Re: Vote 43—Public Libraries Branch	735
	Re: Nature of expense	735
	Re: Vote 49	736
	Re: Bursaries	736
	Re: Vote 50, Item 1	737
	Re: General legislative grants	737
	Re: Chart regarding	737
On Estimates, Department of Health		802
	Re: Printing and Stationery	802
	Re: Purpose of expenditures	803
On Estimates, Department of Public Welfare		1143
	Incident of application of policy in Ottawa	1143
	Case has real merit	1143
	What is Minister's solution	1143
On Bill No. 136—In Committee		1194
	Re: Dissemination of information	1194
	Re: Percentage who exercise franchise	1194
	Re: People should not be compelled to vote	1194
	Re: Notice re voters and non-voters	1194

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On the Budget		1278
Re: General comments		1278
No reference to "sunshine budget"		1278
Little "sunshine" for people		1278
Shows evidence of gloom		1278
Significance of Prime Minister not speaking with exultation		1278
Optimism to fortify courage		1278
Statement of Prime Minister—1944		1278
1944 was time for optimism		1278
Re: Post-war expansion		1278
Dealing only with one side of picture		1278
No thought of other side		1278
Government prepared for good times only		1278
Lack of preparation for recession		1278
Not an "apostle of gloom"		1278
Government should plan for any eventuality		1278
Re: Spending spree		1278
Day of reckoning certain		1278
Re: Increase in population		1278
Re: Increase in older-group brackets		1278
Greater partition of take-home pay		1278
Reluctance of Departments of Welfare and Education		1279
Expansion of industrial economy		1279
Re: Percentage of Canadian exports		1279
To balance importations		1279
Re: Necessity of reliance on foreign-markets consumers		1279
Re: Decline of farm products		1279
Forerunner of general slump		1279
Re: No comprehensive health-insurance programme		1279
Re: Statement of Provincial Treasurer		1279
Re: Laying of sure foundation		1279
Statement by F. A. Fox, <i>Queen's Quarterly Review</i>		1279
Re: Road ahead not as smooth as formerly		1280
Re: "Soft spots"		1280
Two interpretations of		1280
What are Governments plans for		1280
Decline in farm income		1280
Slackness in certain industries		1280
Re: Hon. Treasurer's assumptions		1280
Expanding domestic markets		1280
Cheese producers hard to convince		1280
Re: Increased capital investment		1280
Re: Advancing personal income and public spending		1280
Re: Slack in employment		1280
Taken up by construction projects		1280
Pipe line from Alberta		1280
St. Lawrence Seaway		1280
Will not be sufficient		1280
Avoid hypothetical reasoning		1280
Confidence based on proper planning		1280
Re: Province's "Financial Brain Trust"		1281
Evasion of responsible government		1281
Re: Budget's concern for "Big Business"		1281
Re: Amount of Estimates		1281

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Sources of income should be examined		1281
Should be guided by two principles		1281
Taxation partial confiscation		1281
Re: Social, political and economical health of province should be measured by enterprise of low-income people ..		1281
Re: Ontario has lowest tax rate in Canada		1281
Re: Rich getting richer and poor, poorer		1281
Re: What in Budget for breadwinners		1281
Re: Funds "salted away" in Highway Reserve Fund		1281
Re: "Juggling" of provincial finances		1282
Necessary to have five assistants		1282
Re: Chapter in Budget re "Housing"		1282
Re: No credit to present Government		1282
Re: Failure to take full advantage of agreement with Federal Government		1282
Re: "Pulling wool" over people's eyes		1282
Re: Cessation of Rents Control		1282
Re: Failure to properly deal with serviced-land problem		1282
Re: High price of land great danger to increase residential building		1282
Re: Land Speculators		1282
Re: Little prospect for reasonable rents		1282
Re: Land values should not rise above reasonable figure		1282
Re: Old-Age Pensioners		1282
Reason for not supplementing interesting but not convincing		1282
Would be difficult to administer		1282
Re: A Federal matter		1283
Not relieving government's responsibility		1283
Re: A "preferred-class" Budget		1283
Re: Expenditures for education		1283
High School students not finishing courses		1283
Re: Expenditures for super-highways		1283
Motor cost reaching luxury stage		1283
Re: Financial administration "on the spot"		1283
Re: Conscientious objector to Budget		1283
Re: Not "a voice crying in the wilderness"		1283

CHILD, A. J. (PC Wentworth):

On Speech from the Throne	326
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	326
Re: Fire Departments Act	326
56 hour work week	326
Re: Establishment of Fire College	326
Re: Mandatory oxygen masks	327
Re: Municipal Act	327
Section 20	327
Re: Annexation of Territory	327
Extract from letter from Barton	327
Re: Annexation unfair	327
Re: No protection for home owners	327
Re: Annexation of Bolt Fleet	328
Public cannot be heard	328
Re: Land should be bought at market price	328
Re: Farmers should receive fixed assessment	328
Re: City should guarantee industrial buyer	328

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Traffic accidents	328
	Re: 1953 deaths in	328
	Re: Excessive speed	328
	Re: Departmental safety campaign	329
	Re: Sale of high-powered cars	329
	Re: National Motor Show	329
	Demonstration of high-powered cars	329
	Re: "Rat race" for power and speed	329
	Re: Highway 401	329
	Worst accident record in province	329
	Re: Drivers unqualified for high speed	329
	Re: Control of speed on cars	329
		331
	Re: Drastic action required	330
	Re: Hospitalization of injured	330
	Must keep beds available	330
	Ratio of accident to general patients	330
	Average stay of accident cases from 3 to 6 months	330
	Average stay of general bona fide patients 9.23 days	330
	Elimination of accidents would increase hospital facilities available	330
	Re: No workable plan to curb accidents	330
	Re: Leadership should be given by auto manufacturers	330
	Re: Statement by D. C. Gashin	331
	Re: Designing cars for crash survival	331
	Re: Article "What is New in Cars?"	331
	First word is "speed"	331
	Control of speed would lessen car thefts	331
	Re: Public "smugness" should be avoided	331
	Re: "Speed blindness"	331
	Re: Suggestion for Select Committee to investigate	331
	Differential speed limit in school area	332
	Sale of mechanically-defective cars illegal	332
	More strict licencing of drivers	332
	Increased age for licencing drivers	332
	Trucks must have rear bumpers	332
	Directional lights compulsory	332
	Re: Passing railway protective devices	332
	Should be illegal	332
	Heavy penalty for	332
	Re: Obstruction of traffic by railways	332
	Re: Speed limit crossing railways	332
	Not enforced	332
	Re: Report on Lake Levels	355
	Extent of investigation	356
	Re: Work of International Joint Commission	356
	Board of Engineers	356
	Re: Beach Protection Act	356
	Re: Situation at Hamilton	356
	Re: Setting of level	356
	Congratulatory to Chairman	356
On the Budget		675
	Congratulatory to Minister of Health	675
	Re: Extension of Ontario Hospital, Hamilton	675
	Re: Extension of Nurses' Residence	675

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Tribute to Hospital Superintendent	675
	Re: Unemployment in Hamilton	676
	Re: Housing—Wentworth County	676
	Re: Rental war-time houses	676
	Number of	676
	Re: Extensions of agreement	676
	Can be purchased if removed	676
	Re: Land assembly scheme	676
	Suitable sites should be provided	676
	Re: Education	676
	Re: Bray School, Ancaster	676
	Re: Elimination of "Frills"	677
	Re: Standard plan for schools	677
	Re: Cost per class room should be reduced	677
	Important to taxpayers	677
	Re: Salaries of teachers	677
	Should not be jeopardized	677
	Their efforts reflected in future citizens	677
On Bill No. 5—In Committee		1199
	Pleased at amendment	1199
	Reference to Private Bills Committee not satisfactory	1199
	Re: Effect on future annexations	1199
	Re: Better handled by Planning Authority	1199
		1200
	Re: Article in <i>Globe and Mail</i>	1199
	Re: Annexation might not be in best interest of province	1199
	Re: Standard rules required	1200
	Re: Reposing confidence in electors	1200
	Re: Prevention of increased taxes	1200
	Re: Previous annexations	1200
	Re: A step in right direction	1200
	Re: 75 per cent. of previously annexed land should be serviced	1200

COLLINGS, W. H. (PC Beaches):

On Report by Select Committee on Elections	124
Appreciation of Committee's efforts	124
Attendance at Committee meetings	125
Unanimous support of Committee	125
Re: Travelling ballot box	125
28 amendments proposed	125
Time between writ issuance and election	125
Permanent Returning Officers	125
Repeal of sub. sec. 2 and 3, sec. 16 of present Act	126
Re: Advance Polls	126
Repeal of sec. 169 of present Act	126
Prompt return of nomination papers	126
Re: Sec. 58, sub. sec. "c"	126
Re: Certification of candidates	127
Re: Deposit of \$200	127
Re: Sections 23 to 28	127
Re: Implementation desired	127
On Speech from Throne	436
Congratulatory to Chairman of Whole House	436
Re: Riding of Beaches (Toronto)	436
Terminals in	436
Re: Amendment to Highway Traffic Act	437
Re: Faulty equipment on trailer-tractors	437

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Increased indemnities for members	437
	Re: Federal-Provincial Conference	437
	Need for	437
	Re: Municipal Finances	437
	Re: Toronto unemployment	437
Re: Ontario being given good government		437
	Re: Education	437
	Re: Lands and Forests	437
	Re: Public Welfare	438
	Re: New Finance Bill	438
	Re: Appointment of Committees	438
	Re: Municipal Act	438
	Needs some revision	438
Re: Planning and Development		438
	Re: Commuter service by railroads	438
	Re: Elimination of level crossings	438
	Re: Leadership of Liberal Party	438
	Re: Two-Party system of government	439
	Hon. member for St. Andrew not taken seriously	439
	Re: Invitation to CCF members to cross the floor	439
	Re: Increase in old-age pensions	439
On Estimates—Department of Provincial Treasurer		1120
	Re: Borrowing on American market	1120
	More money available for Ontario expansion	1120
On Bill No. 136—In Committee		1193
	Re: Appointment of Returning Officers	1193

CONNELL, R. (PC Hamilton-Wentworth):

On Speech from the Throne	463
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	463
Congratulatory to Mr. Letherby	463
Regret at recent passing of two members	463
Re: Education	463
Commendation to Minister	463
Re: Reduction in computation period re pensions	463
Pension fund not sufficient for change	463
Re: Pension for members	463
Re: New Teachers College, Hamilton	464
Should be completed forthwith	464
Re: Workmen's Compensation	464
Re: New building for	464
Re: Farmers' Compensation coverage	464
Cost of	464
Re: Highways	464
Re: No. 5 Highway	464
Re: Grading mulch service	464
On secondary roads	464
Re: Grants re Hamilton	464
Re: Aldershot	464
Re: No. 2 Highway	464
Re: 30-mile speed limit	464
Not always enforceable	464

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Early completion of cut off	465
	Campbells Corners to Neilson sign	465
	Inclusion of built-up areas to 1,000 feet	465
	Enforcement of 30-mile limit in school areas	465
	Re: Safety	465
	Appointment of Deputy Sheriffs	465
	To check traffic law violators	465
Re: Planning and Development		465
	Congratulatory to Minister	465
	Re: Infringement on individual rights	465
Re: Hydro		465
	Provides more value per dollar	465
	Costs of	465
	On personal farm	465
	Comparison with cost of farm help	466
	Production of poultry	466
Re: Service to province by Prime Minister		466
	Grants shown on tax Bills	466
	Extent of grants not realized	466
Re: Department of Attorney-General		466
	Re: O.P.P. detachment at Waterdown	466
	Has improved police service	466
	Too much time spent attending courts	466
	One day weekly should be designated as "court day"	466
	New Court House needed at Hamilton	466
	Possibility of governmental assistance	466
	Use of revenue in Registry Office	466
Re: McMaster University		466
	Re: Football team	467
	Expelled from League	467
	Discrimination in worst form	467
	Grants to, available only recently	467
Re: Select Committees		467
	Should be appointed to enquire into manufacturing	
	of farm equipment	467
Re: Inspection of farm machinery		467
	Should be increased	467
Re: Electric bulbs		467
	Not satisfactory	467
Re: Dairying		467
Re: Installation of tank coolers		468
	Not wearing well	468
	Congratulatory to Prime Minister	468

COWLING, A. H. (PC High Park):

On Speech from the Throne	202
Re: Health Insurance	203
Ontario not ready for	203
Situations in other Provinces	203
Costs of: Saskatchewan	203
Re: Accident insurance	204
Cost of in Ontario	204
Re: Welcome to Messrs. Jolley and Letherby	204
Re: Conservation	204
A controversial subject	204

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Land use	205
	15 authorities in Ontario	205
	Pollution of lake front	205
	Editorials in <i>Globe and Mail</i>	205
	Re: Parkettes	205
	Re: Detroit Conservation Scheme	205
	Huron Clinton Conservation Authority	205
	No picnic grounds near Toronto	205
	Re: Fanshaw Dam	206
	Re: Rural Conservation	206
	Re: Conservation taught in schools	206
	Re: Toronto's "green belt"	206
	Good examples in other countries	207
	Re: "Pinery"—Sarnia	207
	Re: Smaller municipalities lack funds for	207
	Re: Provincial grants for	207
	Re: Water supplies	207
	Statements by John Fisher	207
	Re: Greater assistance from Federal Government	207
	Re: Parks	208
	Re: Provincial legislation	208
	Re: Humber Valley Conservation Authority	208
	Re: Conservation spread among too many departments	208
	Re: Don Valley Authority	208
	Re: Island Regatta, 1953	208
	Re: High Park and Riverdale Parks	208
	No parking facilities	208
	Re: Recreation	209
On Bill 79, Second Reading		542
	Congratulatory to Minister	542
	A very forward step	542
	Re: Metropolitan Toronto	542
	Zoological and Botanical Garden required	542
	Re: Riverdale Zoo	542
	Totally inadequate	542
On the Budget		677
	Congratulatory to hon. Prime Minister	677
	Re: Conservation of youth	677
	Disagrees with Mr. Nickle	677
	Children better than formerly	677
	Re: Juvenile delinquency	678
	Formation of "gangs"	678
	Now broken up	678
	Re: Junction Gang	678
	Re: Young people politically interested	678
	Re: Reduction in voting age	678
	Re: "Senior" citizens	678
	Congratulatory to Mr. Robarts	678
	Supplementary grants for	678
	Re: Lambert Lodge	678
	Re: Livestock crossing of thoroughfares	679
	Report of Ontario Stockyards	679
	Re: <i>Globe and Mail's</i> "This is Toronto"	679
	Re: Packing-house industry	679
	Should assist in removing livestock from streets	679

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Estimates—Department of Health		801
Re: Health insurance		801
Provides alternative to hospital care		801
Not in all contracts		801
Hospital facilities not adequate		801
On Estimates—Department of Highways		831
Re: Licence plates		831
Slogan on		831
On Estimates—Department of Labour		867
Re: Athletic Commission		867
Grant for British Empire Games		867
On Bill No. 112, in Committee		1161
Re: Section 19, subsection 7		1161
Sub-para. "E"		1162
Increased to 5 years		1162
On Estimates—Department of Reform Institutions		1172
Re: Use of inmates in conservation work		1172
Time would be constructively spent		1172
Idleness of inmates would be overcome		1172
Practice followed in various States		1172
Discussed in Committee on Conservation		1174
Certainly no "chain gangs"		1174

DALEY, HON. C. (Minister of Labour):

On Bill No. 54, Second Reading	379
Re: Clarification of provision re re-examination	379
Re: Certification	379
Re: No change in principle	379
On Bill No. 90, Second Reading	544
Re: Rehabilitation under Workmen's Compensation Act	544
Increase in yearly expenditures	544
Re: Malton Rehabilitation Center	544
Only buildings purchased	544
Population of	544
Re: Assistance from Medical profession	545
Seeking new site	545
Present site inadequate	545
Cost of new site	545
Re: Section 2	545
Re: Alternate for Secretary	545
Re: Sections 3 and 4	545
Re: Penalizing lackadaisical industry	545
No necessity of reference to Committee	546
Nothing to be gained	546
On Bill No. 102, First Reading	559
Re: Safety provisions in trenches	559
Re: Appointment of Inspectors	559
On Bill No. 103, First Reading	559
Re: Appointment of Inspectors	559
Re: Bill should be discussed in House	560
On Bill No. 110, First Reading	590
Re: Elapsed time for conciliation	590
Re: Boards of Conciliation	590
Permissive powers of Minister to appoint	590
Re: No alteration of working conditions	590

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Ten-months bar	590
	Re: Craft Unions	590
	Inclusions liberalized	591
On Bill No. 103, Second Reading		696
	Was considered by all parties	697
On Bill No. 110, Second Reading		785
	Changes suggested when Act introduced in 1950	785
	Amendments now presented	785
	Proud of 4 years' results	785
	Re: Collective bargaining	785
	First introduced in Ontario in 1943	785
	Increase in trade union membership	785
	Increase in strikes negligible	785
	Only small fraction unlawful	785
	Act has worked well	785
	No provision for compulsory arbitration	785
	Reasons therefor	786
	Results therefrom	786
	Re: Organization of hospital staffs	786
	No power to terminate bargaining rights	786
	Department of Labour's function to settle strikes	786
	Conciliation Officers should not intervene	786
	Re: Table of incidence of strikes	787
	Re: Good judgment of Management and Labour	787
	Re: Promotion of industrial peace	787
	Re: Value of new plant and buildings	788
	Re: Continuation of union activity	788
	No interference with	788
	Re: Assumption of responsibilities	788
	Re: Field of industrial relations	788
	Re: Inclusion of Municipal employees	788
	Legislation provides for conciliation	789
	Protection for public and labour	789
	Municipal employees should not be deprived of benefits of Act	789
	Re: Trade unions responsibilities	789
	Re: Strike votes not desirable	789
	Legislation not intended for collective bargaining	789
	To clear preliminary disputes	789
	Unions carry out provisions of their constitutions	790
	Re: Compulsory check-off	790
	Not provided for in Legislation	790
	Re: Changes in conciliation process	791
	Re: Reduction in time	791
	Re: Power of Minister to refuse Board	791
	Is not new	791
	Re: Amendment to Section 6 (2)	792
	Re: Trade Councils	792
	Re: Abolition of Labour Court	792
	Was too judicial	792
	Act carefully revised	792
	Request support of House	792
On Estimates, Department of Labour		851
	Re: Correspondence between Department and Dominion Glass	851
	Will table correspondence	851

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Two factors to be considered	851
	Competitive markets	851
	Responsibility of Industry	851
Re: Textile industry		851
Re: Farm Implement industry		852
Re: Serious "levelling-off"		852
Re: Endeavour to secure most for workers		852
Re: Mining situation		852
	Re: Labour trouble in connection therewith	852
	Re: Standard of living	852
	Re: High wages	852
	Re: Methods of self-help	852
	Re: Examination of production problems	852
	Re: Present position of industry	852
	Possibilities in future	852
Re: Housing		852
	Prospects for	852
	Re: Future plans for industry	853
	Table of submissions to Department	854
Re: Gas pipe line from West		853
Re: Gas pipe line from Niagara to Toronto		853
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway and Power development		853
Re: Automotive industry		853
Re: Highway development		853
Re: Unemployment		853
	Opening of navigation will assist	853
	Increased tempo on farms and in canneries will afford relief of	854
Re: Tribute to staff		854
Re: Progressive increase of Estimates		854
Re: Growth of Ontario's industry		855
Re: Division of work in Department		855
	Health, safety and working conditions	855
	Operation of power plants	855
	Administration of social legislation	855
	Conciliation, anti-discrimination, etc.	855
	Apprenticeship training	855
	Work of Labour Relations Board	855
Re: Growth of Labour Department		855
Re: Elevator and Lifts Act		855
Re: Factories and Boiler Inspections		855
	Had busiest year	855
Re: Amendment to Factory, Shop and Office Building Act		855
Re: Vacations-with-pay legislation		855
	Re: Reciprocal stamp arrangements	855
Re: Zoning of Inspectors		856
		865
Re: Accident prevention work		858
	Re: Report of Royal Commission	858
	Re: Recommendations being studied	858
	Re: Many volunteer workers, in	859
Re: Massey-Harris fatality		859
Re: Seeking better way to administer		860
	Meetings with organized labour	860
	Briefs from Unions	860
Re: Ontario's accident record good		860

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Payment to workers injured in the past	862
	Difficulty in computing	862
	Re: Cannot estimate number of conciliation	862
	Re: Inspection service	865
	Has been re-organized	865
	Schooling of young inspectors	865
	Re: Fair Employment Practices Branch	865
	Difficult to enforce the law	866
	Employers are fair and just	866
	Co-operate fully	866
	Re: Grants for amateur	867
	Only recently begun	867
	Accomplishments so far	868
	Re: Youths working after 11 p.m.	868
	Authority given in certain cases	868
	Working very well	868
	Women on shift to prevent bottleneck	868
	With approval of Unions	868
On Bill No. 110, In Committee		997
	Bill considered over long period	997
	Consultations with many people	997
	Relationship between employer and council only by agreement	998
	Re: A worthwhile addition to labour relations legislation	998
	Re: Involves only particular union concerned	998
	Re: Determination of Collective Bargaining unit	999
	Re: Section 8 re "Guards"	1000
	Board has power to define	1000
	Re: Section 5	1000
	No way to assure top-level officials bargaining	1000
	No indication re junior officials	1000
	Prefer top-level officials not there	1000
	Provides opportunity for appeal	1001
	Re: Bill in Union's interest	1001
	Re: Reduction in conciliation time	1003
	Sincere effort to bring about	1003
	Employers are not "terrible people"	1003
	Conflicts not antagonistic	1004
	Re: Refusal to grant Boards	1004
	Will not be done drastically	1005
	Re: Not a minor amendment	1004
On Section 7		1005
	Never refused to appoint Board	1005
	Re: length of time for conciliation	1005
	Delays unavoidable	1005
	Re: Nomination of Conciliation Board members	1005
	Re: Co-operative effort on both sides essential	1005
Re: Section 18		1006
	Re: Conditions prior to legal strike	1006
	Re: Declaration from Board required	1007
Re: Section 24, Subsection 2		1007
	Re: Proof of membership	1007
Re: Decertification of Unions		1008
	7 cases in year	1008

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Appointment of supervising Conciliation Officer	1009
	Physically impossible	1009
	Happy at results of Labour Relations Act	1009
	Act result of careful consideration	1009
	Has studied all briefs	1009
On Bill No. 52, Second Reading		1057
	Government's position clear	1057
Re: Preston East Dome		1057
	Base rate increased	1057
	No comparison with agriculture	1057
Re: Checks-off for other purposes		1058
	Only temporary	1058
	For Union dues, permanent	1058
	Government will not accept Bill No. 52	1058

DAVIES, HON. (REV.) M. C. (Speaker) :

Re: Vacancies in House	13
Re: Election of A. C. Jolley, Niagara Falls	13
Re: <i>Hansard</i>	123
Alleged inaccuracies in	123
Weakness in system of	123
Possibility of mechanical recording	124
Improvement will be sought	124
On Report of Select Committee on Election Act	129
Method of consideration in control of House	129
Members may speak once	129
	130
Welcome to students of Orde Street and Ryerson Public Schools	202
Welcome to students of Claremont, Jesse Ketchum, Queensway and St. Michael's Schools	225
Re: Cancellation of meeting of Committee on Health	254
Re: Cancellation of all Committee meetings, March 2, 1954	257
Condolence, passing William B. Harvey	275
One minute's silence	275
Prayer	275
Re: St. David's Day	275
Lack of numbers compensated for	276
By enthusiasm	276
By devotion	276
By intelligence	276
Appreciation of gift of flowers	276
Welcome to students	335
Welcome to Kiwanis Club, Niagara Falls	335
Welcome to students	365
Welcome to students	419
Re: Passing of Charles G. MacOdrum	529
One minute's silence	529
Prayer	529
On Bill No. 90, Second Reading	547
Ruling re continuation of debate	547
Re: Conclusion of discussion on report of Cemeteries' Committee	549
Re: Passing of Joseph D. Nault	593
Tribute to	593
Sympathy extended to family	593
One minute's silence	593
Prayer	593

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Welcome to students	617
	Welcome to students	645
	Welcome to students	671
	Welcome to students	747
	Welcome to students	777
	Welcome to students	845
	Welcome to students	873
	Welcome to students	943
	Welcome to students	989
	Welcome to students	1073
	Welcome to Women's Conservative Association of Orillia	1073
	Re: Report, Select Committee on Indian Affairs	1091
	Discussion closed	1091
	Re: Report, Select Committee on Reform Institutions	1182
	Discussion closed	1182
	Welcome to students	1275

DEMPSEY, J. S. (PC Renfrew South):

On Speech from the Throne	375
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	375
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	375
Re: Riding of Renfrew South	375
Neglected in 1945	375
Roads in deplorable condition	375
Re: Hydro in	375
Former practices in	375
Many important changes in	375
Tribute to former employees of	375
Many still with Hydro	375
Progress of, in Renfrew South	375
Appreciation to Minister	375
Re: Labour	376
Tribute to Minister	376
Re: Public Welfare	376
Tribute to Minister	376
Tribute to hon. Mr. Dunbar	376
Re: Use of term "Hog Town"	376
Publicity not warranted	376
Re: "Pip squeak politician"	376
Definition of	376
"Hog Town" not liked	376
Has liking for Toronto	376
Lives in, greater portion of time	376
Re: Toronto thinks in privileged class	376
Re: Assessment of provincial buildings	376
Toronto	376
Taxes paid on	376
Riding of Renfrew South	376
One million acres	376
No taxes paid by province	376
Timber sold on, by province	376

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Assessment of Hydro property		376
Ruining roads		376
Every seat in Toronto should be "Tory"		376
Re: Differential in subsidies		376
Conditions improved in Renfrew South		377
Congratulatory to Government		377
Re: Irregularities in Highway Department		377
Re: "Art" Mills		377
Was well respected in Renfrew		377
Should not pre-judge		377
Reflection in family		377
Hopes for vindication of		377
Should be re-instated		377
On Report, Select Committee on Reform Institutions		582
Committee faced a tremendous task		582
Commendatory to Chairman		582
		583
Re: Visits to Institutions		582
Re: Money should be no concern when helping unfortunates		582
Re: Crime becoming a major problem		582
Re: Segregation		582
Believes in		582
Youth should be given opportunities to reform		582
Should be kept out of Institutions		582
Society's responsibility should be awakened		582
Should accept discharges		582
Obtain work for		582
Public should "bend over backwards" to assist		582
Institutions well kept		583
Good food and care provided		583
Cleanliness very evident		583
Re: Idleness in Institutions		583
Should be eliminated		583
Re: "Hard labour"		583
Not present now		583
Should be restored		583
Re: Government take over jails		583
Re: Per diem cost in jails		583
Enjoyed work with Committee		583
Personnel of Committee		583
On the Budget		751
Re: Citizens of Hearst, Ontario		751
Re: Exportation of Pulpwood		751
Should not all be sent to United States		751
Companies should be given opportunity to obtain markets		751
Re: Gambling		751
Horse racing		751
Extent of book making		751
Should be legalized		751
Re: Irish Sweepstakes		752
Investigated by Member for Brantford		752
Re: Hydro		752
Re: Conversion of, in Eastern Ontario		752
Should not be charged to citizens		752
Re: Iron-ore industry in Renfrew County		752

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Highway irregularities		752
Deputy Minister responsible		752
Contractors not to blame		752
Will take all they can get		752
Clerical work unknown to Minister		752

DOUCETT, HON. G. (Minister of Highways):

Re: Irregularities in Highways Department, Huntsville Division	47
Suspension of Division Engineer	47
Scope of consultants investigation	104
Re: Campaign funds	247
Not conditional on contracts	247
On Bill No. 80, First Reading	425
Revision of present Act	425
To apply to all channels	425
Not applicable to open or covered drains	425
Re: Allocation of grants	425
Re: Simplification of passing By-laws	425
On Bill No. 81, First Reading	425
Re: Consolidation of By-laws	425
Re: Use of land abutting	425
Broadened to include County Councils	425
Prohibition of construction within ½ mile of controlled access roads	425
On Bill No. 83, First Reading	426
Description of "built-up area"	426
Re: Obtaining licences by false statements	426
Re: Attaching devices to trailers, etc	426
Payments of penalties to Municipalities	427
On Bill No. 81, Second Reading	530
Re: Four recommendations	530
Section 1, Consolidating By-law by County Council	530
Section 11, Amendment to By-law, adding or removing roads	530
Are necessary to prevent unwieldiness	530
Section 2, Powers conferred on County Councils	530
Re: Establishment of County Roads System	530
Width not adequate	530
Widening difficult at times	530
Re: Powers of Section 390 of the Municipal Act	530
Re: Section 92 of Metropolitan Toronto Act	531
Approval of Municipal Board necessary	531
Sections 3 and 4	531
Are complementary	531
Re: Notices by Minister	531
Only effective after amendment comes into force	531
Re: Section 5	531
Re: Controlled-access roads	531
By-laws governing	531
On Bill No. 83, Second Reading	531
Several changes recommended	531
Re: Maximum speed limits	531
Re: Built-up areas	531
Inclusion of Churches and Schools	531
Re: Section 2	531
Re: False statements on applications	531

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Section 3	532
	Two separate attachments	532
	Re: Section 4	532
	Re: Bumpers on trucks	532
	Re: Section 5	532
	Re: Reduction of speed limits	532
	Can be regulated by By-law	532
	Re: Section 6	532
	Re: Right-of-way rule	532
	Re: Sections 2, 3 and 4	532
	Re: Signals for right turns and stops	532
	Re: Subsection 5	533
	Re: Stopping at through highways	533
	Re: Section 7	533
	Re: Validation of existing signs	533
	Re: Section 8	533
	Throwing of rubbish on highways	533
	Re: Section 9	533
	Re: Failure to remain at accident	533
	Penalty for	533
	Re: Increasing penalty	533
	Re: Section 10	533
	Re: Distribution of penalties	533
	Re: Payments to Municipalities	533
	Re: Sections 11, 12 and 13	534
	Re: Unsatisfied Judgment Fund	534
	Re: Increased protection of fund	534
	Re: Interest on judgments and costs	534
	Re: Section 14	534
	Re: Reportable accidents	534
	Increased from \$50 to \$100	534
On Bill No. 80, Second Reading		536
	Changes in Act commendable	536
	No drastic changes	536
	Re: Branch drains	536
	Re: Grants to agricultural sections of drainage work	536
	Re: Adjustment of grants	536
	Re: Section 4 (formerly section 3)	536
	Assistance to Municipalities	536
	Re: Forwarding petitions to Minister	536
	Re: Grants for emergency work	536
	Re: Section 5	536
	Minister allowed to pay grants not exceeding \$5,000	537
	Re: Section 6	537
Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways		594
	Re: Suspension of C. H. Nelson, ex-Chief Engineer, Department of Highways	594
	For failure to co-operate with auditors	594
	Re: Leaving country	619
	Not known to Department	619
	Re: Refusal of Nelson to reply to questions	649
	Re: Right of counsel for	649
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture		649
	Re: Activities of Department	649
	In Northern Ontario	649

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Breackage of land	649
	Table of	649
	Re: Farm Water supply	649
	Table of	649
	Re: Livestock	649
	Table of	649
	Re: Veterinary Services	651
	Table of	651
	Re: Potato production and weed control	651
	Table of	651
	Re: Freight assistance on seed potatoes	651
	Table of	651
	Re: Special Grants	651
	Table of	651
	Re: Field Men	651
	Table of	651
	Re: Contributions to finding of water	652
	Re: Agricultural Societies	652
	Re: Fall Fairs	652
	Re: Horticultural Societies	652
	Re: Plowing Matches	652
	Re: Community Centres	652
	Re: Marketing Branch	652
	Re: Cheese factories and production	652
	Re: Farm labour	652
	Re: Field crops	652
	Re: Agricultural limestone	652
	Re: Control of Warble Fly	652
	Re: Brucellosis	653
	Re: Women's Institutes	653
	Re: Price spreads	655
	Not in provincial jurisdiction	655
	Re: Merchandising research	657
	Government would contribute toward	657
	Re: Abolition of Farm Camps	658
	Re: Royal Winter Fair	659
	Grant used as prize money	659
	Freight not paid on stock for exhibition	659
On Estimates, Department of Highways		809
	Re: First estimates for highways	809
	Re: First contract—Town of York	809
	Re: Ontario road mileage, January 1, 1953	809
	Re: Highways to benefit province	810
	Re: Major construction, 1953	810
	Re: Construction in 1953, in repairs	810
	Re: Construction in 1953, new work	810
	Re: Expenditures in 1953	810
	Re: Grading and modernizing older sections	810
	Re: Trans-Canada Highway	810
	Re: Services rendered by Department	810
	Keeping roads open in winter	810
	Re: Road information and weather reporting service	810
	Assists free movement of commerce	810
	Re: Tourist industry	810
	Expansion of	810

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Roadside parks		811
Re: Picnic tables		811
Widely appreciated		811
Re: Direction and warning signs		811
Makes night driving safer		811
Re: Motor vehicle registrations		811
Increase of—1946-1953		811
Re: Motor accidents and fatalities		811
Appeal for co-operation		811
Requires use of common sense and respect for other's rights ..		811
Registrations in 1953		811
Re: Traffic fatalities 1952 and 1953		811
Re: Property damage 1952 and 1953		811
Re: Educational safety campaigns		811
Re: Examinations for driving licences		811
Endeavour to make adequate		811
Can determine if <i>can</i> operate motor vehicle safely		811
Cannot determine if he <i>will</i>		811
Re: Cancellation of driving licences		811
Re: 90 per cent. of accidents due to human factors		811
Re: Implications of safe driving		812
Re: Hit-and-run drivers		812
Increased penalties for		812
Re: "Safety" addresses by Members		812
Re: Members can be of great assistance in safety campaigns		812
Re: Pamphlet "Speak of Safety"		812
Re: Operation of Old Fort Henry		812
Re: Roads systems of counties and townships		812
Work greatly expanded		812
Re: Subsidies for road improvements		812
Re: Improvement of unserviceable roads		812
When Municipalities cannot finance		812
Re: Equipment pools		813
Machinery in		813
Re: Expenditures by Municipal Roads' Authorities		813
Re: Road improvement in unorganized townships and statute labour areas		813
Re: Snow removal		813
Very expensive		813
Re: Amendments to Highway Improvement Act		813
Example—Town of Wallaceburg		813
Re: Construction of bridges on highways		813
Re: Mr. Arthur Sedgwick		813
No bridge failed through faulty design		813
No civil servant with better record		813
Re: Adequate transportation required		814
Re: Northern Development Road building		814
Poses many special problems		814
Re: Manitouwadge area		814
Re: Expenditures, 1933-1944		814
Re: Expenditures, 1944-1953		814
Re: Accomplishments in 1953		814
Re: Controlled-access highways		814
Re: Traffic, Windsor-Quebec border		815
Re: New route necessary		815
Re: London-Woodstock by-pass		815

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Interceptor road—Toronto	815
	Re: Highway 401	815
	Re: Highway 400	815
	Re: Highway 17	815
	Important revisions east of Ottawa	815
	Re: Trans-Canada Highway	815
	Ontario's share	815
	Benefit to tourist industry	816
	Re: Burlington bottleneck	816
	Re: Navigational rights	816
	Re: Construction of new bridge	816
	Re: Financial obligation of Federal Government	816
	Re: Letter, Minister to hon. Mr. Winters	817
	Re: Research branch of Department	817
	Re: Heavy maintenance programme	817
	Re: Free Camping Parks	817
	Re: Zone painting	817
	Re: Traffic interchanges	817
	Re: Tree and shrub planting	817
	Re: Grade separations	817
	Re: Unsatisfied judgment fund	818
	Re: Normal construction programme anticipated	818
	Re: Municipal claims on Provincial Government	818
	Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways	818
	Re: Accomplishments of Department	818
	Re: Tremendous demands on Department	819
	Re: Extraordinary conditions created	819
	Re: Discovery by Department officials	819
	Re: Vigorous investigation into	819
	Re: Investigation by Provincial Auditor	819
	Re: Engagement of J. D. Woods, Gordon & Co.	819
	Re: Select Committee to enquire into	819
	Re: Prosecutions	819
	Re: Efforts of Department	819
	To discover offences	819
	To ascertain cause	819
	To revise departmental procedure	819
	Re: No condonation of wrong doing	819
	Re: Honesty is characteristic of great majority	819
	Re: Extract from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, page 104	820
	page 180	820
	Re: No violation of principles of British justice	820
	Re: Will be no concealment	820
	Re: Everything an open book	823
	Re: Procedure from original survey to completion	823
	Re: Letting of contracts	823
	Form of	823
	Re: Granting of contracts at less than engineer's estimates ...	823
	Re: Close accuracy of estimates	825
	Re: Statement of pending construction	825
	Re: Variations in contracts	825
	Re: Statement re recompense for low tenders	829
	Totally untrue	829
	Re: Appointment of Acting Engineers	830

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Licence Plates	831
	Slogan thereon	831
	Will not remove Crown	831
	Re: Funds withheld from certain contractors	831
	Re: Snow plowing of roads other than King's highways	832
	Departmental policy re	832
	Letter—McEwen to Wren 11/2/53	832
	Municipalities to make own arrangements	832
	Department will subsidize	832
	Re: Public given all available information	833
	Re: Anticipated future work	833
	Difficult to secure technical men	833
	Continuation of Windsor Highway	834
	Re: Method of granting subsidies	834
	Re: Service road in Oshawa	836
On Bill No. 83, In Committee		1158
	Re: Amendment to Section 3	1158
	Deleted	1158
	Substitution therefor	1158
	Re: Amendment to Section 5	1158
	Re: Amendment to Section 28, Subsection 2(a)	1158
	Re: Amendment to Subsection 10	1158
Re: Council of Metropolitan Toronto		1158
	Re: Section 86, Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953	1158
	Was deleted	1158
	Same power as city	1158
	Re: Decreasing and increasing speeds	1158
Re: Section 11		1158
	Deleted	1158
	Section 12 now Section 11	1158
Re: New Section 12		1159

DOWNER, (REV.) A. W. (PC Dufferin-Simcoe):

On Report of Committee on Reform Institutions	411
Congratulatory to Chairman	411
Day of emancipation for Committee	411
Tribute to hon. Minister	411
Legacy to present Department	411
Department the "unwanted child"	411
Annual cost of Department work	412
Minister should be given opportunity to prove himself	412
Tribute to Deputy Minister	412
Re: Institution at Brampton	412
Created by present Minister of Municipal Affairs	412
Re: Increase in number of Industrial Farms	412
Tribute to hon. Attorney-General	412
For establishment of Probation System	412
Re: Rehabilitation	412
More elaborate plans required	412
Transportation and clothing should be supplied inmates on discharge	412
Work should be secured for discharged inmates	412
Society should be ready to receive him	413
Can best be done by Department	413
Re: Increased segregation	413

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Chaplaincy Service	413
	Extract from Archambault Report, 1946	413
	Formal religious services not sufficient	413
	Personal work and individual counsel required	413
	Chaplains should have more latitude	413
	No present chaplaincy service in Institutions	413
	Some on part-time basis	413
	Should be full-time service	413
	Re: Work in Institutions	413
	Dignity of should be emphasized	413
	Adequate provision for, necessary	413
	Good work programme an essential	413
	Re: Recidivism	413
	Increase in	413
	Re: Reformatory purpose given statutory recognition	414
	Nothing done to give effect to	414
	Re: "Colleges of Crime"	414
	Re: Probation	414
	Situation in Great Britain	414
	Should be greatly increased	414
	Fewer committals rather than more reformatories	414
	Beneficial if properly administered	414
	Will cut prison population	414
	Reformatory plan required for each individual	414
	Report should receive full consideration	415
	Congratulatory to Government	415
On the Budget		1218
	Regret at passing of three Members	1218
	Re: First duty of government	1218
	Plan for peace, prosperity, security and happiness	1218
	Re: Far-reaching legislation	1219
	Main Bills acceptable to Opposition	1219
	Re: Meeting increased costs of Children's Aid Societies	1219
	Re: Secondary School education re marriage	1219
	Re: Forward-looking educational policy	1219
	Re: New Schools in Dufferin-Simcoe	1219
	Re: Activities of Department of Education	1219
	Re: Teachers from England	1219
	Should assist local teaching profession	1219
	Re: Entrance requirements should be raised	1220
	Re: Education of public	1220
	Re: Graduation exercises	1220
	Re: Teachers' uniform text book	1220
	Re: Children should be taught self-reliance	1220
	Should be taught to read properly	1220
	Not be given too much homework	1220
	Should eliminate "frills"	1220
	Standards raised to level of top students	1220
	Re: Uniform entrance examinations	1220
	Re: Examinations in teachers' training should be more difficult	1220
	Re: Tribute to Minister of Health	1221
	Re: Expenditures on health projects	1221
	Re: Cancer control	1221
	Re: Ontario Hospital, Orillia	1221
	Re: Increased grants to hospitals	1221

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Tribute to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission	1222
	Re: Shipbuilding and coastal trade	1222
	Protection for Canadian less than foreign	1223
	Re: Variations in wages	1223
	Re: Carriage of grain on Great Lakes	1222
	Re: In United States only ships carrying U.S. Registry can enter coastal trade	1222
	Re: Legislation to protect Canadian sailors and shipyards urgent	1222
	Re: Department of Public Welfare	1223
	Re: Old-age assistance	1223
	Re: Review of disabled persons' allowances needed	1223
On the Budget (continued)		1227
	Instances of	1227
	Legislation should be enacted	1227
	Basis should be broadened	1227
Re: Criticism of Department of Highways		1227
	Tribute to Minister	1227
	Highways compare favourably with any elsewhere	1227
	Roads in constituency	1227
	Should be improved	1227
	Re: Road, Angus to Creemore	1227
	Re: Highway 89	1227
	Villages of 500 or over should be linked with main highways By Provincial roads	1228
Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways		1228
Re: Agriculture in Province		1228
	A main problem	1228
	Purchasing power of farmers should be increased	1228
	Re: New markets for farm produce	1228
	Re: England greatest potential market	1228
	Sterling should be convertible	1228
Re: Debt owed to Atkinson Foundation		1228
	Tribute to	1228
Re: J. B. Bickell Foundation		1228
Re: Grants by Atkinson Foundation		1228
	Bursaries	1228
	Youth Development and Culture	1228
	To Boy Scouts	1228
	Ballet Guild	1228
	Shakespearean Festival	1228
	Medical research	1229
	School of Nursing	1229
	Many hospitals	1229
	Canadian Institute for the Blind	1229
Re: John Ross Robertson		1229
	Unrepayable debt to	1229
Re: Coronation ceremony		1229
	Created keener and deeper sense of responsibility	1229
Re: Loosening of ties with Motherland		1229
	Causing alarm	1229
	Privy Council appeals abolished	1229
	Removed "Dominion" from Canada's title	1229
	Removed "Royal" from Mail Boxes	1229
	Removed Crown from Air Force badges	1229
	Considering changing the Flag	1229
Re: Re-action of Her Majesty		1229

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Canada must remain part of Commonwealth	1229
	Flag the keystone of the Commonwealth	1229
	Keep hands off	1229
	Re: Erection of Free State must not happen	1229
	Extract from Rudyard Kipling	1229
	Statement by Sir John A. MacDonald	1229
	Re: Ontario's appreciation of strong government	1229
	British to the core	1229
DUNBAR, HON. G. H. (Minister of Municipal Affairs):		
On Bill No. 112, First Reading		94
Re: Section 1		94
Re: Purposes of Bill		94
Re: General revision of Municipal Act		94
On Report of Select Committee on Election Act		129
Careful consideration should be given		129
Cannot support some recommendations		129
Re: \$200 deposit		129
Re: Permanent returning officers		129
Does not favour reduction in number of nominators		129
Would admit "crackpots"		129
Re: Business Colleges		173
Re: Wills Business College—Ottawa		173
Afforded good opportunities		173
Not offered by High Schools		174
Discipline in		174
Re: Member for Kenora		174
Credit advances		174
Total re-payment		174
Re: Business Colleges a necessity		174
Re: Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i> re Metro		202
Creation of Metropolitan area not based on Section 22		202
Re: Dissolution of Interurban Board		202
On Bill No. 56, In Committee		519
Re: Town of Malton		519
Re: Hearing before Municipal Board		519
Only fair procedure		519
Re: Municipal Board		521
Is a necessity		521
Issuance of debentures		521
Re: Representations on County Council		522
On Bill No. 79, Second Reading		544
Re: Eastern Ontario		544
Re: Renfrew County		544
Re: Island between Ontario and Quebec		544
On Bill No. 111, First Reading		591
Re: Combining Parks' Boards		591
On Bill No. 120, First Reading		646
Re: Power to Minister to adjust subsidies		646
For summer fire and police protection		646
In case of annexation		646
On Estimates, Department of Highways		824
Re: Estimates for water works at Sioux Lookout		824
Repeated requests to Municipal Board		824
Resignation of Mr. Wren as Clerk-Treasurer		824
Deficit in Sioux Lookout		824

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 140, First Reading		875
Re: Authorization to Municipal Board to provide grants, upon annexation		875
On Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs		957
Re: Assessment Branch		957
Re: Reasons why correct basis necessary		957
Re: Future expansion		958
Re: Manual of Assessment Values		958
Re: Greater Toronto Assessment Branch		958
Re: Homes for the Aged Act		959
Re: Assessment of Ontario Government property		959
Re: Assessment of Ontario Hydro's property		959
Re: County Assessment System		959
Re: Table of Metropolitan Toronto Assessment		960
Re: Licencing of Municipal auditors		960
Re: Instructions and recommendations to Auditors		960
Re: Municipal auditing and accounting		960
Divisions of		960
Re: Review of Audit Reports		960
Re: Instructions to Municipal Clerks and Treasurers		960
Re: Special Reports		960
Re: Special Investigations		961
Re: Uniform accounting		961
Re: Provincial Grants		961
Table, break-down of		961
Re: Municipal Administration Branch		962
Composition of		962
Supervision		963
Improvement Districts		963
Designated Mining Municipalities		963
General Assistance		963
Departmental approval		963
Road closing		963
Pensions		963
Tile drainage		963
Assistance to Municipalities		963
Table, Gross debenture debt		963
Re: Municipal taxation		963
Table of		965
Re: Ontario Municipal Board		965
Powers and duties		965
Acts concerning		965
Judicial duties and powers of		965
Re: Disputes between Municipality and Municipality		965
Disputes between Municipality and Province		965
Disputes between Municipality and Individual		965
Disputes between Individual and Individual		965
Re: Administrative duties		965
General Comments		966
Re: Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act		966
Re: Registrar-General's Branch		967
Re: Capital expenditures		968
Tables of		968
Table of Local and General debt		969
Re: Partial Exemption policy		972
Voted on by Toronto citizens		972

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Too late to vote for raised exemptions, 1949	972
	Consent on promise of vote in 1950	972
	No power to stop exemptions	972
	Will not be changed	972
Re:	Registrations of births	974
	Fee for	974
On Bill No. 111, In Committee		983
	Re: Municipal Parks' Board	983
	Re: Community Centre	984
On Bill No. 140, Second Reading		1086
	Re: Annexation of rural areas	1086
	Seriously affected financial position of Townships	1086
	Of County	1086
	Re: Municipal Board had no power to compensate	1087
	Re: Amendment to Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953	1087
	Per Capita grants for 5 years	1087
	Re: Payments of compensating grants by annexing Municipalities	1087
	Applicable to amalgamations	1087
	Present procedure under Municipal Act continued	1087
	Re: Defects in former systems	1087
	Now repealed	1087
	Re: Appeals from orders of Municipal Board	1088
	Re: Prior investigation by Government	1088
	Re: No appeal from Order confirmed by government	1088
	Re: New hearing by Municipal Board	1088
	Government to determine personnel of Board re-hearing	1088
On Bill No. 112, In Committee		1159
	Re: Eligibility of Deputy Reeves to sit in County Councils	1159
	Re: Situation in Improvement District of Ajax	1159
	No need to change Act	1159
	Re: Amendment providing right of appeal	1160
	Re: Difference between revoking and issuing licences	1160
	Re: Police Commissions should be vested with great powers	1160
	Re: Section 19, Subsection 7(e)	1162
	Carefully considered by Ontario Municipal Association	1162
	If raised to 20 years, might become "racket"	1162
On Bill No. 113, In Committee		1162
	Amendment to Section 13 (1)	1162
	Amendment to Section 13 (2)	1162
On Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions		1173
	Re: Use of inmate labour	1173
	Nothing new	1173
	Have worked on roads	1173
	Re: Offer for Mercer building	1176
	Re: Selection of site for new Institution	1176
	Land expropriated	1176
	Not wanted in York County	1176
	Re: Segregation impossible without additional Institutions	1176
On Bill No. 138, In Committee		1198
	Re: Power of Lieutenant-Governor in Council	1198
	Re: Naming Board for re-hearing	1198
On the Budget		1283
	Pleasure to enter debate	1283
	Re: Attendance of Members at Session	1283

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Address by Member for Ottawa East	1283
	One statement re "wonderful job"	1283
	Next statement re "worst mess" ever	1283
	Government never failed to co-operate	1284
	Told not necessary enter 2nd Mortgage field	1284
	Re: Statement by Provincial Treasurer	1284
	Re: Great industrial expansion	1284
	Re: Former one-mill subsidy	1284
	Present grant equals 22 mills	1284
	Assisting "little people"	1284
	Re: Department of Public Welfare	1284
	Re: New homes for the aged	1284
	Congratulatory to Minister	1284
	Re: Increase of grants to charitable institutions	1284
	Re: Of great assistance to some Institutions	1284
	Particularly in Ottawa	1284
Re: Department of Health		1285
Re: Minister		1285
	Deserves a Star	1285
	Assistance to Mentally Ill	1285
Re: Treatment in General Hospitals		1285
	No stigma attached	1285
	Grants to General Hospitals	1285
	Ottawa General	1285
	Ottawa Civic	1285
	London, St. Joseph's	1285
	London, Victoria	1285
	St. Catharines	1285
	Toronto, Western	1285
	Toronto, St. Michael's	1285
Re: Ontario first in world to establish scheme		1285
Re: Ontario "going places"		1285
Re: Government preparing for future		1285
Re: Statement by Prime Minister, 1944		1286
Re: Response by people, 1945		1286
Re: Department of Highways		1286
	Estimates passed by House	1286
Re: Surplus in Department		1286
	To be spent for "little people"	1286
Re: American tourists to Ontario		1286
Re: Education		1287
	Tribute to work of Minister	1287
	First educationalist as Minister	1287
	Education a difficult problem	1287
Re: Change in calculation of Superannuation for Teachers		1287
Applications for many Municipalities		1287
Re: Nothing wrong with government		1287
Re: Increase of assessments		1287
Re: Gross debenture debt		1288
	Percentage of taxable assessment	1288
	Slight increase only in 10 years	1288
Re: Financial picture of province		1288
	Reflected in prosperity of Municipalities	1288
Re: Sound financing by Provincial Treasurer		1288

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES

SUBJECTS

PAGES

DUNLOP, HON. W. J. (Minister of Education):

On Bill No. 101, First Reading	559
Provision for alternates for Trustee Organizations	559
Re: Immediate filling of vacancies	559
On Estimates, Department of Education	730
Re: Increase in school population	730
Present enrollment	730
Increased classrooms required	730
Costs of construction of	730
Grants for construction of, only	730
Re: Teacher supply	730
Importing of from British Isles	730
Restrictions eased	731
Re: Departmental staff	731
Re: Increased duties of Inspectors	731
Re: Municipalities may appoint own Inspectors	731
Re: Stress on basic essentials	731
Re: English system	731
Visit by Professor Gurrey	731
Re: Training of retarded children	731
Great response throughout province	731
Re: New Ryerson Institute	731
In different location	731
Close to transportation	731
Re: Vote 39, Item 20	732
Details of	732
Re: Vote 40	732
Re: Enrollment in Teachers' Colleges	732
Has declined somewhat	732
Reasons for	732
Re: Vote 48	733
Re: Toronto Teachers' College	733
On new site	733
Re: Vote 41	734
Re: Guidance	734
Re: Correspondence Courses	734
Re: Vote 41, Item 39	734
Re: Summer Camps	734
Re: Teaching of "Camp Technology"	734
Improved method found	735
199 non-profit camps assisted	735
32,000 attended	735
Re: Vote 43	735
Public Libraries Branch	735
206 Huron Street	735
Invitation to Members to inspect	735
Re: United States Text Books	736
Disappearing rapidly	736
Re: Vote 49	736
Re: Bursaries	736
Value of	736
Shares of costs of	737
Re: Vote 50	737
Education of non-resident pupils	737

Re: Vote 50, Item 1	737
Re: Legislative grants	737
No objection to inclusion of chart	737
Re: Vote 50	739
Re: Recreational facilities	739
Re: Estimates rising since 1943	739
Re: Province assisting cultural activities	742
On Bill No. 135, First Reading	845
Now a faculty of University of Toronto	845
On Bill No. 87, In Committee	900
Re: Number of retired teachers	900
Re: Method of calculating pensions	900
Changed during depression	900
Re: Matter fully considered	900
Re: Attempt at adjustment would become general	900
Re: Problem too large for any government	900

EDWARDS, J. F. (PC Perth):

On the Budget	672
Congratulatory to previous speakers	672
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	672
Re: Special grants and payments	672
Re: Grants to hospitals	672
Re: Hospital services for middle class	672
Met with rising costs	672
Re: Contributory Health Insurance Plan	672
Government should lead, re	672
Re: Grants to Municipalities	673
Re: Upkeep of provincial highways	673
Municipalities should be freed from	673
Re: Decentralization of Industry	673
Re: Transportation and shipping costs	673
Re: Truck haulage	673
Creates highway hazards	673
Licence fees should be increased	673
Re: Bus licence fees	673
Re: Visit to Cobalt	673
Re: Equipment of Ontario Northland Railway	673
Excellence of	673
Should be province-wide	673
Re: Conservation	673
Re: Fanshaw Dam	673
Re: Need for proper sanitation and sewers	674
Re: Towns of Mitchell and St. Marys	674
Re: Perth County	674
Agriculture in	674
Re: Reduced earnings in	674
Number of farms in	674
Acreage of	674
Population on	674
Farmers incomes restricted	674
Re: Education	674
Grants for	674
Should be increased	674
Supplying of text books desirable	674
Text books should be standard	674

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Child Welfare and Protection	675
	Work of Children's Aid Societies	675
Re: Stratford Shakespearian Festival		675
	Extract from <i>Financial Post</i>	675
On Bill No. 94, In Committee		1066
	Re: Coal supplies	1066
	Re: Protection to public	1066

ELLIOTT, R. E. (PC Hamilton East):

On Bill No. 5, In Committee	1198
Re: Section 4, deleted	1198
Substitution therefor	1198
On the Budget	1257
Re: Committee on Travel and Publicity	1257
Problems of	1257
Re: Submissions	1257
From Northern Great Lakes Area Council	1257
By President Widnall	1257
Re: Pooling advertising	1257
Re: Contributions by Members	1257
Re: Increase in contributions	1257
Re: Magazine "Holiday"	1257
Re: United States Airlines	1257
Re: South America	1257
Re: State of Oregon	1257
Re: Province of Ontario	1257
Re: From Ontario Tourist Courts Association	1257
Licensing by Central Authority	1257
By Inspectors in unorganized Territory	1257
Re: Complaint re business assessment	1258
Suggest Select Committee to investigate	1258
Re: Three-star grading system	1258
Desire government assistance	1258
Re: Travel beneficial	1258
Promotes goodwill	1258
Re: Enlarged scope of Department	1258
Re: French language colour advertising "short"	1258
French language "short" by Department of Highways	1258
Re: From Canadian Trailer Court Association	1258
Re: Select Committee to investigate mobile home parking facilities	1259
Re: 70 Parks operated by Department of Highways	1259
Re: From Canadian Restaurant Association	1259
Interested in Canadian cuisine	1259
Re: Amendment to Liquor Licence Act	1259
Re: Control of flies and mosquitoes	1259
By use of Lindane	1259
Re: Business injured by early closing of Service Stations	1259
Suggest Select Committee re their problems	1259
Re: From Association of Tourist Resorts of Ontario	1259
Re: Direction signs needed	1259

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: From Hotel Association of Ontario		1260
Good co-operation from Department		1260
Re: From Chairman, Museum's Committee of Ontario Historical Society		1260
Suggested support to assist in extension		1260
Only after investigation		1260
To prevent over-lapping		1260
Re: Promotion of winter vacations in Province		1260
Re: Potential ski terrain		1260
Re: Investigation by Standing Committee		1260
Re: Bulletin, Royal Bank of Canada		1260
Re: Competition with United States		1260
Re: Educational programme necessary		1261
Re: Touring in Ontario		1261
Should include farming areas		1261
Similar to conditions in Europe		1261
Re: Demonstration farms		1261
Re: Tourist expenditures declining		1261
Re: Must attract tourists		1261
Re: Select Committee on Tourist Promotion		1262
Re: Attraction of Tourists to United States		1262
By consistent advertising		1262

FISHLEIGH, H. F. (PC Woodbine):

On Speech from the Throne	370
Re: Woodbine riding	370
Nothing has happened in	370
Termites in	370
Efforts at extermination of	370
Woodbine variety of	370
Origin in, unknown	370
Migration of	370
Action taken if visiting Lindsay	370
Re: Canadian bacon	370
Not palatable	370
Danish bacon best	371
Re: Pig raising	371
Experience in	371
Eating habits of	371
Indications of disease of	371
Re: Visits of Canadians to Florida	371
Attractions of Ontario should be promoted	371
Scenic beauties of Ontario	371
Ski-ing facilities in Ontario	371
Should attract many tourists	371
Value of apples as food	371
Ontario crop should be increased	371
Should attract winter tourists	371
Would assist Bruce and Grey Counties	371
Re: Housing	371
Re: Bill No. 80, 1953	371
Government has favoured Toronto	371
Has entered another phase	372
Entry of American and English builders	372
Plant for making electricity with atomic energy	372

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Increase in apartment building	372
	Entire building complexion changing	372
	Re: Use of United States money	372
Re: Inflation		372
	Is uneconomical	372
	Re: Government Mortgages	372
	Decrease in demand for high-priced homes	372
	Influx of people into Toronto	372
	Scheme of City Council to curb	372
	Scheme abandoned	372
	Present good time to sell old houses	372
	Many homes needed	373
	Selling old houses and buying new	373
	Re: Provincial Second Mortgages	373
	New houses better than old	373
	More modern inspections	373
	Re: Land assembly	373
	Re: Profits from	373
	Should be used for services	373
	Re: 40 foot lots	373
	Advantages of	373
	Re: Suburban services	374
	Restricted by Metropolitan Council	374
Re: Delays before Municipal Board		374
	Zoning of land for commercial purposes	374
	Effect on Dominion Store expansion	374
	Metropolitan Council will succeed	374
Re: Acoustics in Legislative Chamber		374
Complimentary to Government		375
On the Budget		748
	A credit to government	748
	Statement of Julius Caesar	748
	Lack of public appreciation of	748
	Municipalities demanding further grants	749
	Re: Reduction of grants	749
	Will create trouble	749
	Re: Method of overcoming difficulties	749
	Re: Size of Budget	749
	Astonished at	749
	Comparison with City	749
Re: Greater Toronto Business Men's Association		749
	Grants for	749
	Grants refused	749
Re: Financial future		749
Re: Liquor Control Board		749
Re: Comparisons of jail population		750
Re: Effect of T.V. on beer consumption		750
Re: Income Tax		750
Re: Municipal grants		750
	Amendment to Motion	750
	Not seconded, withdrawn	750
On Estimates, Department of Labour		861
	Re: Cancer fund	861
	Workers donations to fund	861

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions		1173
Re: Situation at Westchester, N.Y.		1173
Re: Large farm		1173
Re: Inmates co-operate with work		1173
Reason not applicable here		1173
Department not properly meshed together		1173

FOOTE, HON. J. W., V.C. (Minister of Reform Institutions) :

On Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions	1164
Interesting, difficult and instructive year	1164
Previous events in addition to routine programme	1164
This year a Select Committee	1164
Made heavy demands on staff	1164
Staff equal to demands	1164
Re: Irritating observations	1164
Opportunity to all to express views	1164
Dissatisfaction created at times	1164
Never pleasant to be criticized	1164
Arduous duties of Chairman	1165
Was honest, fearless, diligent and intelligent	1165
Created public confidence in Government	1165
Applies to Committee personnel	1165
Field controversial and complex	1165
Abilities applied faithfully to problems	1165
Work received acclaim of public	1165
Thanks for their work	1165
Re: Inherited "mess"	1165
Referred to by Member for Kingston	1165
Re: Department faced with many problems	1165
Due to increased population	1165
Difficult to foresee	1165
Tremendous contributions to field of penology	1165
Beginning with Ministry of Mr. Hanna	1165
Continuing to present date	1165
Appreciation of wise counsel by Minister of Municipal Affairs	1165
Re: Establishment of Brampton	1165
Re: Industrial Farm System	1165
A new conception of penology	1165
Re: Studies dating back to 1896	1165
Re: Archambault Report	1166
Member for Kingston's connection with	1166
Agrees, in main, with Committee's Report	1166
Re: Efforts to implement Report	1166
Re: Current expenditures	1166
Maximum Department entitled to	1166
Re: Evaluation of responsibility	1166
Re: Creation of healthy economic conditions	1166
Re: Fair treatment for inmate population	1166
Re: Encouragement to those trying to reform	1166
Re: Methods of proceeding	1166
Variety of opinions re	1166
Each believes is right	1166
Re: Field of Theology	1166
Experience in	1166

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Reformation not by people	1166
	By the Grace of God	1166
	People's own determination	1166
Re: "Reform Institutions"		1166
	A peculiar name	1166
	Never liked	1166
	Cannot help people who will not help themselves	1166
	Will not "toady" to unsound and unreasonable demands	1166
	Discipline without weakness	1166
	Control without sentimentality	1166
	Rehabilitation impossible without respect for authority	1166
	Solid citizens entitled to protection	1166
Re: Probation System		1167
	Will relieve jail pressure	1167
	Has some limitations	1167
	For those guilty of minor offences	1167
Re: Grants to Training Schools		1167
	Not wholly under Department jurisdiction	1167
Re: Children in Children's Training Schools		1169
	Follow ordinary school procedure	1169
	Receive understanding direction and supervision	1169
Re: Advisory Board		1169
	In existence a long time	1169
	Re: Opinion of Select Committee	1169
	Re: Acts on advice of Superintendent	1169
	Re: Home superior to Institution	1169
	Re: All foster homes not satisfactory	1169
	Re: Improvement in social environment	1169
	Re: Retarded children	1170
	Re: Recreational centre	1170
	Government contribution to	1170
Re: Schools as good as possible		1170
Re: English public school system		1170
Re: Grant to John Howard Society		1171
Re: Parole Board		1171
	Re: Resignation of Chairman	1171
	Re: Public announcement of	1172
	Re: Considering recommendation of Select Committee	1172
Re: Use of inmate labour		1172
	Only applicable to certain inmates	1172
Re: Labour by inmates in Reformatories		1173
Re: Industry in Institutions in Canada		1173
Re: No surplus of labour		1173
	Many not capable of hard labour	1173
	Cannot compete with outside labour	1173
	Re: Another Select Committee	1173
	Member for Woodbine as a member	1173
Re: Output from Guelph greater than that of combined Canadian Federal Institutions		1173
Re: Mercer Reformatory		1175
	Does not favour dismantling	1175
	Nothing wrong with it	1175
	Extract from Report of Grand Jury on	1175

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Facilities should be enlarged	1175
	Other facilities required	1175
	Mercer retained and used as a centre	1175
	Women's institution similar to Brampton for men ..	1175
Re: Criticism of Galt School by Select Committee		1177
	Costs can be cut	1178
	Efforts to do already made	1178
	Matter to be very carefully examined	1179
Re: Uniforms for Galt		1179
	May be objection to	1179
	Are in use in private schools	1179

FROST, ARTHUR (PC Bracondale):

On Speech from the Throne	293
Regret at passing of W. B. Harvey	293
Congratulations to mover and seconder of Reply	293
Welcome to Mr. Jolley	294
Welcome to Mr. Letherby	294
Regret at passing of Doctor McPhee	294
Re: Return hon. Mr. Gemmell	294
Congratulations to hon. Mr. Dunbar	294
Re: Municipal grants	294
Re: Toronto Metropolitan area	294
Re: Healthy economy of province	294
Re: Concentration of Industry	295
Re: Urban transportation	295
Congratulations to Prime Minister	295
Re: Highways	295
Expansion of	295
Re: Railway service from Toronto	295
Re: Suburban expansion	296
Re: Railway commuter service	296
Re: High land values	296
Re: Parking problem	296
Re: Regent Park development	296
Re: Housing	296
Re: Proper planning	296
Re: Age of exploitation is passed	297
Re: Natural resources	297
Re: Export of forest products	297
Re: Mining industry	297
Development of	297
United States Mining decreasing	297
Trade position improved	297
Congratulatory to Minister of Health	297
Re: Capital grants	297
Re: Mentally ill	297
Mental hospital at Lakehead	297
Extension of Toronto Hospital	298
Extension of Orillia Hospital	298
High discharge rate of	298
Re: Public Welfare	298
Re: Pensions for unemployables	298
Re: Homes for the Aged	298
Commendation of hon. Minister	298
Re: Lambert Lodge	298

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Free hospitalization	298
	Re: Buoyant revenues	298
	Re: Health Insurance	298
	Re: Traffic accidents	298
	Re: Ontario Provincial Police	299
	Re: Administration of Justice	299
On the Budget		1262
	Congratulatory to Prime Minister	1262
	Re: Revenue on current account	1262
	From few sources	1262
	Gasoline tax	1262
	Vehicle licences	1262
	Lands and Forests	1262
	Liquor profits	1262
	Succession Duty	1262
	Tax-rental Agreements	1262
	Re: No Sales Tax in Ontario	1262
	Re: Amusement tax	1262
	A nuisance tax	1262
	Re: Federal budget	1262
	Re: Federal annual expenditures	1262
	One-half from Ontario taxpayers	1262
	Re: Results from expenditures	1262
	Re: Expenditures on Education	1262
	Re: Provincial highways	1263
Re: Welfare		1263
	Pensions for unemployables	1263
Re: Department of Reform Institutions		1263
	Great improvement in	1263
	Report of Select Committee, re	1263
Re: Hydro		1263
	Re: Growth of	1263
	Re: Expansion of rural hydro	1263
	Re: A great factor in prosperity of Ontario	1263
	Proportional division of tax dollars	1263
	Services provided by Province	1263
	New distribution of duties and responsibilities needed	1263
	Municipal governments most in need of help	1263
	Re: Grants to	1263
Re: Credit at all-time high		1264
Re: Incoming immigration		1264
Re: Ontario Hospital, Queen Street		1264
	Addition to	1264
	For diagnostic and early treatment	1264
Re: New bridge at Humber		1264
Re: By-pass north of Toronto		1264
Re: Increasing registration of motor vehicles		1264
Re: Poses many problems		1264
Re: Readjustment of taxation practice		1264

FROST, HON. L. M. (Prime Minister) :

Re: Passing of Dr. McPhee	6
Re: Resignation of W. L. Houck	6
Re: Welcome to former Premiers	6
Number of since Confederation	6

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	List of those deceased	7
	Five still living	7
	All present at Opening	7
Re: <i>Hansard</i>		13
	Printing of	13
		14
	Reference to Committee on Printing	14
Re: Former estimates for printing		14
	As compared with mimeographing	14
Re: Recommendation of Committee		14
	Limited to 800 copies	15
Re: Printing of earlier proceedings		15
	Referred to Committee on Printing	15
Re: Appointments of Standing Committees		15
	Seventeen in number	15
	Re: Early appointment of	16
Re: Committee on Redistribution		16
Re: Appointment of Chairman of Committee of Whole House		16
Re: Visit to Subway		21
Re: Membership on Committees		29
	Addition of Messrs. Wren and Nickle to Public Accounts Committee	45
	Addition of Mr. Salsberg to Public Accounts Committee	46
Re: Appointment of Public Accounts Committee		30
Re: Provincial Auditor's report		30
Re: Irregularities at Fort William		30
	Criminal action instituted	30
	Civil action not precluded	30
	Tribute to Provincial Auditor	30
	Auditor's investigation	30
	Appointment of J. D. Woods & Gordon	30
	Commission far-reaching	31
Re: Disclosures		31
	Reasons for withholding	31
	No desire to limit investigation	31
		36
	Highways Department activities may be extended	31
	Procedure capable of betterment	31
	Lessons learned will be applied	31
	Committee will have full power	32
Re: Matters sub judice		32
	Bar references outside the House	32
	Extent of privilege	32
	Re: Prejudicial to trial of accused	32
Re: Appointment of Select Committee		33
Re: Time required for passage through Courts		33
Re: No desire to withhold information		33
		34
Re: Will meet situation "head on"		33
Re: Method of discovery		33
Re: Investigation without fear or favour		33
Re: Desirable to clear up all matters		33
Re: Broad powers of Committee		33
	Reference to Committee no bar to other procedure	36
Re: Passing of Agnes MacPhail		37
	Brief political biography of	37

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Discussion of Bills on second reading	40
	Re: Unemployment in Toronto	48
	Re: Unemployment Insurance	48
	Re: Relief for unemployables	48
	Re: Largely a Federal responsibility	48
	1954 expected to be year of high employment	48
	Re: Works programme	49
	Hydro	49
	Roads	49
	Public building	49
	Re: Staffs—Oppositions	68
	Former personnel of	69
	Re: Salary—Leader of Opposition	69
	No different treatment re	69
	Re 1950 revision of	69
	Implementation delayed pending election	69
	By recommendation of Select Committee	69
	Re: Ottawa revisions	69
	Agreeable to another Select Committee	69
	Recognition of burdens on Opposition	69
	Re: Research work by Opposition	70
	Supplying not required of Government	70
	No parallel for in Canada	70
	Would be beyond Mr. Speaker's control	71
	Will re-consider matter	71
	Re: Flash floods in Ontario	71
	Latest reports encouraging	71
	Re: Effect on City of London	71
	Relief afforded by Fanshaw Dam	71
	Re: No requests for financial aid	72
	On Bill No. 51, second reading	88
	Thorough consideration in Committee	88
	Personal subscriber to rural telephone	88
	Re: Experiment in Kenora riding	88
	Re: Wireless communication	88
	Re: Consideration of Report of Committee on Elections	88
	On Speech from the Throne	106
	Congratulatory to Mr. Dent	106
	Government endorsed by people twice	106
	Re: Department of Highways	106
	Irregularities on	106
	Government on trial	106
	How situation being handled	106
	Inception of matter	106
	Re: Auditors' investigation	106
	Showing no fear or favour	106
	Re: Stoppage of payments	107
	Re: Suspension of senior officials	107
	Re: Appointments of special prosecutors	107
	Re: Appointment of consultants	107
	Commission unlimited	107
	Re: Press release, October 7, 1953	107
	Re: No attempt at secrecy prior to by-elections	107
	Re: Statements possible in Simcoe East	108

Re: Seriousness of situation not minimized	108
Thinks proper course followed	109
Re: Royal Commissions	109
Re: Mr. Oliver's statement, 1949	109
Re: Strengthening of all Departments	109
Problems constantly growing	109
Honesty in all systems essential	109
Extract from <i>Inspection News</i>	110
Crime statistics	110
Extract from <i>Saturday Evening Post</i>	110
Ways to rob banks	110
Government of Ontario big business	110
Comparison of budgets	110
Expansion of highway programme	110
Majority of contractors competent	110
Comparative state of Highways	110
Re: Revision of Highway Improvement Act	111
Re: Comptroller of Finances	111
Re: Provincial Economist	111
Re: Comptroller of Revenue	111
Comptroller of Accounts	111
Re: Pending new Finance Act	111
Justice to all	111
Application of lessons learned	111
Issues of good government	111
Record of Government	112
Re: Metropolitan Toronto	112
Developments of	112
Re: Attitude of late Controller Shannon	112
Re: Housing in	112
Re: Assistance to Municipalities—Grants to	112
Re: Visit to Manitoba	112
Address to Municipal Associations	112
Re: Unconditional grants	113
Re: Advertisement in Simcoe East	113
Re: Ontario Social Services	113
Re: Pensions to disabled	114
Re: Education	114
Re: Progress in other fields	114
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway	114
Re: Fiscal arrangements	114
Re: No additional taxes	114
Re: Ontario's taxes lowest in Canada	114
Re: Break-down of under-estimated \$58,000,000	115
Re: Credit of Province	115
Re: Future faced with confidence	115
Extension of public projects	115
Supplying rural power	115
Loans to young farmers	115
Housing financing	115
Extension of hospitals	115
Re: White Paper, Lands and Forests	120
Re: Beveridge Report	120
Great Britain security	120
Meeting of Forestry experts	120
Re: 20-year policy of Department	120

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: <i>Hansard</i>	123
	Inaccuracies in	123
	Not enthusiastic about	202
	Should be accurate	123
On Report of Select Committee on Election Act		127
	Summation of consensus of opinion of three Parties	127
	Re: "Leader-at-large" of CCF Party	128
	Re: No influence in preparation of report	128
	Re: Report may not reflect consensus of opinion of the House	128
	Re: Report a good one	128
Re: Telephone Authority		146
	Purpose—modernization of Statutes	146
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway		148
	People anxious to have built by Canada	148
	Complete agreement—Ontario and Federal Governments	148
	Development of power, primary	148
	St. Lawrence an International river	148
		149
	Re: United States Authority	148
	United States co-operation welcomed	148
	Re: 1951 agreement with Ottawa	149
Re: Lands and Forests		160
	Committee on	160
	Long-term policy required	161
	Re: Export of pulpwood	161
	Re: Forests of other days	161
	Regarded as weeds	161
	Ruthlessly destroyed	161
	Re: Best achievements possible desired	161
Introducing Mr. Lloyd Letherby		197
Re: Compensation of wrongful imprisonment		199
	Many difficulties connected therewith	199
	Every effort made to correct mistakes	199
	Most meticulous care must be taken	199
	No compensation paid in Commonwealth	200
	Convictions by juries in good faith	200
	Different juries might have different views	200
Re: Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i> , Feb. 24, 1954		200
	"Is Metro a matter for laughs?"	200
	The answer is, "No"	200
Re: Amalgamation not desired		200
	Too late for	200
	Area too large	200
	Problem too big	200
	Too many complications	200
	Chaos the inevitable as a result of	200
	Would not work	201
	Governments action right a year ago	201
	Principle still right	201
	Changes may be necessary	201
	Only minor amendments in 1954	201
	All doubts now dispelled	201

Re: Metropolitan Council	201
Efforts appreciated	201
Nothing done for expediency	201
Broad view of general betterment desired	201
Re: Picket line at Noranda	243
Re: Depressed gold-mining industry	244
Re: Party funds	245
In all respects unconditional	245
Only on what is good for the country	247
Re: Appointment of Committee on Government Commissions	249
Re: Delegations re Unemployment and Public Works	250
Re: Previous Commission on Hydro	250
Re: Hydro and Highways doing tremendous work	250
Re: Government's business to carry on efficiently	250
Re: Alleged secret agreement between Ottawa and Washington	263
Existence of denied	263
Re: Wiley Bill	265
Re: Water route, Montreal to Fort William	265
Re: Canals en route	265
American canal the larger	265
Re: Negotiations through International Joint Commission	266
Re: Passing of William B. Harvey	278
Biography of	278
Business history	278
Great loss to Province and Assembly	278
Re: Funeral of late W. B. Harvey	307
Re: Boards of Trade Conference	342
Re: Diversification of industry	342
Re: Other industries affected	342
Re: Gold industry	342
Re: Attack on broad front	342
Not an aspirin tablet	342
Re: Comparison of Ontario 1944 and 1954	343
Re: Bill No. 68, held over	344
Could be referred to Committee on First reading	344
Bill a safe step	344
Not committed to specific future Acts	344
Motion to refer to Committee	344
Same procedure as with Private Bills	345
Re: Convening of Committee on Public Accounts	387
On Bill No. 78, First Reading	420
Appointment of Committee re	420
Schedules left for Committee	420
On Bill No. 91, First Reading	452
Re: Procedure in Treasury Department	452
Re: Growth of Ontario's finances	452
Re: Increase in budget in decade	452
Re: Development of method of Treasury control	452
Re: Objects of Bill	452
Consolidation of certain Acts	452
Reorganization of Treasury Department	453
Designation of senior officials	453
Duties of	453
Deputy Provincial Treasurer	453
Comptroller of Finances	453

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Provincial Economist	453
	Comptroller of Revenue	453
	Comptroller	454
Re: Budget Committee		454
	Duties of	454
	No further changes in policy	454
Re: Plaque to Robert Baldwin		455
		996
		1018
Re: Investigation re irregularities in Department		
	by J. B. Woods & Gordon	479
	Covering entire Department	479
Re: Increasing expenditures to exhaust appropriation		479
	Highways Department has operated within Estimate	479
	Increased expenditures not tolerated	479
	Most minute investigation will be made	480
	Nothing will be withheld	480
Re: Monies received from Federal Government		483
	More advantageous under former agreement	483
On the Budget		490
	Eleventh consecutive	490
Re: Prophecy of 10 years ago		490
	More comprehensive review	490
	Last decade remarkable	490
Re: Capital investments		490
	Increase in	490
Re: "Soft spots"		490
	Downward trend in farm incomes	490
	Slackness in Textile industry	490
	Plight of gold mining industry	490
	Increased unemployment	490
	Problems must be kept in proper focus	490
	Attitude of confidence justified	490
	Expansion of domestic markets	490
	Increasing population	491
	Requirements to maintain living standards	491
Re: St. Lawrence River power project		491
Re: Flexibility to meet changing conditions		491
	Efforts to maintain stability	491
	Budget result of efforts of many	491
	Criticism of 1953 presentation	492
Re: Fiscal programme		492
Re: Provincial expenditures		492
	Ordinary and Capital	492
Re: Surpluses		492
Re: Conservation of credit		492
	Ontario's taxation lowest in Canada	492
Re: Appendices to		492
Re: Supplementary Estimates		493
	Re: Special payments	493
	Re: Expansion of College of Dentistry	493
		1075
	Re: Grants to Universities	493
Re: Human betterment		494

Re: Education	494
Re: Health and Welfare	494
Re: Ontario Mental Hospitals	495
Re: Psychiatric treatment	495
Re: Cancer Foundation	495
Re: Cobalt-bomb therapy	495
Re: Poliomyelitis	495
Re: Hay fever	495
Care of Indians	495
Re: Charitable institutions	495
Pensions for disabled	495
Re: Housing	496
Increase of units	496
Re: Partnership arrangement	496
Re: Programme for	496
Acquisition of land	496
Re: Subsidized rental housing plan	496
Re: Second-Mortgage plan	496
Re-payments under	496
Re: Natural resources	496
Re: Extension of rural power lines	496
Re: Ontario's record	497
Re: Mining Industry	497
A foundation industry	497
Will assist in improving	497
Re: Uranium deposits	497
Re: Forestry	497
Re: "White Paper" on	498
Re: Conservation	498
Re: Shelf of projects	498
Re: Highways	498
Expansion of	498
Increase in motor vehicles on	498
Reasons for	499
1953-4 expenditures for	499
Re: 5-year plan	499
Re: Public Works	499
Large-scale programme	499
Re: Hydro	500
Great progress in regard to	500
Re: Rural Hydro	500
Re: Assistance to Municipalities	500
Programme of	500
Re: Unconditional grants	500
Re: Federal-Provincial Relations	500
Re: Tax-rental agreement	500
Re: Closer integration of levels of government	500
Re: Division of responsibility re unemployment	501
Re: Timing grants	501
Should be co-operative effort	501
Re: Provincial Net Debt and Investment in Resources	501
Re: Provincial credit	501
Re: Amount of bonds guaranteed	502
Re: Post-war construction	502
Re: Addition to physical assets	502
Re: No additional taxes	503

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Reduction in some taxes	503
	Re: Estimates for coming year	503
	Re: Budgeting uncertain	503
	Re: Highlights of Budget	503
	Re: High record of achievement	504
	Re: 1953 promise	504
	Re-affirmed in 1954	505
	Re: Citation from Mr. Cecil Frost	505
	Re: Notice of Motion	505
	Re: Select Committee on Highways Department	505
Re: Passing of Charles G. MacOdrum		527
	Citation of John Bright	527
	Biography of Mr. MacOdrum	527
	Re: Legal career	528
	Words futile at this time	528
	Sympathy extended to family	528
	Adjournment of House in memory of	530
On Bill No. 79, Second Reading		541
	Final decision not made, re	541
	Four Departments involved	541
	No new Department to be established	542
Welcome to Mr. Desjardins, from Quebec		553
	Re: Histories of Ontario and Quebec	553
Re: Provincial debt		567
	Increase in	567
	Effect of St. Lawrence project on	567
	65 per cent. of capital commitments paid from cash	567
	35 per cent. capitalized	567
Re: Headline in Toronto <i>Star</i> re Conference with Unions		574
	Totally inaccurate	574
Re: Passing of Joseph D. Nault		591
	Biography of	592
	Re: Political career	592
	Re: Sympathy extended to family	592
Re: Third Readings of Bills		596
	Re: Royal assent	596
	May be deferred until end of Session	596
Re: Orderly consideration of Estimates		596
On Supplementary Estimates		597
	Re: Shortage of Dentists	597
	Re: New site for Dental College	597
	Re: Probable cost of	597
	Re: Time element involved	597
	Re: Admitted inadequacies in present facilities	597
	Re: Method of most rapid progress	597
	Re: Property situation	597
	Does not preclude new building later	597
Re: Cancer Institute		597
	Difficulties re	597
	Caused by divergent views	597
Re: Same situation re Dental College		598
Re: Opportunity to Federal Government to assist		598
Re: Supplementary Estimates part of responsible government		599
Re: Estimates an investment in future		599

Re: Payments of capital commitments	599
Percentage of from ordinary account	599
Estimate for betterment of Province	599
Re: Hospital grants	599
Re: Superannuation grants	599
Re: Old-age pensions	599
Re: Supplemental payments re	599
Would cause general dissatisfaction	599
Desire to avoid further Salsberg speeches	599
Present position of old-age pensions	599
Will pay proper share of Federal increases	600
Future actions as dictated by circumstances	600
Re: Highway reserve fund	600
Re: Sales taxes in other provinces	601
Fiscal future of province not to be jeopardized	601
Re: "Taking a chance"	601
Re: Investments in province	601
Re: Endeavour to avoid sales tax	601
Re: Hospital grants	602
Re: Deficit in Teachers' Superannuation Account	602
Re: Fund will increase until 1970	602
Then decline	603
On Bill No. 118, First Reading	646
Extension of exemption for payments	646
Re: Committee re gold mining industry	647
Situation causing concern to Government	647
Decline in number of operating companies	647
Decline in number of employees	647
Industry, world-depressed	647
Cause of	647
Price remained static	647
Rise in price would relieve situation	647
Re: Recent labour disputes	647
Reasons for	647
Lack of agreement as to main factors	647
May be removed by Committee's action	647
Re: Negotiations, re	647
Re: Lack of understanding of problems	647
By management	647
By labour	647
Re: Enquiry essential	647
Re: Shaping of provincial policies	647
Re: Committee not a Royal Commission	648
Personnel of Committee	648
Re: Terms of reference	648
Are very broad	648
Conditions affecting	648
Underlying causes	648
Effects of development	648
Committee not a Board of Arbitration	648
Personnel has no direct connection with mining interests	648
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture	659
Re: Milk Board	659
Created by Statute	659

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Decisions of Board	660
	Only after settlement not arrived at	660
	Board then exercised its responsibility	660
	Settlement necessary in public interest	660
	Re: Unanimous Conciliation Board Report	660
On Bill No. 78, Second Reading		694
	Re: "Gerrymandering"	695
	Definition of	695
	Vacancy on Committee not filled	695
On Bill No. 106, Second Reading		698
	Re: Contributions for public-ward beds	698
	Re: Opportunity provided for Hospital and Municipal participation	698
	Re: Conference with Hospital Association	698
	Re: No sound hospitalization insurance plan in Canada	698
	A failure in United Kingdom	698
	Subsidization essential	698
	Tried in other provinces	698
	Scheme abandoned	698
	Province will proceed slowly and soundly	699
On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General		717
	On Vote 29, Items 7 and 8	717
	Re: "Crime comics"	717
	Simply lurid stories	717
	Should continue with Estimates	718
On Estimates, Department of Insurance		726
	Re: Increase in Blue Cross rates	726
	Re: Article in <i>Toronto Telegram</i>	729
	Extract from	729
	Re: Increase a moderate one	729
	Re: Duties of Superintendent of Insurance	729
On Miscellaneous Estimates		742
	Has been changed	742
	Will not appear next year	742
Re: Tabling of Trans-Canada agreements		781
	Involves voluminous correspondence.....	781
	Should be an Order for Return	781
	Will be placed before Select Committee	781
	Agreement could be tabled immediately	781
Re: Appointment of Select Committee re Expenses of Select Committees		782
	Notice of Motion to appoint	782
On Bill No. 110, Second Reading		784
	Opportunity for further discussion	784
	Indulgence granted to member for St. Andrew	794
	Full opportunity afforded to all members to speak	795
	Statement by member entirely incorrect	795
	Legislation mentioned in Speech from the Throne	795
	Legislation discussed with delegation	795
	Re: Holding of Bill	795
	Re: Bill fully explained	796
	Eulogistic references to good legislation unavoidable	796
On Estimates, Department of Health		796
	Re: Chlorination of water	796
	Referred to University of Toronto	796

	Referred to Department of Dentistry	796
	Referred to Faculty of Medicine	796
	Government's contribution to Brantford experiment	797
	Situation will be reviewed by experts	797
On	Estimates, Department of Highways	821
	Re: Proceedings of Select Committee	821
	Parliament is supreme	821
	Re: Exercise of fair play and common sense	821
	Re: Committee as supreme as Legislature	821
	Re: Dealing with technicalities	822
	Re: Should do nothing to prejudice trials	822
	Re: No concealment	822
	Re: Best system possible will be provided	822
	Re: Highway Reserve Fund	830
Re:	Appeal by Canadian Cancer Society	846
	Government investment in research	847
	Commends to people	847
On	Estimates, Provincial Auditor	847
	Should not become routine	847
	Re: Auditor, a servant of the House	847
	Not of Government	847
	Re: Provincial Auditor and Staff	847
	Have been self-effacing	847
	Re: Letter from Brown to Hepburn	848
	Appraisal that of Government	848
	Mr. Brown's appraisal correct	848
	Has shown unswerving loyalty	848
	Faithful to duty	848
	Sound advisor	848
	Opinions on fiscal position	849
	Is of great ability	849
	Equally applicable to Deputy	849
	No work more important	849
Re:	Allowances for	849
	May be increased	849
	Power of Auditor to secure assistants	849
	Difficulties in securing	849
	Great amount of work involved	849
	Re: Auditing all provincial activities	851
	Re: Differences of opinion regarding	851
	Re: Warrants further consideration	851
On	Bill No. 139, First Reading	873
	Two great races in Canada	874
	In close co-operation	874
	Canada now has many nationalities	874
	Statutory opposition to racial and religious discrimination	874
	Re: Racial Discrimination Act, 1944	874
	Re: Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1950	874
	Re: Present law prohibits discrimination in all condition of employment	874
	Re: Accommodations, services and facilities not covered by statutory enactment	874
	Re: Many requests to remedy	874
	Re: Repeal of Racial Discrimination Act	874
	Provisions included in present Act	874
	Re: Latest development of science	874

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Promote respect for human rights	874
	Re: Denial, cause of World's trouble	874
	Re: Universal Declaration of Human Rights	874
	Re: Full citizenship for Indians	874
	Re: No further "bond and free"	875
On	Bill No. 87, in Committee	901
	Re: Pension computed many years ago	901
	Re: Principle affects wide variety of cases	901
	Re: Incident of raise in pension	901
	Re: Government has done everything possible	901
	Re: Pension fund will increase to 1970	901
	Then begin to decrease	901
On	Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests	917
	Re: Salvaging operations	917
	New procedure	917
	Re: Fire in Mississagi forest reserve	917
	Re: Investment from Consolidated Revenue Fund	917
	Re: Result, 300 million board feet	917
	Re: Emergency programme	917
	Re: Results better than anticipated	918
	Re: Good start in forest management	918
	Re: Forests' Commission	919
	85 per cent. Ontario land in the Crown	919
	Not feasible nor democratic	919
	Re: Appointment of Advisory Committee	919
	Fullest opportunity for ascertaining all information	919
	No pressure on government	920
On	Bill No. 91, In Committee	932
	Re: Amendment to Part VI	932
	Sections 66, 67, 68 and 69	932
	No infringement on jurisdiction of Provincial Auditor	932
On	Bill No. 51, In Committee	933
	Re: Stated case to Court of Appeal	933
	By Authority itself	933
	Re: Section 96, Subsection 1, Municipal Board Act	933
	Re: Subsection 2	933
	Remitted to Authority	933
	Can then give to interested parties	933
	Section may appear ambiguous	933
	Re: Payment of costs	933
	Authority semi-judicial body	933
	Re: Section VI	934
	Amendment to	934
	Acceptable to Government	934
On	Bill No. 92, In Committee	936
	Re: Section 1, Subsection 3	936
	Re: Section 1(b)	937
	Re: Amendment to Section 1	937
Re:	Opening of Toronto Subway	969
	Received lasting impressions	969
	Re: Admiration for people of Toronto	969
	Re: Sixth subway in America	969
	First in Canada	969
	Re: Modern approach to major traffic problems	969
	Re: Vision of leaders over years	969

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: York birthplace of responsible government	970
	Re: Toronto on brink of greater things	970
On Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs		975
Re: Metropolitan assessment		975
	By virtue of Bill, 1951	975
	Necessity of reconciling situation	975
	Assessors did good work	975
	Methods unavoidably varied	975
	Differences vanished on Re-assessment	975
	Reports almost equal	975
	Situation misunderstood at first	976
	Same yardstick not used	976
	Reasons for	976
Re: Introduction of Bill No. 80		977
Re: Provincial-Municipal Committee		977
	Has enormous task	977
	Doing excellent work	977
Re: Meeting Manitoba Municipal Association		977
Re: Dominion-Provincial Conference necessary		977
	Re: Health Insurance and Hospitalization	977
Re: Committee studying powers of Municipal Board		978
Re: Permanency of Committee		978
Re: Difficulties involved		978
Re: Interim reports of		978
Re: Committee a fact-finding body		979
Re: Salaries of		979
On Bill No. 19, In Committee		980
	Purpose of Bill	980
Re: Appointment of Select Committee re Committees' members		
	expenses	985
	Reasons for	985
Re: Unveiling plaque to Robert Baldwin		996
		1018
On Bill No. 110, In Committee		997
Re: Memo from Ontario Federation of Labour		997
	Not opposed to Bill	997
Re: Bill available for some weeks		997
	Considered in open meeting	997
Re: Legal strikes		1007
	Re: Hollinger strike	1007
	Re: Decision of Board	1007
	Governs Minister	1007
Re: Hon. Robert Baldwin		1019
	Biography of	1019
	Descendants present	1019
	Plaque to Nursing Sisters	1019
	Including Dorothy M. G. Baldwin	1019
Re: Radio broadcast, May 9, 1950		1019
	At opening of Mackenzie House	1019
	Re: Letter from Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King	1020
	Extracts from Radio broadcast	1020
	Robert Baldwin a Moderate	1021
	Believer in principles of responsible government	1021
	Re: Election of 1843	1021
	Re: Statement by Lord Durham	1021
	Re: Progress continuing in 1954	1022
	Re: World's ideas and ideals	1022

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 52, Second Reading		1060
Government attitude re check-off		1060
Is permissible		1060
Re: Ontario Northland Railway		1060
Re: Civil Service Association		1060
Re: War Veterans Association		1060
Re: Framework of Government Act		1060
Collective bargaining		1060
Re: Eight kinds of check-off		1061
Selection of, determined by bargaining		1061
Would obliterate collective bargaining		1061
Becomes matter of arbitration		1061
Revocable check-off is meaningless		1061
Re: Period of experimentation		1061
Some section may require amending		1061
No interference with operation of Act		1062
On Bill No. 141, First Reading		1074
Appointment of Mrs. E. Frankel to Board		1074
Details of her work		1074
Appointment of Bradley Heintzman to Board		1074
Re: Grant to School of Dentistry		1075
Close relationship between Dental and Medical Health		1075
Only five Dental Colleges in Canada		1075
Extended dental teaching programme		1075
Of nation-wide benefit		1075
Hopes for Federal grant		1075
Ontario will match Federal grant		1075
Federal funds for Ontario health grants		1075
Cannot be spent economically		1075
Re: "Secrecy bars" re information concerning tax payers		1076
Information requested would become public		1076
Same provisions as re Income Tax		1076
Information will be given in confidence		1076
Re: Felicitations to Mr. Nixon on birthday		1077
On behalf of all Members		1077
On Bill No. 139, Second Reading		1078
Will strengthen legislation		1078
Progress in anti-discrimination practices		1078
Re: Letter from R. C. Churchman		1078
Letter from Rev. Canon Judd		1078
Re: Deputation from Civil Liberties Association		1078
Re: Address by Mr. Don Moore		1078
Could be no discrimination against him		1078
Re: Department to administer Act		1079
Combined with Fair Employment Practices Act		1079
Public Housing authorities warned against discrimination		1080
On Estimates, Department of Provincial Treasurer		1117
Re: United States borrowings		1117
Re: Methods of borrowing		1117
Return to New York market, 1951		1117
Too much borrowing raises interest rates		1117
Re: Establishment of European market		1118
Re: Large amounts of money in Europe		1118
Re: Swiss investments in Canadian securities		1118
Re: Recent New York loan		1118

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Credit maintained at high level	1118
	Re: Ottawa financing from ordinary accounts	1118
	Re: Ontario situation different	1119
	Position one of expansion and development	1119
	Re: Establishment of third or fourth borrowing market	1119
	Explanation endorsed by financial advisers	1119
	Re: Purchase of bonds of Ontario Northland Railway	1120
	Re: Not drying up markets	1120
	Re: More borrowings in Canada than United States	1120
	17 per cent. from United States in 10 years	1120
Re:	Censorship a difficult problem	1123
	Provincial Treasurer a Court of Appeal	1123
	Re: Variety of opinions re censorship	1123
	Re: French picture "Le Ronde"	1123
	Large Board of Appeal thereon	1123
	Re: Statement by Alex Barris	1124
	Re: Three varying points of view	1125
Re:	Junior Farmers Establishment Loan Corporation	1125
	Re: Irate comments by supporters	1125
	Re: Remarks deserve serious consideration	1126
	Re: Board "too tough"	1126
	Re: Functioning of Agricultural Loan Board	1126
	Re: Some loans still outstanding	1126
	Re: Matter will be further considered	1126
	Re: Purposes for which loans were to be made	1127
	Re: Directors of Board	1127
	Re: Will serve useful purpose in Ontario	1127
Re:	Bill No. 78	1149
	Should be carefully read by Members	1149
On	Bill No. 128, In Committee	1163
	Complete Committee Report presented	1163
	Is not the last word	1163
	Will be further considered	1163
Re:	Appointment Select Committee on Highway safety	1187
	Re: Personnel of Committee	1187
	Re: Number of deaths on highways, 1953	1187
	Re: Concerns all America	1187
	Re: Offences covered by Criminal Code	1187
	Re: Of vital concern to Ontario	1187
	Re: Opportunity for full investigation	1188
	Re: Publicity should eliminate personal carelessness	1188
	Re: Investigations in United States	1188
	Re: Conference convened by President of United States	1188
On	Bill No. 124, Second Reading	1189
	A good Bill	1189
	Inflicted on rural people	1189
	Objection to in some localities	1189
	Municipal Council to be consulted	1189
	Re: Situation in Brantford Township	1189
	One difficulty a legal technicality	1189
	Re: Municipality not zoned	1189
	Re: Bill gives right to Township to pass on applications	1189
	Re: Field for self-determination	1189
On	Bill No. 136, In Committee	1192
Re:	Appointment of Returning Officers	1192

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Situation in Kenora	1194
	Particular circumstances of	1194
	Should be some elasticity	1194
On	Bill No. 139, In Committee	1202
	Re: Continuation of Education	1202
	Re: Ontario's problems different	1203
	Re: Legislation educational	1203
	Re: A matter of policy	1203
	Agrees with objective	1203
	Re: Situation in United States Departmental Stores	1203
On	the Budget	1214
	Re: Committee on Commissions	1214
	To meet present-day situations	1214
	Re: Former Select Committee on Hydro	1214
	For specific purpose	1214
Re:	Notice of Motion No. 8	1248
	Appointment of Select Committee	1248
	Re: Registration of conditional Sales contract	1248
	Personnel of	1248
	Due to changing conditions	1248
	Originally registered in local offices	1248
Re:	Notice of Motion No. 9	1248
	Appointment of Select Committee	1248
	Re: Operation Fort William Division, Department of Highways	1249
	Personnel of	1249
	Committee should meet soon as possible	1249
	Expected to be able make statement in February	1250
	Investigation a tremendous affair	1250
	Filled with unusual difficulties	1250
	Re: Alleged irregularities in engineering data	1250
	Re: Investigation not confined to one division	1250
	Re: Issuance of search warrants	1250
	For reasonable and probable cause	1250
	Matters should be expedited	1250
	No books or amounts held without justification	1250
	Re: Investigations not completed	1250
	Re: Search warrants not issued promiscuously	1251
	Re: If not issued, probably no reasonable and probable cause	1251
	Re: Chief Engineer	1251
	Should be left to officers of the Crown	1250
Re:	National Wildlife Week	1274
	Widely recognized in Canada	1274
	Re: Jack Miner and his work	1274
	A great conservationist	1274
	Expression of thanks to Members	1274
	No Parliament more devoted to duties	1274
No	change in appearance of Leader of Opposition and Member for Brant	1274
Tribute	to Member for Cochrane South	1274
	A careful member of House	1274
Re:	Member for St. Andrew	1274
	Meticulous in collecting clippings	1274
Re:	Work of Legislature greatly increased	1275

GEMMELL, HON. W. S. (Minister of Lands and Forests) :

Re: Renewable Resources' Development	149
White Paper on	149
Thanks to House for expressions when ill	149
Congratulatory to newly-elected members	150
White Paper a blue-print for future	150
Continuous efforts for good management	150
Re: Surveying and engineering	150
Re: Water resources	150
Re: Forest inventory	150
Re: Aerial survey of Patricia area	150
Photos supplied to other Departments	151
Re: Lumber and pulp and paper industries	151
Importance of	151
Re: Federal grants	151
Re: Scope of accessible forests	151
Half under lease	151
Working plans required	151
Re: Co-operation of industry	151
Re: Completion of inventory	151
Re: Largest markets in United States	151
Re: Saw-milling industry	151
Red and white pine basis of	152
Possibly extinct in 20 years	152
Re: Pulp and paper industry	152
Spruce, basis of	152
May also become extinct	152
Re: Experimentation with other species	152
Pending legislation	152
Re: hard and soft woods	152
Full discussion required	152
10-year programme should be inaugurated	152
Re: Rotation of crops	152
Re: 85-year period	152
Chief concern 50-100 years from now	153
Methods used in preparation of report	153
Re: Special Report, Dean Sisam	154
Re: Special examinations, Maj-Gen. Kennedy	154
Re: Importance of protection of forests	154
Re: Forest fire-protection	154
Re: Research Pathological Station at Maple	154
Re: Research in insect destruction	154
Re: Construction of Beaver Aircraft	155
Re: Fish and Wild Life Division	155
Re: Assessment of Natural Resources	155
Re: Non-resident angling licences	155
Re: Resident hunting licences	155
Re: Reforestation	155
Re: Contribution by Mr. Zavitz	156
Re: Use of best silviculture methods	157
Re: Scandinavian methods not applicable to Ontario	157
Re: Forestry programme retarded by depression	157
Close study of report desired	157
On Bill No. 82, First Reading	426
Re: Control of tree cutting	426

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 82, Second Reading		517
Re: Cutting of trees		517
By-laws covering		517
Re: Appointment of Inspectors		517
Re: No authority in certain organized municipalities		517
On Bill No. 89, Second Reading		517
Re: Plans deposited for cutting		517
Must be approved by Department		517
Re: Regeneration and reforestation		517
Method of handling		517
Minister empowered to require further work		517
Re: Tribute to Ministers for assistance during absence		905
Regrets at passing of Dr. McPhee, Mr. Harvey, Mr. MacOdrum and Mr. Nault		905
Re: Place of renewable resources in Economics		906
Re: Industries which process raw materials		906
Table of gross value of products for Canada		906
Re: Pulp and Paper Industry		906
Primary producers		906
Re: Gross value of production		906
Re: Increase in production of pulpwood		906
Extract from <i>Canada Year Book</i> , 1952-1953		906
Re: Sawmilling Industry		907
Gross value of production		907
Re: Future outlook		907
Bright for pulp and paper		907
Re: Wood pulp		907
For rayon, cellophane, plastics, etc.		907
Re: United States consumption of pulpwood		907
Exceeds production		907
Re: Unprecedented demand for lumber		907
Ontario industry unsettled		907
Re: Inventories in British Columbia		907
Reached Ontario		907
At competitive prices		907
Re: British Columbia stocks exhausted		907
Ontario benefits from lessened competition		907
Upward trend will continue		907
Re: Departmental "White Paper"		907
Production maintained at high level		907
Re: Kraft industry		907
Re: Fish and Wildlife values		907
High economic value		907
Value of fish to tourist industry		907
Maintained at high level		908
Re: Water values		908
One-fifth of Ontario under water		908
Second to air in value to humans		908
Survey re control and conservation		908
Re: Departmental activities		908
Timber Management		908
Completion of forest inventory		908
Expanded in 1953		908
Re: Discarding Doyle rule		908

Re: Proclamation of Crown Timber Act, 1952	908
Re: Organization of management units completed	908
Re: Timber cut from Crown Lands	908
Re: Forest protection	908
Flexibility of aircraft important	908
First use of helicopters	908
More efficient use of fire fighters	909
Training courses in fire fighting	909
Re: Suppression crew and equipment	909
Re: Water bombing	909
Re: "Shock forces"	909
Re: Survey of insects and disease	909
Re: Agreement between provincial and federal Departments of Agriculture	909
Re: Reforestation	909
Re: Reduction in applications	909
Re: Total year's planting	909
Re: Additional land for reforestation	909
Re: Regeneration of burned-over land	909
Re: Lands	909
Re: District Committees	909
Duties of	909
Recommendations of	909
Re: Growing use of public lands	909
Recreational development of public lands	910
Commercial summer camps	910
Summer cottages	910
Parks	910
Wilderness areas	910
Deferred zones	910
Re: Fish and Wildlife	910
Re: Trapline Management	910
Increased production of fur	910
Re: Deer production study	910
Re: Training of guides	910
Re: Great Lakes fishery research	910
Directed by Joint Committee	910
Re: Prevention of lake trout destruction	910
Re: Use of aircraft for distribution of hatchery fish	910
Re: Advances in development of distribution of stock	910
Re: Development of two hybrid forms	911
Re: General	911
Re: Specialized work of divisions	911
Re: Research	911
Forest regeneration problems	911
Special fire control vehicle	911
General fisheries	911
Surveys	911
Of base and meridian line	911
Operation and Personnel	911
Emphasis on conservation	911
Departmental policies	911
Budget-Financial	911
Allocations to 5 main services	911
Re: Timber Management	911
Re: Total estimates	911
Long-range programme	912

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Management units	912
	Increase of	912
	Reviewed every five years	912
Re: Forest capital capable of greater development		912
	Particularly in pulpwood	912
Re: Engagement of men of outstanding ability		912
Re: Mississagi operations		916
	Re: Reference to Committee on Lands and Forests	916
	Re: Committee meeting re Hearst situation	916
	Re: Full accounting when investigation completed	916
	Re: Cost of salvage operations	917
	Re: J. D. Campbell Lumber Co.	917
	Re: Contract with one, Lahti	917
	Three types of contracts	917
	Seizure of logs	917
	Use of equipment	917
	By virtue of agreement	917
Re: Abolition of Fish Hatcheries		921
	In connection with commercial fishing	921
	Not giving value for investment	922
	No decision reached as yet	922
	Game fish production down	922
	Re: Sault Ste. Marie hatchery	922
	Re: Fishing in lower Muskoka	923
	Position being consolidated	923
	Situation will improve	923
Re: Departmental construction		923
	By or in conjunction with Public Works	923
	Two methods of procedure	923
Re: Sawmilling Industry		924
	Attempting to slow operations	924
	Re: Limiting diameter of cut	924
	Re: Switching to other species than red and white pine	924
	Re: Present wording of directives	924
Re: Saw-log Timber Dues		925
	Question a perplexing one	925
	Re: Federal Government's percentage	925
	Re: Costs of wood operations	925
	Re: Province not large producer of craft paper	925
Re: Increase of jack pine dues in 1950		925
Costs continuously rising		925
	Necessitating increase of Crown dues	925
Re: Freight rates		926
Re: Appointment of Committee		926
	To study economics of operations	926
Re: Alternative to pulpwood exports		926
	May be granted for over-mature stands	926
Re: White and black spruce		927
	Should not be exported	927
	Until local industry requirements met	927
Retention of soundness in spruce		927
Re: Exports from private and Crown lands		927
Re: No relief expected		927
	For those who started after policy effective	927

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Situation at Hearst	927
	Government not responsible	927
	Re: Hearst situation will be reviewed	928
	Will be guided by economic conditions	928
	Re: Hearst business men not suffering	928
	Re: Aircraft landing in Northwest	928
	Illegal except through customs	928
	Illegal to travel without permit	928
	Practice not encouraged	928
	Re: Organized search parties	929
	All departmental facilities available	929
	Services have never been denied	929
	Re: Seeding from air	929
	Research into	929
	Expectation that expenditures will produce results	929
	Programme will be increased when practical	929
	Re: Wolf bounties	930
	Re: Responsibility for provincial parks	930
	Re: Canadian Press Report, March 27th	994
	Re: Conditions in Niagara River	994
	Extract from	994
	Investigated by biologist and engineer	994
	Interim report by	995
	Conclusions in	995

GOODFELLOW, HON. W. A. (Minister of Public Welfare):

On Bill No. 68, First Reading	257
Has received careful consideration	257
Requested by commodity groups at Dairy Industry	257
Extract from Brief from Commodity group	258
Is an educational programme	258
Re: Co-ordinating body	258
Re: Appointment of Dairy Commissioner	258
Re: Milk Industry Commission	258
No change in present practices	258
Re: Concentrated Milk Producers	258
Re: Stabilization Fund	259
On Bill No. 77, First Reading	338
A consolidation of	338
Children's Protection Act	338
Children of Unmarried Parents' Act	338
The Adoption Act	338
Revision re Child Welfare desirable	338
None in 60 years	338
Re: Establishment of informal committee	338
Met continuously for one year	338
Legislation not perfect	338
Re: New principles in Bill	338
Close relationship between Children's Aid Societies and Municipalities	338
Re: Director of Child Welfare	338
Re: Financial assistance to District C.A.S.	339
Re: Child neglect	339
Emotional and incompetence	339
Limitation of temporary wardship	339
Reduction in age limit for guardianship	339

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Transference of Wards	339
	Re: Special provincial aid if conditions warrant	339
	Re: Right of appeal re wardship	340
	Re: Unattended children	340
	Re: Extension of natural relationship of adopted children	340
	Re: "Black marketing" of babies	340
On	Bill No. 67, Second Reading	511
	Re: Unemployment situation	512
	Re: Burial of indigents	512
On	Bill No. 107, First Reading	589
	Re: Capital grant on new construction	589
	Re: Payments re maintenance costs	589
	Re: Commends work of Charitable Institutions	589
	Re: Increased grants for	589
On	Bill No. 108, First Reading	589
	Re: Simplification of administration	589
	Re: Children continuing at School	589
	Re: Method of ascertaining eligibility	589
On	Bill No. 109, First Reading	590
	Re: Percentages more specific	590
	Lessens responsibility on Minister	590
	Re: Penalties	590
On	Bill No. 77, Second Reading	634
	Bill favourably received	634
	Re: Appointment of Committee to survey problems	634
	Tribute to Committee	634
	Re: "Emotionally-upset children"	634
	Re: Trafficking in babies	636
	Bill would not affect	636
	Re: Unwed Mothers	637
	Trafficking not extensive in Ontario	637
On	Report, Select Committee re Indian population	875
	Purpose, emancipation of Indians	875
	No second-class citizens in Ontario	875
	Re: Indians' feeling	875
	Re: Tribute to Members of Committee	875
	Re: Addresses by Member for Brant	875
	Re: Full co-operation by Federal Government	875
	Re: Congratulations to Secretary	875
	Re: Suggestions for possible government assistance	876
	Re: Responsibility for Indian	876
	Outlined in B.N.A. Act	876
	Solely under jurisdiction of Federal Government	876
	Some provincial treaties	876
	Some problems require further study	876
	Situation in British Columbia	876
	Re: Proceedings of Committee	876
	Visits made by	876
	Re: Recommends Report to House	876
	Re: Nine recommendations	876
	Re: Disabled Persons' Allowance	876
	Not covered in report	876
	Hope to provide by agreement with Federal Government ...	876
	Re: Report not a cure-all	876

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Annual expenditure on Indians		877
Re: Reconciliation with British North America Act		877
Re: Dominion-Provincial Conference necessary		877
Re: Indian leaders in certain fields		877
Re: Whole reserve system out-dated		877
Re: Middle-aged Indians engaged in industry		877
Re: Adjustments required		877
Re: General desire for integral		877
Re: Basic problem of Indians		877
Indians not admitting		877
Re: No discrimination because of race		877
Re: Enfranchisement		878
Re: Health care and education for Indians		878
Re: Alcohol, in relation to Indians		878
Careful study by Committee		878
Re: Original restriction at request of Indians		878
Re: Request to purchase packaged goods		878
Re: Right granted in British Columbia		878
With very few unsatisfactory incidents		878
Re: Report by British Columbia Committee		878
Extract from		878
Re: Elimination of discrimination		878
Prohibition of Indians drinking can only be classed as discrimination		878
Re: Reserve drinking for Federal decision		878
Re: Homes on reserve no different from any other		878
Re: Right of Indians to vote		879
In Provincial elections		879
Not desired by all Indians		879
Demanded assurance vote not affecting treaty rights		879
Not full citizens without vote		879
Re: Knowledge of value of vote		879
Can vote in British Columbia		879
Indian Member of B.C. Legislature		879
Value of vote not learned in text books		879
Indication of equality		879
Further step toward integration		879
Education essential		879
Full citizenship necessary		879
Non-Indians must appreciate Indians		879
Should understand problems of		879
Full equality essential		879
Many homes equal to those of whites		879
Living standards high		879
Educational benefits must be extended		879
Encouragement to attend Vocational Schools and Teachers' Colleges		879
Development of inferiority complex		879
Must be overcome		879
Reminder of famous Indians		879
Difference between wards of Federal Government and full citizens		879
Must be effected by themselves		879
Re: Report discussed with Bands on Reserves		893
Prepared as a result of conferences with Indians		893

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 108, In Committee		983
Re: Payments during summer months		983
On Estimates, Department of Public Welfare		1127
Provision for many needy		1127
Legislation progressive		1127
High measure of prosperity		1128
Natural resources only touched		1128
Meeting needs Department's responsibility		1128
Re: Progress in Welfare legislation		1128
Re: Surpluses in Dairy products		1128
Butter surplus increasing		1128
Re: Increased unemployment		1128
Causing some concern		1128
Re: Federal Government should assume full responsibility		1128
Reasons for		1128
Re: Much unemployment, seasonal		1129
Re: Full co-operation with Ottawa		1129
Re: Statement by Prime Minister		1129
Re: Unconditional grants		1129
Re: Traditional responsibilities for services to needy		1129
Private Social agencies		1129
Churches		1129
Fraternities		1129
Re: Many such services now rendered by Government		1129
Re: Does not remove responsibilities of private agencies		1129
Re: Canadian National Institute for Blind		1129
Provides specialized attention and service		1129
More adequate site needed		1129
Re: Col. Eddy Baker		1130
The most capable director		1130
Re: Private Welfare Organizations are indispensable		1130
Re: Mason Foundation—Sudbury		1130
Re: Law Society of Upper Canada		1130
Re: Professional Training in Universities		1130
U. of T. School for Social Work		1130
U. of Ottawa School of Social Welfare		1130
Grants for		1130
Commends to private donors		1130
Re: Child Welfare		1130
Child Welfare Act—1953		1130
Classes of children receiving services		1130
To any needy child		1131
No discrimination whatever		1131
Re: Children's Aid Societies should be strengthened		1131
Re: Day Nurseries		1131
Re: Mothers' Allowances		1131
		1138
Re: Disabled persons' Allowances		1131
Extracts from letters		1132
Re: Old-Age Assistance		1132
Statistics relating to		1132
Increase in pensioners		1132
Re: Supplemental Assistance		1132

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Base rate established by Federal Government	1132
	Re: Statement by Hon. Paul Martin	1132
Re: Homes for the aged		1133
	Several measures taken in re	1133
Re: Elderly Person's Housing Aid Programme		1133
Re: Private Charitable Institutions		1133
	Re: Grants to	1133
	Increase of	1133
Re: Homes for the aged programme		1133
	Re: Other steps required	1133
	Re: Care for aged in private dwellings	1133
	Applicable to larger centers	1134
	Method of applying for	1134
	Provinces to share in cost	1134
	Special home care results	1134
	Saving in capital costs	1134
	Providing adequate care out of institutions	1134
	More economical way for increased provisions	1134
	Possibilities not exhausted	1134
	All have stake in old age	1135
Conclusions		1135
	Department has well-knit staff	1135
	Look beyond forms in all cases	1135
	Freedom to request reconsideration	1135
	Re: Heavy responsibility for "Out" cases	1135
	Re: Citation of old proverb	1135
	Re: Renovating old buildings	1135
	No provision for grants for	1135
	Re: Department had to control	1135
	To provide for buildings which can be renovated	1135
	Re: Salvation Army	1135
	Re: Old Galt Hospital	1135
Re: Burials of indigent immigrants		1136
	50/50 basis by agreement with Federal Government	1136
	No stipulated fee	1136
Re: Maintenance of children from unorganized territory		1137
	Department adopted "get tough" policy	1137
	Heaviest in Cochrane	1137
	Low-cost housing in	1137
	People move in from outside	1137
	Wives object to returning husbands in some cases	1137
Re: Policy re estates of over \$1,000		1137
	Re: Controlled account	1137
Re: Allowances not paid to mothers working full time		1138
Re: Dislikes old-age assistance programme		1143
	Many cases under present formula	1143
	Suggested several other formulae	1143
	Relieve restrictive and unfair computation	1143
	Present method of computation unfair	1144
Re: Disabled persons' pension		1144
	Federal Government following present set-up	1144
On Bill No. 68, In Committee		1146
	Has support of four producer groups	1146
	Re: Amendment to Section 28	1146
	Re: Section 51 deleted	1146
	Substitution therefor	1146

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 77, In Committee		1146
Re: Termination of wardship at 18		1146
No reason to change		1146
Re: Transfer of ward from one C.A.S. to another		1147
Reason therefor		1147
Incident of		1147
Re: No change in Section 27		1147
Re: Religious faith of child		1147
Adhered to very closely		1147
Re: Consultation with child		1147
On Section 31		1148
Applicable only to neglected children		1148
On Bill No. 121, In Committee		1151
To care for situation in Port Arthur		1151
Nothing in Act to prevent transfer		1151
Transfer requires approval of Minister		1151
On Bill No. 77, In Committee		1157
Section 37 not new		1157
C.A.S. responsible until child 18		1157
On Section 85		1157
For uniformity of laws		1157
On Bill No. 109, In Committee		1163
Re: Section 6		1163
Provides machinery for marketing scheme		1163

GORDON, G. T. (L Brantford):

Re: Report of Select Committee in Cemeteries	314
Re: Visits to cemeteries	314
Re: Abandoned cemeteries	314
Re: Compromises in Committee easy	314
On Speech from Throne	468
Re: Pensions for disabled	468
Examples of injustice in re	468
Workmen's Compensation rate	469
Re: Pollution of Grand River	469
Becoming steadily worse	469
Precludes use of water	469
Contains a DDT flavour	469
Water shortage in California	470
Grand River an "open sewer"	470
Re: Inspection of Grand River	470
Re: Pollution control methods	470
Provincial share in	470
Laws concerning pollution	470
Not enforced	470
Situation aggravated	470
Prosecution of owners improperly washing septic tanks	470
Cost of pollution control	470
Municipal sewage treatment plant	470
Re: Report of Grand River Anti-pollution Committee	470
Letter from Minister of Health	471
No mention of law enforcement	471

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Fluorination of drinking water		471
Very successful in Brantford		471
First Canadian experiment		471
Backing of Canadian Dental Association		471
Article Toronto <i>Globe and Mail</i>		471
"Fluorination—Boon or Blunder"		471
Re: "Scottish Dentist"		471
Statement of—bunk		472
Re: Public opening of tenders		472
No attempt at secrecy in Brantford		472
Re: Canadian bacon		472
Equal to any		472
Superior to U.S. bacon		472
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker		472
On Estimates, Department of Health		768
Re: Chlorination of Water		768
Re: Pamphlet, Fluorination, "Boon or Blunder"		768
Re: Dr. Charles Dillon		768
Facts regarding		768
Statement by Dr. Leitch		768
Statement by Mr. Forrest		768
		770
Re: Citation in <i>Globe and Mail</i> re Dr. Dillon		769
Re: Letter from Prof. A. M. Thomson		769
Extracts from		769
Re: Citation from Dr. Dillon in <i>Globe and Mail</i>		769
Reply from British Minister of Health		770
Re: Extract from "Oral and Dental Diseases"		770
Re: Extract from <i>Journal American Medical Association</i>		770
Re: Statement by Dr. Longwell		770
Re: Statement by Abraham Lincoln		771
Re: Brantford beyond experimental stage		797
Has had 8 years experience		797
Re: Fluorine Committee		797
Re: Not injurious to health		797
Re: Only pretenders opposing		797

GRIESINGER, HON. WILLIAM (Minister of Public Works):

On Estimates, Department of Public Works	1230
Re: Outline of Work projects	1230
Office accommodation in Toronto	1230
For all departments	1230
Yardley Building	1230
Ontario Government Buildings	1230
New Treasury Building	1230
New Government Office Building, Queen and York Streets	1230
No. 7 Queen's Park Crescent	1230
Athelma Apartments	1230
Wellesley Street Property	1230
Re: Department of Agriculture	1230
Ontario Food Terminal Building	1231
Ontario Agricultural College—Guelph	1231

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Agricultural School—Kingsville	1231
	Western Ontario Agricultural School—Ridgetown	1231
	Fruit Inspection Station—Schomberg	1231
Re: Attorney-General's Department		1231
	O.P.P. District Headquarters, Chatham	1231
	Detachment Building, Little Current	1231
	Housing Units O.P.P.	1231
	Registry Offices	1231
Re: Department of Education		1232
	New Teacher's College	1232
	Junior Residential School	1232
	Provincial Institute of Textiles	1232
Re: Department of Highways		1232
	1200 Sheppard Avenue—vacated	1232
	Keele Street and Wilson Avenue—new	1232
	Ontario Government Building, New Liskeard	1232
Re: Department of Labour		1232
	Offices, Workmen's Compensation Board	1232
Re: Department of Lands and Forests		1232
	Division of Fish and Wildlife	1232
	Division of Forest Protection	1232
	Division of Research	1232
Re: Department of Mines		1232
	Miner's Reserve Station	1232
Re: Department of Planning and Development		1232
	Construction at Markham	1232
Re: Department of Health		1232
	Re: New Ontario Hospital—Port Arthur	1232
	Ontario Hospital—Smiths Falls	1233
	A-2 Group	1233
	A-5 Group	1233
	A-6 Group	1233
	A-8 Group	1233
	Ontario Hospital—Brockville	1233
	Ontario Hospital—North Bay	1233
	Ontario Hospital—Kingston	1233
	Ontario Hospital—Orillia	1233
	Ontario Hospital—Toronto (Queen Street)	1233
Re: General Improvements		1233
	Department of Reform Institutions	1234
	Re: New Jail—Millbrook	1234
	Re: Burwash	1234
	Heating Plant—Camp 2	1234
	Public School—Camp 2	1234
	Dormitory—Camp 5	1234
	Hospital—Guelph Reformatory	1234
	Dormitory—Mimico Reformatory	1234
Re: Department of Travel and Publicity		1234
	Re: Doors, locks and docks	1234
Re: New work to be started, 1954-55		1234
	Department of Agriculture	1234
	O.A.C.—Guelph	1234
	O.V.C.—Guelph	1235
	Demonstration Farm—New Liskeard	1235

Re: Department of Attorney-General	1235
O.P.P. District Headquarters	1235
Housing Units—O.P.P.	1235
Registry Offices, Fort William and North Bay	1235
Re: Department of Education	1235
Ontario School for the Deaf—Belleville	1235
Ontario School for the Blind—Brantford	1235
Re: Department of Health	1235
Ontario Hospital—Hamilton	1235
Ontario Hospital—Kingston	1235
Re: Department of Highways	1235
Cochrane	1235
Owen Sound	1235
Re: Department of Mines	1235
Mining Recorder, Inspector	1235
Resident Geologist and Staff, Swastika	1235
Re: Department of Public Works	1235
General Headquarters, O.P.P. Toronto	1235
Re: Department of Reform Institutions	1235
Ontario Reformatory—Mimico	1235
Ontario Reformatory—Brampton	1235
Industrial Farm—Monteith	1235
Re: Department of Travel and Publicity	1236
Reception Center, Niagara Falls	1236
Re: Department of Lands and Forests	1236
Kapusking	1236
Pembroke	1236
Rondeau Park	1236
Miscellaneous	1236
Tribute to Senior Officers and Staff	1236
On Vote 151, Item 4, "Insurance"	1236
Variations in expenditures	1236
Statement of Insurance	1236
Only Parliament Building insured by private company	1236
Balance government-insured	1236
Re: Maintenance Staff	1237
1st year—Casual	1237
2nd year—Temporary	1237
Then permanent if suitable	1237
Re: "Miscellaneous"	1237
Re: Works of Art	1237
Records of	1237
All large construction by tender and contract	1238
Re: Projects under Conservation Act	1238
Re: Mitchell Flood Control	1238
Re: St. Mary's Flood Control	1238
Re: Arable River Construction Authority	1238
Re: Conistoga Dam	1238
Re: Fanshaw Dam	1238
Re: Brampton Flood Channel	1238
Re: Reforestation	1238
Re: Engineering	1238
Re: Grant immediately available	1239
In case of serious floods	1239

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES

SUBJECTS

PAGES

GRUMMETT, W. J. (CCF Cochrane South):

Re: Passing of Doctor McPhee	9
Re: Resignation of W. L. Houck	9
Re: Welcome to living former Premiers	9
Re: <i>Hansard</i>	15
Printing of	15
Re: Printing of earlier proceedings	15
Re: Appointment of Public Accounts Committee	34
Is matter sub judice	34
Committee hampered at start	34
Opposition stymied	35
Re: Preliminary enquiry by Courts	35
Delay too long	35
Re: Passing of Agnes MacPhail	38
Re: Discussions on Bills on Second Reading	40
On Bill No. 51, Second Reading	85
Proper step by Government	86
Transference of duties from Municipal Board	86
Re: Services of Mr. McDonald	86
Re: Assessments	86
Re: Continuous service	86
Not always practicable.....	86
Re: Bell Company should not take over provincial phone services	86
Re: Independent Company in North taken over by Municipality of Ansonville	86
Much benefit accrued	86
On Report of Select Committee on Election Act	128
Should be dealt with by sections	128
Disagrees with provision for \$200 deposit	128
.....	134
Certain corrections necessary	128
Should be clarified	128
Re: Permanent Returning Officers	135
Re: Number of nominators	135
Ten should be sufficient	135
Re: Advance Polls	135
On Speech from the Throne	174
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	174
Congratulatory to Hon. Mr. Gemmell	174
Regrets at absence of Hon. Mr. Thomas	174
Re: Over-burdening Cabinet Ministers	174
Congratulatory to Mr. Jolley	175
Congratulatory to Mr. Noden	175
Re: Reading of speeches	175
Should be permitted for important speeches	175
Rule re	175
Formerly strictly enforced	175
Caused embarrassment to many members	175
Re: Salaries, Ontario Provincial Police	175
Should be increased	175
Re: Salaries, Civil Servants	175
Increases necessary	175
Particularly Guards in penal institutions	175
Good Civil Servants require good salaries	175

Re: Suitable quarters for Ontario Provincial Police	176
Re: Speech from the Throne very unique	176
Gives greater indication of legislation	176
Reference to 24 amendments	176
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway	176
Built by Canada, if necessary	176
Re: Gas pipe line	176
Distribution of gas a provincial responsibility	176
Would create secondary industries	177
Distribution should be by Public Utility	177
Re: Welfare	177
Re: Family desertions	177
Re: Payment of Mothers' Allowances	177
Ceases when deserting husband located	177
Re: Provincial Parks	178
Should be extended	178
Re: Rehabilitation	178
Extension of benefits under Disabled Person's Allowance Act	178
Re: Agriculture	178
Many farms unoccupied	178
Too much pasture land	178
Farms should be in full production	178
Re: Clearance of farm land	178
Survey required	178
Re: Kennedy Report	179
Should be re-studied	179
Re: Reforestation	179
Growth increased by flash fires	179
Re: Highways	179
Re: Fort William scandal	179
Members should know full details	179
Re: Delay in prosecutions	179
Should be soon completed	179
To permit further action	179
Facts are required	180
Method of obtaining immaterial	180
Re: Awarding of contracts	180
Re: Protection of contractors	180
Prejudicial to bona fide contractors	180
Re: Inspection of banks	180
Same procedure re Highways should be adopted	180
Amendment to amendment to be presented later	180
Re: Passing of William B. Harvey	279
A friend to all	279
On Bill No. 68	344
Should not be sent to Committee without debate	344
Could be referred on First Reading	344
Re: Report, Committee on Reform Institutions	404
Congratulatory to Chairman	404
Re: Reformatory Institutions	404
Four classes of	404
Reformatories	404
Industrial Farms	404
Training Schools	404
District and County Jails	404

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: District Jails	404
	Up-to-date and well managed	404
	Re: County Jails	405
	Antiquated and obsolete	405
	No ventilation	405
	Poor lighting	405
	No work provided	405
	Re: Salaries	405
	Re: Interviews of guards and officials	405
	Re: Visits to United States Institutions	405
	Re: Guard turn-over	405
	Re: Buildings should be permanent	405
	Re: Unreformables	405
	Re: Burwash	406
	Should be a prison	406
	Re: Many not amenable to reformative measures	406
	Re: Hard labour	406
	Re: Idleness should be eliminated	406
	Re: Commission on Correction	407
	Re: Reception Center	407
	Re: Method of preparation of report	407
	Re: Parole Board	407
	Re: Training Schools Advisory Board	407
On	Bill No. 56, In Committee	519
	Re: Sending Bills to Committees	519
	All members deprived of knowledge of proceedings	519
	One member of each Committee should report to House	519
Re:	Passing of Charles G. MacOdrum	528
	A serious blow to Legislature	528
	Words inadequate	528
	Loss suffered by Veterans	529
	Sympathy extended to Family	529
Re:	Passing of Joseph D. Nault	593
	Good representation of French population	593
	Sympathy extended to family	593
On	the Budget	604
	Had not intended to speak on	604
	Re: Riding of Cochrane South	604
	Highways in	604
	No reference to Fort William	604
	Re: Mining-access roads	604
	Re: Highway No. 101	604
	Re: Meeting Northeastern Municipal Association	604
	Partially completed in 1947	604
	Balance should be completed at once	604
	Necessity for detours	604
	Re: Warren Lake extension	604
	Considerable work done	604
	Important to Timmins and Porcupine areas	605
	Connecting link important	605
	Re: Highway No. 11	605
	Entire road in riding paved	605
	Re: Death toll on Highways	605
	Suggested remedies	605
	Engine governor not the answer	605

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Driving privileges should be cancelled	605
	Present penalties not sufficient	605
	Experiences as Coroner	605
	Erection of signs at scenes of accidents	606
	As cautions to motorists	606
Re: Industrial unrest in Porcupine area		606
	Reasons for strikes	606
	Calls for governmental action	606
	Position of labour in paper mills	608
	No labour disputes	606
	Check-off provided	606
Re: Difference in Management's attitudes		606
Re: Experience of son in Iroquois Falls		606
	Limited time to join union	607
	Otherwise could not work	607
	Co-operation of paper mills with labour	607
	Situation different in Mining	607
	Officials in paper mills former employees	607
	Officials in Mines, outsiders	607
Re: Arrogant attitude of mine management toward	government	607
	Re: Arming of guards to prevent trespassing	608
	Re: Same trouble will recur	608
On Bill No. 94, Second Reading		627
	Of great importance to North	627
	Will eliminate one-industry communities	627
Re: Feeder lines for supplying gas		627
Re: Combining municipalities for		627
Re: Equal supply to all municipalities		628
Re: Not a public utility		628
On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General		711
	Special Expenses, administration of Justice Expenses Act	711
	Vote 29, Re: Item 6	712
	Re: Clothing of prisoners	712
	Re: Probation Officers	713
	Differentiation between Statutory and Ordinary	714
Re: Vote 31, Items 5 to 10		719
Re: Vote 34, Item 13		721
Re: Vote 35, Item 6		724
	Favours policing of certain Municipalities by	
	Provincial Police	725
On Estimates, Department of Education		732
	Re: Vote 39, Item 20	732
On Estimates, Department of Health		767
	Re: Indigent patients	767
	Re: Examination of expectant mothers	798
	Results do not justify expense	798
	Re: Nursing Assistants	799
	Re: Clothing for Bailiffs	803
On Bill No. 110, Second Reading		784
	Re: Labour Relations Act	784
	Held for few days	784
On Estimates, Provincial Auditor		850
	Tribute to Provincial Auditor	850
	Agree with Prime Minister	850
	Tribute well-deserved	850

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Report, Select Committee re Indian population		885
Tribute to Chairman		885
Gave excellent service		885
Regrets at missing some meetings		885
Particularly to Brant Reserve		885
Re: Indians' right to vote		886
Re: Have been deprived of elementary right of citizenship		886
Re: Extract from Election Act		886
Re: Military service by Indians		886
Why not the right to vote		886
Should be given right automatically for military service		886
Re: Sale of liquor to Indians		886
Extract from page 22 of Report		886
Re: Section 95 of Indian Act should be proclaimed		887
Re: Restrictions should be removed Federally		887
Excessive charges to Indians for liquor		887
Opportunity to be "shot" in Armed Services but not "half shot" in Canada		887
Many Indians have reached high positions		887
Unfair status should be discontinued		887
Whole-hearted agreement with recommendations		887
Trust every member will read it		887
On Bill No. 51, In Committee		934
Re: Expropriation of Municipal Telephone System		934
Re: Section 9		934
Re: Section VI		934
Amendment to		934
Re: Section 10		934
Subsection should be added		934
Re: Signatures by land owners		934
Definite percentage should be designated		935
Re: Responsibility of land owners		935
On Estimates, Department of Mines		953
Re: Cable-testing laboratory		953
Re: Mining access roads		955
Congratulatory to Minister		955
More sympathetic than Minister of Highways		955
On Bill No. 110, In Committee		997
Re: Memo, Ontario Federation of Labour		997
Should have time to consider		997
Re: Section 3		999
Re: Amending definition section in original Act		999
Re: Guards		999
Should be clearly defined		999
Re: Section 5		1000
Re: Bargaining Committee		1000
Bargaining by junior officials possible		1000
An amendment required		1000
Re: Section 7		1004
Re: Refusal to grant Board		1004
Under what circumstances?		1005
Re: Appointment of supervising Conciliation Officer		1008

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Plaque to Hon. Robert Baldwin		1023
A man who belonged to Canada		1023
Was a statesman		1023
Not a politician		1023
On Bill No. 52, Second Reading		1056
Re: Checks-off		1056
Situation in North		1056
Re: Compulsory irrevocable		1056
In effect in paper mills		1056
Some management will not grant		1056
Re: Preston East Dome		1056
Low salary schedule		1056
Wage dispute could have been easily settled		1056
No security afforded		1056
On Bill No. 139, Second Reading		1079
A step forward		1079
Statute long desired		1079
Re: Discrimination re housing projects		1079
Re: Should be incorporated in Act		1080
On Estimates, Department of Public Welfare		1137
Re: Maintenance of Children from unorganized territory		1137
Becoming burdensome to Province		1137
Re: Municipalities prefer Department does nothing to return husbands		1137
Re: Old-age pension grants		1139
Re: Old-age assistance		1139
Should be separate item		1139
On Bill No. 77, In Committee		1147
Re: Transfer of Ward from one Children's Aid Society to another Reason therefore		1147
Re: Purpose of Section 27		1147
Re: Subsections 4 and 5		1147
Re: Religious faith of child		1147
Re: Consultation with child		1147
Not a good policy		1147
On Bill No. 121, In Committee		1150
Re: Joint Municipal support for Home for Aged		1150
Re: Control over transfer		1151
Re: Possible situation in Timmins		1151
On Bill No. 77, In Committee		1157
Bringing children into Ontario		1157
Object of		1157
On Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions		1167
Re: Grants to Training Schools		1167
Not wholly under jurisdiction of Department		1167
Re: Children in Training Schools		1171
Many not amenable to discipline		1171
Example of		1171
Could not be sent to private homes		1171
On Bill No. 139, In Committee		1201
Re: Enquiries into controventions		1201
Re: Penalties for violations		1201
Re: Offences should be defined		1201
On Estimates, Department of Travel and Publicity		1245
Re: Amount for advertising, publicity and promotion		1246
Should be broken down		1246

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES

SUBJECTS

PAGES

HANNA, J. W. (PC Huron-Bruce):

On Estimates, Department of Provincial Treasurer	1121
Great trust imposed	1121
Junior member of Commission	1121
Racing will attain a high standard	1121
Affords great pleasure in West	1121
Re: Saving to bettors—1954	1121
Re: Commission's headquarters	1121
Re: "Ambassador of Good Will"	1121
Re: Racing "Big Business"	1121
Re: Night racing	1122
A matter of Government policy	1122

HERBERT, A. R. (PC Temiskaming):

On the Budget	608
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	608
Congratulatory to hon. Prime Minister	608
Re: Situation in northern Ontario	608
Re: Strikes in Porcupine area	608
Re: Kirkland Lake never recovered from earlier strike	609
Re: Single-industry communities	609
Crown companies should be established	609
Re: Establishment of industry in Southern Ontario	609
Hard to understand	609
Re: Establishment of industry in agricultural areas	609
Re: Situation should be given serious study	609
Re: Freight Rates	609
Effect of	609
Ottawa should subsidize	609
Re: Change of location of Royal Canadian Mint	609
Re: Federal Metallurgical services	609
Should be established in depressed gold areas	609
Re: Northern communities are bastions	610
Should not deteriorate	610
Should have no "Ghost towns"	610
Re: Mining industry in Ontario	610
Outlook for future bright	610
Ontario led in 1953	610
Re: Town of Cobalt	610
Great revival of production	610
Red Lake iron-ore deposit	610
Re: Mining Access Roads	610
Should be continued indefinitely	611
Re: Commendatory to Administration	611
For its positive attitude	611
Re: Statement by Cecil Frost	611
Re: Future of province in good hands	611
On Estimates—Department of Mines	954
Re: Issuance of Mining tags	954
Re: Mining access roads	955
Re: Congratulatory to Minister	955
Re: Should be closer liaison with Department of Highways	955

HUNT, S. J. (PC Renfrew North):

On Bill No. 51—Second Reading	84
Situation more acute in Eastern Ontario	84
Re: Four types of telephone service	84
Re: Many small independent companies	84
Re: Government Departmental lines	84
Re: Telephone Authority of great value	85
Re: Present condition of original lines	85
Bill not a "cure-all"	85
Re: Sufficiency of revenue	85
Present action long overdue	85
Re: Assessments objected to	85
Re: Wedding Anniversary Hon. and Mrs. Dunbar	121
On the Budget	1106
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	1106
Welcome to new Members	1106
Re: Agriculture	1107
Re: Regret at passing of four Members	1107
Re: Rural Municipal Governments	1107
Re: Costs of water systems	1108
Paid by farmer	1108
Re: Agricultural industry not flourishing	1108
Reasons for things undone should be made known	1108
Greater use of radio and local papers desirable	1108
Tribute to Minister of Education	1108
Re: Dearth of Teachers	1109
Re: Tribute to Minister of Health	1109
Re: Giving advice to Hospital Boards	1109
Re: Editorial from leading Ontario dailies	1109
Re: Grants to Cancer Clinic	1109
Re: Department of Lands and Forests	1109
Re: Eddy Match headquarters	1110
Re: Conservation projects	1110
Re: Extension of existing nurseries	1110
Re: Tree growing on private land	1110
Re: Tribute to Minister of Highways	1110
Re: Bridge over Ottawa River	1111
Re: Cost to be shared between Ontario and Quebec	1111
Re: Headline in <i>Ottawa Journal</i> re Allumette Island Bridge	1111
Re: Extract from <i>Ottawa Journal</i> editorial, March 12, 1954, re Highways in Eastern Ontario	1111
Re: Golden Lake, Ontario	1111
Termini of 3 highways	1111
Re: Highway 41	1111
Re: Highway 60	1112
Re: Highway 62	1112
Re: Extract from letter from J. J. Foran	1112
Re: Extension of highways should proceed	1112
Re: By-Election in Essex North	1112

JANES, C. E. (PC Lambton East):

On Bill No. 51, Second Reading	76
Long been needed	76
Personnel of very acceptable	76
Re: 1951 investigation	76
Re: Qualifications of personnel	76

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Number of independent companies	77
	Difficulties created by	77
	Listing of different types of	77
	History of company in which personally interested	77
	Original method of establishing telephone systems	77
	Individual centrals organized	77
	Hazards created by weather	78
	Comparative costs of	78
	Re: Service-station companies	78
	Re: Municipal companies	78
	Weaknesses of	78
	Situation in Western provinces	78
	Re: Subsidizing rural lines	79
	Borrowing ability satisfactory	79
	Re: Issuance of Charters	79
	Re: Rural telephone a right	79
	Re: Bell Telephone Co.	79
	Not interested in rural companies	79
	Re: Ontario Hydro	80
	Re: Interference greater since conversion	80
	Re: Improvement of some services necessary	80
	Extracts from Telephone Blue Book	81
	Penalties for repeating conversations	81
	Authority's facilities adequate	81
	Engineering service required	81
	Amalgamation of small companies imperative	81
On	Bill No. 80, Second Reading	537
	Good legislation	537
On	Bill No. 79, Second Reading	539
	Good legislation	539
	Long overdue	539
	Re: Ipperwash Park	539
	Efforts on behalf of	539
	Re: Departmental assistance	539
	Re: "The Pinery"	540
	"Bogland" adjacent	540
	Must be kept under forest cover	540
	Bill does not provide for park taxation	540
	Pinery should not be exempt	540
	Should be admission fee for all parks	540
	Re: Ausable authority	540
	Re: Should be no "Coney Island"	540
On	Bill No. 139, Second Reading	1085
	Re: Slur at Town of Dresden	1085
	Re: People of Dresden will support	1085
	Re: Trouble caused by LPP agitators	1085
	Re: Letters received from Detroit	1085
	Re: Refusal to serve coloured people	1085
	In restaurants	1085
	In Barber shops	1085
	Re: Mr. Salsberg visit to Dresden	1085
	Caused dissention and trouble	1085
	Not caused by coloured people in Dresden	1085
	White and coloured peoples working and playing together	1085
	Should be no discrimination	1085

JOLLEY, A. C. (PC Niagara Falls):

On Speech from the Throne	50
Re: Passing of Dowager Queen Mary	50
Re: Coronation Ceremony	50
Re: Niagara Falls by-election	50
Tribute to W. L. Houck	50
Appreciation of support given	50
Re: Election in Simcoe-East	51
Re: Passing of Dr. McPhee	51
Re: Illness of hon. Mr. Gemmell	51
Re: Illness of hon. Mr. Thomas	51
Re: Select Committees	51
Re: Niagara Industrial Development	51
Some projects in	52
Re: Niagara Parks Commission	52
History of	52
Plans for future development	52
Re: Hydro	53
Re: Developments of	53
Re: Expansion of	53
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway	53
Re: Health Department	54
Progress to date	54
Low incidence of tuberculosis	54
Maintenance grants to Sanatoria	54
General Hospitals	54
Grants to	54
Mental Hospitals	54
Additions to facilities	54
Re: Welfare	55
Re: Homes for the Aged	55
Re: Children's Aid Societies	55
Provincial share in cost	55
Disabled pensioners	55
Re: Municipal Affairs	55
General taxation	55
On Real Estate	55
Provincial taxation fields limited	55
New deal required	56
Re: Co-operation with Ottawa	56
Congratulation to Minister	56
Re: Rent Control	56
Re: Ontario Provincial Police	57
Re: Ontario's food supply	57
Re: Sacrifice of farm land for housing	57
Ajax filling station	57
Malton Airport	57
Re: Fire Prevention	57
On Farms desirable	57

KELLY, HON. P. T. (Minister of Mines):

On Estimates, Department of Mines	944
Re: Activities of Department	944
Re: Proposed programme, 1954-1955	945
Re: Revenue derived from industry	945

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Preliminary report of Department	945
	Re: Page 11 of	954
	Re: Production of Mines, 1900	945
	Re: Production of Mines, 1941	945
	Re: Production of Mines, 1946	945
	Re: Production—1953	945
	Re: Mineral deposits at Blind River	945
	Discovery of	945
	Re: Manitouwadge mining area	945
	Re: Mineral deposits in Ontario	945
	Re: Mining roads	946
	Companies' participation in	952
	Re: Vast areas in North undeveloped	946
	Re: Estimated ordinary expenditures	947
	Re: Functions of various branches	947
	Re: Natural Gas Commissioner's Office	952
	Re: Administration of Fuel Board a matter of policy	952
	Re: Cable-testing laboratory	953
	Re: Production of Ontario Natural Gas	953
	Re: Fumes conditions—Sudbury	953
	Re: Claims re	954
	Payment of	954
	Amount of damages	954
	Re: Exports of ore	954
	Re: Importation of iron ore from U.S.	954
	Re: Leasing areas	954
	Letter from President, Prospectors and Developers Association	954
	Re: Activities of Dr. W. D. Harding	954
	Re: Issuance of mining tags	954
	Under departmental study	955
	Re: James Bay lowlands	955
	Re: Development should be carefully done	955
	Re: Lundberg Exploration Co.	955
	Re: Seeking capital to explore	955
	Re: Oil possibilities	955
	Re: Mining access roads	955
	Close liaison with Department of Highways	956
	Situation in Manitouwadge area	956
	Re: Cost of access mining roads	956
	Shared by company and Department	956

KENNEDY, T. L. (PC Peel):

On Bill No. 136, In Committee	1191
Re: Appointment of Returning Officers	1191
Should be appointed early	1191
Re: Recent election in Peel	1191
Re: Creation of new subdivisions	1191

KERR, D. McM. (PC Dovercourt):

On the Budget	611
Regret at passing of Mr. Nault	611
Regret at passing of other Members	611
Experiences in Twenty-fourth Parliament	611

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Unemployment	611
	Fault re found by Opposition	611
	No reference in following Session by Opposition	611
	Renewed by impending general election	611
	Opposition's remarks re Hydro	611
	Spearheaded by Mr. Wren	612
	Re: "Preaching for a call"	612
	Budget is outstanding	612
	Commendation to Department of Lands and Forests	612
	Re: Algonquin Park entrance	612
	Museum in	612
	Article in Toronto <i>Star</i> re Hydro	612
	Re: Chairman Saunders	612
	Re: Old-Age Pensions	613
	Suggestion for relief of	613
	Investment of percentage of fund in stocks	613
	Re: Dovercourt Riding	613
	Ontario Building at C.N.E.	613
	Re: Packaging of foods	613
	Should be dated	613
	Re: Strikes in North country	613
	Re: Statements by Union Leaders	613
	Re: Statements by paid organizers	613
	Re: hon. Prime Minister	613
	Re: Minister of Labour	613
	Favours Trade Unions	613
	Have a job to do	613
	Re: English "Cuckoo"	613
	Present in Unions	614
	Re: Labour troubles caused by paid agitators	614
	Re: Paid agitators are parasites	614
	Re: Government close to people	614
	Understands their needs	614

LEAVINE, S. F. (PC Waterloo North):

On Report of Select Committee on Election Act	131
Re: \$200 deposit	131
Cannot support	131
Re: Favours increase in nominators	131
Re: More modern method of voting required	131
Re: General exercise of franchise	131
Should be responsibility of candidates	131
Re: Compulsory voting	131
Re: Scrutineers	131
Serve no useful purpose	132
On Speech from the Throne	279
Congratulations to Mr. Speaker	279
Re: Professional training	279
Re: Irregularities in Highway Department	280
Re: Highways, Waterloo County	280
Re: Controlled access roads	280
Re: Locating proper department difficult	280
Re: Waterloo Safety Campaign	280
Re: "Menace of black buggies"	280
Re: Examinations for driving permits	280

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Highway accidents	281
	Re: Speed limit in school areas	281
	Re: Sewage disposal and water supply	281
	Re: Water treatment must be complete	281
	Re: International Ploughing Match	281
	Re: Unconditional grants	281
	Re: Decentralization of Government	282
	Re: Pensions for disabled persons	282
	Re: Residents in Home for Aged	282
	No caloric deficiency	282
	Re: Dietary unbalance	282
	Re: Treatment of cancer	282
	Re: Research regarding rheumatism	282
	Re: Defective children	282
	Re: Adoption of children	283
	Re: Indigent hospital patients	283
	Re: Socialized medicine	284
	Re: Natural gas	284
	Re: Changes in labour legislation	284
	Re: Compulsory voting	284
	Re: Raise in pay for Federal Members	284
	Re: Income Taxes	284
	Breeds shrewd practices	284
	Re: Housing	284
	Re: Education	285
On	Bill No. 90, Second Reading	547
	Re: Necessary precautions not taken	547
	Should not raise assessments	547
	Industry should be billed for costs of repairs	547
On	Report—Select Committee on Reform Institutions	578
	Commendatory of Chairman	578
	Re: Menlo Park experiment	578
	New Jersey Diagnostic Center	578
	No accommodations for adults	578
	Re: Director of Welfare	578
	Has free hand in selecting associates	578
	Method of studying individual cases	578
	Adults treated as out-patients	579
	Re: Previous efforts at reformation	579
	Efforts slowed down	579
	Measures not fully co-ordinated	579
	Proper methods will lessen costs to province	579
On the	Budget	1091
	Verse by Edgar A. Guest	1091
	Re: Grants of hospital beds	1092
	Re: Expansion of hospitals necessary	1092
	Reasons for	1092
	Re: Medical services in home	1092
	Housing situation makes it difficult	1092
	No room available for elderly people	1092
	Re: Statutory payments for indigents	1092
	Re: Costs of operation of hospitals	1092
	Estimates can only be gained from experience	1092
	Certain services cannot be bought	1092

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Grants to Universities		1092
Approves of		1092
Funds should be easily collectible		1092
Re: Change in method of computing income tax desirable		1092
Re: Welfare programme of February 22, 1954		1092
Impressive and laudable		1092
Counties provide material in four Departments		1092
Health		1092
Welfare		1092
Education		1092
Labour		1092
Programme bound to succeed		1093
Re: Advertising—Movie Theatres		1093
Announcement re— <i>Telegram</i>		1093
Re: Will be death blow to sick business		1093
Re: Check-off		1093
First in Nova Scotia for church dues		1093
Motives of the best		1093
Nothing wrong with idea		1093
Re: Deductions for Federated Charities Drive		1093
Re: Pre-natal examinations		1093
Campaign re for 10 or 15 years		1094
Re: Unmarried mothers		1094
Re: Payment of fees		1094
Percentage unable to pay		1094

LYONS, C. H. (PC Sault Ste. Marie):

On the Budget	1097
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	1097
Ontario on the March	1097
Developing resources	1097
Harnessing of power	1097
Fashioning a story of progress	1097
Re: Ore deposits	1097
Re: Personal income in Ontario	1097
40 per cent. of entire Dominion	1097
Re: Combined private and public investment in Ontario	1097
Re: Dynamic expansion	1098
Re: Increase in grants for Education	1098
Re: Increase in grants for Health services	1098
Re: Increase in grants for Welfare	1098
Re: Increase in grants for Highways	1098
Re: Grants to Municipalities	1098
Re: Treasurer's caution not warranted	1098
Re: Increases during Treasurer's term of office	1098
Re: Meaning of "surpluses"	1098
Re: Examples of expansion in 1953	1099
Re: Budget should be sent to all Communists	1099
Re: Many pitfalls in path to paradise	1099
Re: Shoals ahead	1099
Receding farm prices	1099
Slowing down of sales	1099
Declining bank loans	1099
Weakened export position	1099
Things are obviously not alright	1099

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Capital expenditures	1099
	Can be withheld	1099
	Two things certain	1099
	Not undertaken when demand declining	1099
	When lower prices and costs anticipated	1099
	Must be subject to discipline of facts	1099
	Re: More productivity per man hour	1099
	Re: Responsibility of management and labour	1100
	Re: Costs added to prices of consumer goods	1100
	Re: Slowing down of piece work	1100
	Re: Small corps of management and labour "fighting the Boer War"	1100
	Re: Half-man work must be abolished	1100
Re: Lands and Forests		1100
	Tribute to Minister	1100
	Forests resources not what they used to be	1100
	Ontario at the cross-roads	1100
Re: Lumber Industry		1100
	Expansion of	1101
	History of	1101
	"Cut out and get out"	1101
	Re: White pine stands	1101
	Depletion of	1101
	Reforestation urgently needed	1101
Re: Trent Valley Watershed		1101
Re: Comparison of cutting operations—Ontario and Northern Michigan		1101
Re: Same comparison re fires		1101
Re: Organization of Provincial Air Service		1102
	Re: Sub-bases for	1102
Re: Present fire-fighting organization		1102
Re: Spruce timber stands		1102
	Source of raw material	1102
	Operators not taking available limits	1103
	Relationship of pulp and lumber industries	1103
Re: Capital outlay of pulp mill operators		1103
	Not advanced as far as rest of Canada	1103
Tribute to Minister of Education		1105
Tribute to Minister of Health		1105
Tribute to Minister of Public Welfare		1105
Tribute to Minister of Mines		1105
Re: Mines		1105
	Re: Access roads	1105
	Built in small sections	1106
Re: Highways		1106
	Re: Magnitude of programme	1106
	Re: Lake Superior Highway	1106
	Under construction	1106
Re: "Brain-washing"		1106
Re: "McCarthyism"		1106
	Re: hon. member for Kenora	1106
	Like "Charlie McCarthy"	1106
	"Who is pulling the wires of the puppets?"	1106
	Re: "Energetic ignorance"	1106

MANLEY, PETER (L Stormont):

On Speech from the Throne	439
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	439
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	439
Condolence on illness of hon. Mr. Thomas	440
Re: Department of Agriculture	440
Most important branch of Government	440
Statement by Daniel Webster	440
Statement by Emerson	440
Farming tightly woven into Canada's greatness	440
Re: Cheese producers of Ontario	440
Government's inability to serve best interests of Industry	440
Government played "Party Politics"	440
Re: Developing Crisis	440
Re: Riding of Stormont	440
Re: 1952 Cheese inventory	440
Reduction in prices	440
Increased by Government guarantee	440
Re: Carry-over into 1953	441
Re: Co-operative Marketing Act	441
Re: Ontario's refusal to continue guarantee	441
Re: Purchase by Federal Government	441
Re: Which Government had real interest of industry at heart	441
Re: Improved British dollar position	441
Re: Conditions more hopeful in 1954	441
Re: Fire-fighters of Ontario	441
Work-week should be shortened	441
Re: Representative exhibit of prize cattle at Royal Winter Fair ..	442
Handicapped exhibiting by lack of finances	442
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway	442
Vitality affecting Stormont and other communities	442
Removal of 7,000 people	442
Condemnation of wide area	442
Plan should proceed forthwith	442
Re: Hydro Advisory Committee	442
House should be informed of recommendations	442
Power should be available to Eastern Ontario	443
To attract industry	443
Re: Decentralization of Industry	443
Would hold the population	443
Provide local markets	443
Build up sustaining communities	443
Relieve Housing situation	443
Re: Highway No. 2	443
Accidents on	443
New No. 2 should be started forthwith	443
Re: Morality standards of film censors	444
Not sufficiently high	444
One picture cited	444
Not offered in smaller centers	444
House should be informed of any change in policy of	444
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture	657
Re: Cheese Marketing	657
Re: Advertising campaign	658
Contribution by cheese producers	658

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Contribution by Federation of Agriculture	658
	Campaign successful	658
	Repetition desired	658
	Re: Ontario and Canada, best markets	658
	Re: Quality of Eastern Ontario cheese	658
Re: Increase in Vote 10		659
Re: Royal Winter Fair		659
	Livestock exhibited at	659
	Transportation of—difficult	659
	Governmental assistance desired	659
Re: Benefits of Hydro to rural areas		663
	Limits to extensions	663
	Penalty for living beyond	663
	Should be modified	663
On Estimates, Department of Health		767
	Re: Service to Civil Servants	767
	Re: Salaries and service out of line	768

MAPLEDORAM, C. (PC Fort William):

On Report, Committee on Mining	990
Largest Committee appointed	990
Work divided into Special Committees	990
Re: Natural gas	990
Re: Mining roads	990
Re: Suggestions in	991
Re: Liability for fire	991
Re: Responsibility for maintenance of mining roads	991
Re: Apportionment of costs	991
Re: Specific road construction projects	991
Warren Lake to Foleyet	991
Foleyet to Sultan	991
Hearst to Hawk Junction	991
Hornepayne to Michipicoten Road	991
Re: Delegation from Hornepayne	992
Pronto-Preston East Dome to Blind River	992
Highway 17 to Manitouwadge Lake area	992
Nakina to Geraldton	992
Savant Lake to Highway 17	992
Re: No roads from "nowhere" to "nowhere"	992
Re: Completion of Highway 101	992
Re: Building of roads a serious matter	993
Re: Government universally praised	993

MORNINGSTAR, E. P. (PC Welland):

Re: Unemployment in Welland	147
Re: Trans-Canada pipe line	147
Paige-Hersey Co. should manufacture pipe	147
On Speech from the Throne	472
Re: Unemployment	472
In City of Welland	472
Re: White Paper, 1952, Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe	472
Re: Elimination of level crossings	472

Re: Construction of high-level bridges	472
Re: Niagara Peninsula, vital section	472
Re: Federal Government Unemployment Insurance.....	473
Re: Encouragement of Public Works	473
Re: Village of Fonthill	473
Re: Miss Marlene Stewart	473
Re: Anne Sharp	473
Re: Mrs. Dorothy Rungeling	473
Re: Scouts' Parade at Fonthill	473
Re: Construction of new fire halls	473
Re: Grants to fire-prevention programme	474
Re: Grants to District Volunteer Firemen's Assoc.	474
Re: Civil Defence preparation	474
Re: Standard couplings	474
Re: Hydro	474
Conversion of	474
Re: Highways	474
Road, Port Colborne to Welland	474
On the Budget	1275
Tribute to Minister of Health	1275
Re: Welland and District Health Unit	1275
History of	1275
Re: Improvement in milk production	1276
Re: Expansion of	1276
Re: Unique programme established	1276
Re: First dental public health programme	1276
Re: Graduating class from public school—Crowland	1276
Completely free of dental defects	1276
Re: Programme of medical public health	1276
Re: Statement of accomplishments by Welland and District Health Unit	1276
Re: Incidence of Tuberculosis	1276
Decrease of	1276
Work of Division of Tuberculosis Prevention	1276
Re: Child Health Conferences	1277
Ability of municipalities to co-operate	1277
Re: Mental Health Programme, 1948	1277
Re: Provincial Grants for	1277
Re: 26 Health Units in province	1277
In ten years	1277
Re: Province has lowest death rate from tuberculosis	1277
Re: Establishment of clinics	1277
Re: Mobile Clinics	1277
Re: No one need go untreated	1277
Re: Cancer Treatment	1277
Re: Provincial financial aid	1277
Re: Tribute to Cancer Foundation	1277
Re: Cobalt Bombs	1277
Increase in installation of	1277
Re: Ontario Cancer Society	1277
Work primarily educational	1277
Re: Welfare work by	1277
Re: Collection of voluntary funds	1278
Used by research	1278

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
MORROW, D. H. (PC Carleton):		
Re: Report of Committee on Reform Institutions		408
Congratulatory to Chairman		408
Progress made in Reform Institutions		408
Educational facilities improving		408
Brampton excellent academic school		408
Re: Academic Training		408
Two schools of thought		408
Full-time studies		408
Attendance at night classes		408
Education of illiterates		409
Co-operation of organized labour		409
Re: Vocational Training		409
Re: Hobbies		409
Utilization of leisure time		409
A factor in delinquency		409
Essentials should be provided in all institutions		409
Re: Libraries		409
Care should be exercised in selection of books		409
Re: Increased segregation		410
Re: Reception and Diagnostic Center		410
Re: Increased Probation service		410
Re: Juvenile Delinquency		410
Re: Tribute to Dr. J. S. Atcheson		410
Causes of Juvenile Delinquency		410
Re: Establishment of Clinic in Juvenile Courts		410
Re: Implementation of recommendations		411
Re: Parental responsibility		411
Re: Responsibility of public must be acquainted		411
On Estimates, Department of Health		799
Re: Training of nursing assistants		799
Estimates for		799
Incentive should be supplied		799
Re: Shortage of registered nurses		799
Government financial assistance would be welcomed		799
MURDOCH, W. (PC Essex South):		
On Bill No. 51, Second Reading		85
Re: Service rendered by Hydro		85
Re: Service to Pelee Island		85
On Report of Select Committee re Cemeteries		314
Re: Perpetual care		314
Indicated by "P.C."		314
Re: Report on Lake Levels		357
Congratulatory to Chairman		357
Re: Former damage in Ontario		357
Re: Riding of Essex South		357
Point Pelee Onion marsh		357
Re: Ogoki Diversion		357
Re: Mersea Township		357
On Bill No. 79, Second Reading		542
Re: Essex County		542
Shortage of beaches		542

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: "Needling" of Government	542
	Re: Provincial assistance for park maintenance	542
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture		655
	Salsberg's figures should be checked	655
	Re: Cost of peaches in North Bay	655
	Re: Reason for increased spread	655
	Due to demands of Labour	655

MYERS, R. M. (PC Waterloo South):

On Speech from the Throne	324
Re: Textile Industry	324
Primary and Secondary industries	324
Mainly in Ontario and Quebec	324
In smaller cities and towns	324
Ratio of employees in	324
Capital investments in	324
Wages in	324
Highest in world except United States	324
Summary of	324
Future outlook not good	325
Unemployment in	325
Caused by reduction of import duties	325
Permitting entrance of foreign goods	325
Should be limited	325
Re: Situation in Galt, Preston and Hespeler	326
Increased unemployment in	326
Dominion-Provincial Conference necessary	326
Gainfully employed personnel necessary solution	326
Re: Report on Lake Levels	353
Re: Historical aspects of Great Lakes	353
History of present Great Lakes System	353
Great Lake unstable	354
Extract from Diary of Mrs. Jameson—1836	354
Erosion as long as lakes exist	354
On the Budget	782
Re: Department of Welfare	782
Giving excellent service	782
Influence on people increasing	782
Re: Pension plans	782
Re: Homes for the aged	782
Table of	782
Re: Grants to charitable institutions	782
Re: Housing	782
Two municipalities have completed	783
Others now constructing	783
Re: Radio broadcast, Minister of Welfare	783
Extract from	783
Re: Physically disabled	783
Associations assisting	783
Re: Inspection of Amity Rehabilitation Centre, Hamilton	783
Society for Crippled Civilians, Toronto	783
Extracts from departmental files	783
Are many others	784
Training of, to be intensified	784

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES

SUBJECTS

PAGES

MacAULAY, ROBERT (PC Riverdale):

On Speech from the Throne	180
Re: Trial of Paul Cachia	180
Twice convicted though innocent	180
Re: Purported confession	181
Obtained by force	181
Re: Conference between Court and Crown Attorney out of court	181
Re: Confession not produced at trial	181
Re: Fair investigation by hon. Attorney-General	181
Lessons learned from trials	181
Conviction should not be based on "back-door evidence"	181
No reflection on Judge at first trial	181
Desire of Crown Attorney for conviction	181
Compensation for innocent when convicted	181
Re: Central Registry Office	182
Registration of motor cars in	182
Re: Certificate of Title of Ownership of Motor Vehicles	182
Re: Tenders for public construction	183
Should be opened in public	183
Re: Liability of motor-car drivers	183
Re: Right of passengers to sue	183
Re: Sanitary Cap on milk bottles	183
Re: Pensions for disabled persons	183
Re: Opening hours of liquor outlets	183
Re: Address by Leader of Opposition	184
Re: "Swallowing of arguments"	184
Re: Variation in definitions of "Surplusses"	184
Re: Ontario Hospital Plan	184
Impossible for five reasons	184
Not sufficient doctors	184
Not sufficient nurses	184
Not sufficient beds	184
Not sufficient hospitals	184
Federal Government will not co-operate	184
Re: Responsibilities of Federal Government	185
Which Ontario cannot assume	185
Would face economic bankruptcy	185
Legislation ultra vires	185
Neglect of provincial duties	185
Re: Housing	185
Statement re by Mr. Oliver	185
Availability of more goods for sale	185
Re: Meeting of Federal Banking Committee	185
Re: Federal Bill No. 102	185
To cure high interest rates	185
To cure high down-payments	185
To cure repayment policy	186
All purposes missing from Bill	186
Re: No alternative plan suggested	186
Re: Highways—Irregularities in	186
All members want situation corrected	186
All necessary steps will be taken	186
Re: Inconsistency of Opposition	186

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Report on Lake Levels		354
Effect in City of Toronto		354
Height of water, 1860-1952		354
Re: Toronto Island		354
Re: Eastern Gap		355
Effect on inundation		355
Should be closed		355
Aerial photograph of		355
Re: Report of Cemeteries' Committee		547
Report unanimous		547
Re: Item III (ii)		547
Re: Limitation to number of salesmen		548
Re: Freedom of Trade		548
Re: Balance between public and industry's need		548
Re: Inherent characteristics of PC Party		548
Do recommendations encroach upon		548
Re: Refunds to purchasers		548
60-day period too long		548
To limit pressure sales		548
Not consistent with sound planning		548
Re: Large initial capital outlay		549
Re: Recommendation No. 3, Subsection No. 5		549
Re: Perpetual care fund		549
35 per cent. too high		549
Not in public interest		549
Re: Limits to Ministerial discretion		549
On Budget		1213
Re: Committee on Commissions		1213
Information would have been supplied on request		1213
Report of, will be tabled		1213

MacODRUM, C. GORDON (PC Leeds):

Re: Business Colleges	172
Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i>	172
Re: Brockville Business College	172
History of	172
Blanket accusations against	172
Unwarranted and unjustified	172
No unethical practices in	172
Policy of, to be commended	173
To be registered under Trade School Act	173
Business course, good investment	173
Congratulations to Mr. Speaker	299
Regret at passing of W. B. Harvey	299
Congratulations to mover and seconder of reply	299
Congratulations to hon. Prime Minister	300
Congratulations to hon. Mr. Cecile	300
Re: Girl Guides	300
Re: Warble Fly	300
Re: Natural gas pipe line	300
Re: Magnitude of development	300
Cost of	300
Difficulties of, appreciated	300
Care in securing franchises required	300
Should check with Department of Mines	300

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Department of Public Welfare	301
	Congratulations to Minister	301
	Re: Departmental Institution of Brockville	301
	Should be center of activities	301
	Congratulatory to hon. Minister of Public Works	301
	Re: Renovation of General Hospital	301
	Re: Eastern Ontario Hospital	301
	Further buildings required	301
	Re: Department of Education	301
	Elimination of "frills"	301
	Re: Ontario Federation of Teachers	301
	Extract from brief	301
	Re: Superannuated Teachers	302
	Extract from brief	302
	Re: Department of Highways	302
	Irregularities in	302
	Re: Discovery of discrepancies	302
	By Provincial Auditor	302
	Attitude of Prime Minister toward	302
	Re: Highway No. 2	302
	Very heavy traffic in	302
	Numerous accidents on	302
	Highway—Brockville-Cornwall	303
	New No. 2 should be constructed	303
	Re: Hydro	303
	Re: St. Lawrence Seaway	303
	Should be built by Canada if necessary	303
	Re: Reading speeches	303
	Re: Department of hon. Attorney-General	303
	Re: Paroles system	303
	Should be improved	303
	Congratulatory to hon. Mr. Challies	303

NICKLE, W. M. (PC Kingston):

On Speech from the Throne	429
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	429
Re: Coronation Medal for Lieutenant-Governor	429
Re: Letter by Prime Minister at time of Coronation	429
Re: Extract from Queen's Coronation Broadcast	429
Re: Visit of Mrs. Frost to Coronation	430
Re: Visit of Choir of St. George's Cathedral (Kingston) to Westminster Abbey	430
Re: Article by Dr. Corry	430
Re: Civil Servants	430
Re: Establishment of Committees	430
Re: Sale of Property at Tax Sales	430
Re: "Financial Vultures" in connection with	431
Re: No allowance above ten per cent.	431
Re: Sunnyside Children's Center—Kingston	431
Grants for, should be increased	431
Re: Address by Col. W. H. J. Peck, Vancouver	431
Address a dis-service	431
Reserve units at Kingston	431
Units at Barriefield	431
Statement denied	431

Re: 50th Anniversary of R.C.C.S.	431
	432
Re: Crash of R.C.A.F. Twin-jet CF-100 plane	431
Treatment of photographers at	432
Re: Army must never be superior to civil authority	432
Re: Visit to Kingston of Sir Archibald Nye	432
Re: Old Fort Henry	432
Re: Royal Military College	432
Should issue degrees	432
Re: Major-General T. P. Vanier	433
Re: Address by hon. member for Kenora	433
Re: Ontario Liberalism	433
Re: Leadership of Liberal Party	433
Re: Campaign funds	433
Re: Source of, for Mr. Salsberg	433
Re: Extract from <i>London Times</i>	433
Re: Cachia Case	434
No complaint re confessions illegally obtained	434
No case of Crown Prosecutor attempting to influence Judges	434
Trials conducted irrespective of class, colour or creed	434
Re: Irregularities in Highway Department	434
Re: Pre-election statements by Government	434
Re: 58 million dollars over-taxation	434
Re: Attitude of Prime Minister to Highway Irregularities ..	435
	436
Re: Highway Matters not sub judice	435
Re: Supremacy of Parliament	435
Re: Hypothetical Court Case	435
Not sub judice in Parliament	435
Re: Committee should investigate promptly and fully	435
Re: Possible changes in departmental procedures	435
Re: Royal Commission	435
Not proper tribunal	436
Statement by Leader of Opposition	436
Re: Military record of Prime Minister	436
On Report Select Committee on Reform Institutions	574
Re: Passing of Mr. MacOdrum	574
Extract from letter by	574
Re: Pleasure to serve on Committee	574
Re: First report on penal reform	574
Re: Influence of Harry Anderson on prison reform	575
Re: Influence of Kingston <i>Whig-Standard</i>	575
Re: Riot trials at Kingston Penitentiary	575
Re: Retained by accused	575
Re: Statement by Leader of Opposition	575
Re: "Mellowing"	575
Re: Will stand by own convictions	575
Will speak if believed right	575
Re: Wrong: re administration of Justice at	
Riot Trials needed righting	575
Re: "Whitewash brush"	575
Will put principle ahead of all else	575
Would not permit trials to be rushed through	575
Trials resulted in Archambault Commission	575
With leadership from Mr. Anderson and Senator Davies ..	575
Tribute to Chief Justice McRuer	576

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Committee's refusal to visit Kingston Penitentiaries	576
	Re: Minister of Reform Institutions	576
	Re: Institutional care good	576
	Re: Aside from Brampton, institutions encourage idleness	576
	Re: Vocational Training	576
	Re: Minister took over discouraging portfolio	576
	Has shown same courage as that which won the V.C.	576
	Efforts of, to straighten out "mess"	576
	Minister not afforded proper chance	576
	Re: Principles re Reform Institutions	576
	Four in number	576
	Probation	576
	Parole	576
	Vocational Training	576
	Alcoholism	576
	Suggested amendment to Liquor Control Act	576
	Sentences for alcoholism should be increased	576
	Re: Conference with Federal officials desirable	577
	To consider amendments to Criminal Code	577
	Re: Parole from definite sentences	577
	Province has custodial care	577
	Should determine date of release	577
	Re: What is wrong with modern youth?	577
	Committing many serious crimes	577
	Where does the fault lie?	577
	Re: Possible economic slump	577
	Resulting surplus of labour	577
	Those with prison records will not be employed	577
	Vocational training in institutions imperative	577
	Re: Discharge of prisoners at week-ends	577
	Re: Implementation of recommendations	578
On the Budget		680
	Re: Disclosure of sources of information by press	680
	Freedom of press must be retained	680
	Extract from Libel and Slander Act	680
	Methods of instituting proceedings	680
	Extract from Section 7, The Evidence Act	681
	Should be amended	681
	Re: Satisfaction of people of Kingston with Budget	681
	Extract from <i>Whig-Standard</i> , March 12, 1954	681
	Re: Queen's University	681
	Statement by D. M. Gordon—April, 1903	681
	Rendering excellent service to Province	682
	Re: Government's sound financial policy	682
	Re: Grant to Canadian Cancer Foundation	682
	Re: Ontario Division, Canadian Cancer Society	682
	Re: Work of Mrs. F. Archer	682
	Re: Grant to Canadian Cancer Institute	682
	Re: War and Cancer—murderers	683
	Re: List of advancement in Medical Science	683
	Research for cure of cancer	683
	Re: Grant to Canadian National Institute for Blind	683
	Re: New Institute at Kingston	683
	Re: Tribute to Dr. S. M. Polson	683

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Grants to Agricultural Fairs	683
	Forces of nature conquered to assist	683
	County Fairs are educational	683
	Re: Sam Carr	684
	Should be carefully watched	684
	Re: Federal-Provincial Conference	684
	Re: Silver Crosses to mothers of Korean soldiers	684
	To sisters if mothers not available	684
	Re: Faculty of Engineering, Queen's University	684
	Re: Dean Ellis	684
	Re: Highway fatalities	684
	Extract from Editorial, <i>Globe and Mail</i> , January 2, 1954	684
	Re: Section 41, Highway Traffic Act	684
	Should be amended	684
	Re: Section 41, Subsection 1	684
	Re: Section 41, Subsection G(ii)	684
	Should be amended	685
	Re: Right-of-way	685
	Re: Tribute to hon. Prime Minister	685
	Equality, justice and toleration in Ontario	685
On Bill No. 19, In Committee		980
	No evasion of Income Tax	980

NIXON, HARRY C. (L Brant):

	Re: Committee on Redistribution	16
	Select or Standing Committee	16
On Report of Select Committee on Election Act		137
	Congratulatory to Chairman	138
	Report a consensus of opinion	138
	Re: Permanent Returning Officers	138
	Re: \$200 deposit	138
	Re: Advance Poll	139
	Re: Repeal of Section 169 of present Act	139
On Bill No. 83, Second Reading		534
	Re: Rubbish on Highways and adjacent property	534
	Re: Built-up areas	534
	Speed limits in	534
	40m.p.h. in some areas	535
	Re: Section 3	535
	Re: Two attachments to trailers	535
	Re: Previously presented	535
	Withdrawn	535
	Description of own farm	535
	Horses very scarce	535
	Hauling largely by tractors	535
On the Budget		562
	Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	562
	Re: Passing of Mr. MacOdrum	562
	Re: Earlier debates	562
	Re: Address by Mr. Macaulay	562
	Cannot commend wholly	562
	Re: Charges against Administration of justice and Toronto Police Force	562
	In agreement with hon. Attorney-General and Mr. Nickle	562
	Attack on Force deprecated	563
	Denied confession obtained by force	563
	Denial should have been mentioned	563

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Attack on Leader of Opposition	563
	Totally unwarranted	563
	Extracts from <i>Hansard</i> pages 184-185-186	563
	Re: "Water pistol"	563
	Re: Ease of election in landslide	563
	Mr. Oliver's victory outstanding	563
	Re: Financial status of Leader of Opposition	563
	Earned the hard way	563
	Re: Application of word "despicable"	563
	Definition of	563
	Totally unjustified	564
	An offensive term	564
	Should publicly apologize	564
	Motivation unknown	564
	Re: Provincial leadership of Liberal Party	564
Re: Indians in Brant County		564
	Appreciation of—for action taken	564
	Re: Honorary Chieftain in Band	564
	A great honour	564
	Hopes Prime Minister will accept honours	564
Re: Theatre Act		565
	Re: Drive-in Theatre at Brantford	565
	Second to be established	565
	Application opposed by Council	565
	Permit refused	565
	Extract from <i>Brantford Expositor</i>	565
	Statement by Minister of Planning and Development ...	565
	Council should not be "the goat"	565
	No necessity for second Drive-in	566
Re: 1954 a Milestone in public life		566
Re: Public accounts—1919		566
	Revenue at that time	566
	Revenue from Liquor Commission	566
	No gasoline tax	566
	Contingent liabilities	566
Congratulatory to Prime Minister in presentation of Budget		566
	Presentation an improvement over last year	567
	Debt retirement scheme—30 years ago	567
	Prophecy then fulfilled now	567
Re: Increase in debt alarming		567
Re: Accuracy of Estimates		568
	Revenue \$58 million over Estimate	568
	Expenditures \$36 million over Estimate	568
Re: Address by Minister of Health		568
	Extract from	568
	Re: Fusel oil content	569
	Re: Statement by distillery official	569
Re: Extract from Alberta Budget		569
Re: Buoyancy of revenues		569
Re: Old-age pensioners		569
	Supplemental assistance for	569
Re: Page 4 of Budget		570
	Summary of revenue and expenditures	570

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Revenues		570
Capital and ordinary		570
Re: Federal agreement		570
Re: Debt position		570
The "meat in the cocoanut"		570
Re: Hydro		570
Advance to		571
Interest payments on		571
Cost of conversion		571
Industry farming 25-cycle areas		571
Extract from report of Municipal Electric Association		571
Changing factors should have been considered		572
Extract from address by Mr. Drew		572
1953 Amendment re debt increases		572
Re: Borrowing funds in New York market		572
Re: Adverse exchange rate		572
Extract from statement by Mr. Hepburn		573
Present currency premium		573
May change adversely		573
Securities should be sold in Canada		573
Repayable in Canadian funds		573
Re: Amendment to motion		573
Amendment negatived		573
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture		666
Re: Rural Hydro		666
Re: Installation of towers on private property		666
Grants for		666
Destruction of land by Hydro trucks		666
On Bill No. 78, Second Reading		695
Re: Filling vacancy on Committee		695
On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General		707
Re: Probations		707
Number of failures		707
Re: Registrar of Regulations Branch		711
On Estimates, Department of Health		767
Re: Services to Civil Servants		767
Re: Alcoholism Research Foundation		772
Re: Fusel Oil content in liquor		772
Re: Statement from Windsor authority		772
Re: Minister's statement erroneous		772
On Estimates, Department of Highways		829
Re: Highway Reserve Fund		829
On Report, Select Committee re Indian Population		879
Pleased to serve on Committee		879
Appreciation of Chairman		879
Discharged his duties well		879
Added to dignity and prestige of Committee		880
Had to make report unanimous		880
First efforts to study problems of Indians		880
Great advance over the years		880
Equality, Divine intent		880
Rejoicing at progress of civilization		880
Elimination of discrimination		880
Re: Declaration of Human Rights		880
Article I		880
Article XXI		880
Article XXV		880

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Indians not had fair deal in past	880
	Recommends report for careful study	880
	Province not jurisdiction in all respects	880
	Putting Declaration of Human Rights into effect	881
	Doing Province's part concerning Indians	881
	Elimination of discrimination in Manitoba	881
Re:	Six-nation band	881
Re:	Report's reference to agriculture	881
	Agricultural development not adequate on reserves	881
	Land very valuable	881
	Outside provincial jurisdiction	881
	Acreage of Reservation in Grant	881
	Many Indians excellent farmers	881
	Indian assistance on own farm	881
	Were entirely satisfactory	881
	Indians unaware of land equity	881
	Cannot grant mortgages	881
	No power to assist junior farmers	881
Re:	Building of farm ponds	881
	Reimbursed 50 per cent. to \$100	881
Re:	One built by Indian graduate of O.A.C.	881
	Found ineligible for reimbursement	882
	Because no assessment made	882
	Will continue efforts to secure	882
	Something must be done to save land	882
	Tempted to apply for allotment on reserve	882
	Not too late to make good use of land	882
	Much remains to be done	882
Re:	Indians right to vote	882
	Will be extended	882
	Right never questioned in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia	882
	Right afforded in British Columbia and Manitoba	882
	Federal government should make right nation-wide	883
	Endorses Committee's recommendation	883
Re:	Intoxicants	883
	Indian Act sections dealing with	883
Re:	Indian Act, 1951	883
	Provision to give Provinces jurisdiction	883
	Re: Proclamation of Section 95 Indian Act desired	883
Re:	Request for removal of discrimination	883
	No Criticism from temperance forces	883
Re:	Indians should be subject to same laws and regulations as white	883
Re:	Six-nations' Tribe	883
	History of	883
	Originally in United States	883
	Migration to Canada	883
	Led by Joseph Brant	883
	Biography of Joseph Brant	884
	Visit to Court of St. James	884
	Grant of land to Six-Nations	884
	Largely quickly dissipated	884
	Many served in 5 wars	884
	One decorated with D.S.M.	884

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Rev. E. T. Montour	884
	Showing capacity of Indians	885
	Re: Pauline Johnston	885
	Re: Agricultural Fair on Reserve	885
	Re: Treatment of Indians as second-rate citizens, absurd	885
	Indians should be emancipated	885
On Estimates, Department of Mines		953
	Re: Claims re fumes—Sudbury	953
	Payment of	954
	Amount of damages	954
On Estimates, Department of Planning and Development		1046
	Re: Chicago office	1046
Reply to Felicitations on birthday		1077
	Embarrassed at first by youth	1077
	Now by age	1077
	Extends thanks to hon. members	1077
On Bill No. 12A, In Committee		1188
	Sections 1 and 2 deleted	1188
	Substitution therefor	1189
	Not permitted in Quebec Province	1189
	Ban applied in 1947	1189
	Re: Endeavours to establish in Brantford	1189
	Request for building permit	1189
	Approved by Theatres' Branch	1189
	Entire community opposed	1189
	Re: Outlet on main road	1190
	Creates traffic hazard	1190
	Re: Motion for writ of Mandamus	1190
On Bill No. 136, In Committee		1191
	Re: Appointment of Returning Officers	1191
	Re: Permanent appointments	1191

NODEN, WILLIAM G. (PC Rainy River):

On the Speech from the Throne	58
Re: Loyalty to Crown	58
Re: Passing of Dowager Queen Mary	58
Re: Passing of Doctor McPhee	58
Re: Illness of hon. Messrs. Gemmell and Thomas	58
Re: Congratulatory to Mr. Jolley	58
Re: Tribute to Prime Minister	59
Re: Extract from <i>Toronto Daily Star</i>	59
Re: Riding of Rainy River	59
Many elements of pioneer progress	59
Natural resources in	59
Timber assets	59
Forest administration necessary	59
Re: Pulp and paper industry	59
Investment in	59
Re: Nursery Farm—Kapuskasing	59
Re: Forest fire-protection service	60
Re: Wild-life Division	60
Re: Water supply	60
Importance of	60
Famine of—in Eastern Ontario	60
Government assistance re water supply	60
Protection to industry	60

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Water Conservation	60
	Re: Conservation Authorities in East	60
Re: Terrace Bay and Marathon		60
Re: Previous disposal of pulpwood forests		61
	Halted by present Government	61
	Processing of resources in Canada	61
Re: Mining activities in		61
	Re: Steep Rock	61
Re: Ore deposits in United States		61
Re: Economic relations with United States		61
Re: Gold mining industry in Ontario		61
Re: Provincial highways		62
	Re: Atikokan Highway	62
	Should be extended to Fort Frances	62
Re: Additional bridge at Rainy River		62
Re: Quetico Provincial Park		62
Re: Increased demands on various departments		62
Re: Maintenance grants to Hospitals		62
Re: Ontario's credit		62
Re: Education in Northwest		62
Re: Agriculture in Rainy River		63
Re: Housing in Atikokan		63
Re: Hydro in north		63
Re: Civil Service		63
	Courtesy of	63
	Increased salary for	63
	Comparison with private industry	63
Re: Scrutiny of Government salary schedules desirable		64
Re: Consideration of North and Northwest		64
On Report Select Committee re Indian Population		891
	Found Committee educational and interesting	891
	Southern Indians advanced educationally	891
	No comparison with Northern Indians	891
	Have forgotten mother tongue	891
	Northern Indians cannot speak English	891
Re: Provincial vote first step in advanced education		891
Re: First government group to show interest in Indians		891

OLIVER FARQUHAR R. (L Grey South), Leader of Opposition:

Re: Passing of Dr. McPhee	8
Re: Resignation of W. L. Houck	8
Re: Welcome to living former premiers	9
Re: <i>Hansard</i>	14
Printing of	14
Former estimate of	14
Not correct	15
Re: Congratulatory to Mr. Dent	14
Re: Addition of Mr. Wren to Public Accounts Committee	17
Re: Appointment of Public Accounts Committee	29
Irregularities at Fort William and elsewhere	31
Re: Extent of matters sub judice	31
Re: Committee handicapped before it starts	32
Re: "Astute political move"	32
	33

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Preponderance of Government members	32
	Re: Select Committee preferable	32
	Re: Previous investigation of Department of Highways	33
	Re: Prevention of Committee from functioning	33
	Reference to Committee not fair	34
	Cannot be properly argued in Committee	35
Re: Passing of Agnes MacPhail		38
Re: Salary—Leader of Opposition		70
	No change at last revision	70
	Would be ample if all available	70
	Personal expense for additional help	70
	Competent research personnel required	70
	Not pressing for increase in	70
	Provincial Secretary's remarks unfair	70
Re: General revision of Municipal Act		94
On Speech from the Throne (Opening)		95
		474
	Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker	95
Re motion and seconding reply		96
	No mention of Government omissions	96
	Criticism always beneficial	96
Re: Municipal affairs		96
	Grants should be shown to tax bills	96
Re: Municipal financing		97
Re: Position of Municipalities		97
	Tax base static	97
	Taxation of real estate	97
	Difficulty of meeting increased costs	97
Re: Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i>		97
	Re: Division of tax fields	97
	Re: Welfare costs	97
	Re: Costs of Administration of Justice	97
	Incidence re	98
Re: Provincial Auditor's report		98
	Re: Overtaxation	98
Re: Health Insurance and Hospitalization		98
	Should be provincial responsibility	98
	Increase in Blue-Cross rates	98
	Statement by Minister of Health	98
	Later statement by Minister	98
Re: Federal Government's responsibility		99
	Dealing with 10 Provinces	99
Re: Housing		99
	Re: National Housing Act	99
	Has met great need	99
	Federal Government's work successful	100
	Province should pioneer plan	100
	Re: "Second-Mortgage Plan"	100
	Of great service to young people	100
	Re: Difficulty in securing homes	100
	Many ways Government could act	101
Re: Highways		101
	Process of building	101
	History of building	101
	Province's original grants for	101
	Increase in grants	101

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Irregularities in re	101
	Condonation of isolated incidents	102
	Present extent of	102
	Extract from Toronto <i>Star</i>	102
	Extract from Windsor <i>Daily Star</i>	102
	Scandals in connection with	103
	Duty of Parliament re	103
	Administrative practices	103
	Lowering of	103
	Full information a necessity	103
	Less opportunities for	103
	Grave responsibility of Government	103
	People have right to expect honest spending	104
	Methods of dealing with	104
	By group of consultants	104
	Scope limited	104
	By Royal Commission	104
	By Select Committee of House	105
	By Public Accounts Committee	105
	Evidence not available to	105
	Amendment to motion	105
	Amendment negatived	485
Re: <i>Hansard</i>		121
	Deletions from	121
	Instances of	121
	Should be none	122
On Report of Select Committee on Election Act		130
	Discussion should be general	130
	Simply a report	130
	Requires implementation	130
	Detailed discussion a waste of time	130
Re: Telephone authority		146
Re: Trials of Paul Caccia		200
	Re: Statements by member for Riverdale	200
	Re: Use of rubber hose	200
	Re: Anxiety of Crown Attorney to obtain conviction	200
	Should be substantiated or contradicted	200
Re: Secret agreement, Ottawa-Washington		262
	Existence if desired	262
Re: Passing of W. B. Harvey		278
	Came as shock to all	279
	Emphasizes the uncertainty of life	279
Re: Objections of Department of Planning and Development		342
	Has made large centers larger	342
	Small measure of relief to outlying areas	342
	Re: Awareness of complexities of problem	342
Re: Bill No. 68		343
	Should be held over	343
Re: Report on Lake Levels		359
	Commendation to Chairman	360
	Conditions at time of Committee's appointment	360
	Indemnification by Provincial and Federal governments	360
	Impossibility of	360
Re: Governmental responsibility		360
	Advice as to appropriate types of protection	360

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Opportunity for Department of Planning and Development	360
	United States measures not effective	360
	Recommendations should be accepted by Government	360
Re: Report Committee on Reform Institutions		401
	Committee not out to "get" anybody	402
	Nor to criticize officials unduly	402
	Exacting examination of Department	402
	Presenting unbiased report	402
	Tribute to Chairman	402
	Re: Recommendations of importance	402
	Re: No real criticism of conditions	402
	Re: Case meeting public approval	402
	Re: Department has twin obligation	402
	Security of detention	402
	Efforts at reformation	402
	Security well looked after	402
	Policy of Reformation far short of requirements	402
	Re: Brampton, a pilot scheme	402
	An experiment worthwhile	402
Re: Reformation		402
	Not adequate	402
	Greater segregation required	402
	Segregation a myth	402
	Efforts should be directed toward particular groups	403
	Only small percentage possible of reformation	403
Re: Probation		403
	Should be given before first sentence	403
	Only two alternatives	403
	Build more institutions	403
	Increase probation and efforts at reformation	403
Re: Probation in other countries		403
Re: Proper probation system necessary		403
	Regardless of cost	403
Re: Committee fearless in reporting		404
Re: Committee has not "played politics"		404
Re: Solutions to be arrived at		404
	Efforts of Committee toward that end	404
Re: Committee not in agreement with some policies of Department of Reform Institutions		404
Re: Recommendations should be implemented		404
On Speech from the Throne (Closing)		474
Re: Discussion on Estimates		474
Re: Unemployment		475
	In Welland	475
	Amount of substantial	475
	Primary responsibility not with Federal Government	475
Re: Federal-Provincial Conference		475
Re: Province should accept some responsibility		475
	Responsibility belongs to people of Canada	475
	Cash-relief system not desirable	475
	Speeches on Throne debate up to or above par	475
	Were thought-provoking	475
Re: Speech by hon. member for Kingston		476
	Less of a crusader	476
	Hon. member has mellowed	476
	Would be welcome addition to Cabinet	476

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Housing		476
Province should do more toward		476
Federal Government a great benefactor		476
Programme should be supplementary to National Housing Act		476
Re: Highways		476
Re: Irregularities in Department		476
Seizure of certain records		476
Why statement re made by Attorney-General		476
Not ordinary irregularities		476
If shown in one division		477
Likelihood of occurring in others		477
Most exhaustive inquiry into policies necessary		477
Right of public to expect		477
All obstacles to complete investigation should be removed		477
Judicial inquiry requested		477
Refused by Government		477
What other method can full probe follow		477
By Public Accounts' Committee not adequate		477
Re: Former inquiry into Lands and Forest Department		478
Information as to why continuation of—possible—desired		478
How it passed auditors		478
Collusion between Divisional Engineers and below		478
Re: Collusion between Divisional Engineers and above		478
Division engineers not solely to blame		479
Apparent direction from above		479
"High Brass" should turn spotlight on themselves		479
Crux of whole situation		479
Re: Increase in expenditures to exhaust appropriations		479
Practice should be stopped		479
In the interests of economy and the people		479
Re: Appointment of Select Committee to examine into		480
Re: Passing of Chas. G. MacOdrum		528
Re: Loss suffered by government and the House		528
Re: Was a man of the people		528
Re: Sympathy extended to family		528
On Bill No. 94, First Reading		557
Provision re Ontario's production of gas		557
Re: Protection of market		557
Re: Markets for present production		557
Re: Passing of Joseph D. Nault		592
Regret it		592
Sympathy extended to family		593
On Supplementary Estimates		596
Re: Grants to Dental Colleges		596
Re: Unsatisfactory housing for Dental Colleges		597
Grant would stabilize present facilities		597
New faculty of dentistry required		597
Re: Supplemental allowances		600
Government's position very weak		600
Should be paid to aged		601
Re: Irregularities, Highway Department		618
Re: Suspension of Chief Engineer		619
Re: Leaving country		619
Why not prevented		619

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 94, Second Reading		620
Favourably impressed with principle		620
Should be minutely examined		620
Re: Agreement as to securing Alberta gas		620
Re: Possible commitments by Government		620
Re: Creation of Ontario market		620
Re: Elapsed time before gas available		620
Re: Importation of Tennessee gas		620
Should be stopped when Alberta gas available		621
A significant arrangement		621
Re: Estimate of amount of gas to be purchased		629
Re: Powers of Fuel Board		633
Re: Conversion of equipment required		633
By whom will cost be borne		633
On Bill No. 77, Second Reading		634
Re: Emotionally upset children		634
Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways		649
Re: C. H. Nelson		649
Re: Article—Toronto <i>Telegram</i> , March 22, 1954		649
Re: Refusal to answer questions		649
On advice of Counsel		649
On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General		706
Re: Probation		706
Re: Savings affected		706
Re: Number now on probation		706
Re: Cost-of-living bonus		708
Re: Salary to Supervising Coroner		719
Re: Institution of 5-day week		725
Re: Resignations from Provincial Police		725
On Estimates, Department of Education		732
Re: Vote 40		732
Re: Enrollment at Teachers' Colleges		732
Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways		781
Re: Seizure of books and records		781
Re: Tabling of Trans-Canada agreements		781
Re: Placing before Select Committee		781
On Estimates, Department of Health		800
Re: Incidence of venereal diseases		800
Re: Sanatoria for Consumptives Act		800
Re: Payment for		800
On Estimates, Department of Highways		821
Re: Proceeding of Committee sub judice		821
Re: If not discussed in House, cannot be in Select Committee		821
Re: Government's decision demanded		821
Re: If Minister's statement correct, Committee can do nothing		821
Re: Variations in contracts		825
Re: Appointment of acting engineers		830
Re: Funds withheld from certain contractors		831
On Estimates, Provincial Auditor		849
Re: Provincial Auditor		849
Of high calibre		849
Has confidence of all people		849
Allowances should be increased		849
On Estimates, Department of Labour		867
Grants for amateur sports should be increased		867

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 87, In Committee		900
Re: Teachers' superannuation		900
Re: Steps taken to meet objectives		900
On Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests		916
Re: Mississagi operations		916
Re: Calling Committee to consider		916
Re: Abolition of Fish Hatcheries		921
Re: Decline in production		922
Re: Departmental construction		923
Re: Sawmilling industry		924
Re: Landing aircraft in Northwest		928
Are laws sufficient to control		928
Re: Regeneration of forests by air seeding		929
On Bill No. 51, In Committee		932
Re: Stated case to Court of Appeal		933
Interested parties should be notified of results		933
Re: Section 109, Municipal Board Act		933
Re: Section 111, Municipal Board Act		933
Re: Payment of costs		933
Should not be borne by successful applicant		933
On Bill No. 92, In Committee		936
Re: Section 8		936
Re: Mental Health Officer		936
Authority of		936
On Estimates, Department of Mines		951
Re: Opening of mining roads		951
Re: Companies' participation		951
Re: Production of Ontario Natural Gas		953
Re: James Bay lowlands		955
Re: Gas and oil possibilities		955
On Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs		978
Re: Provincial-Municipal Committee		978
Permanency of		978
Re Report of		978
Re: Nature of		978
Re: Salaries of members		979
On Bill No. 110, In Committee		1005
Re: Nomination of Conciliation Board members		1005
Is legislation sufficient		1005
Re: Practice followed re		1005
On Budget		1014
Re: Frequency changeovers		1014
Estimated cost of		1014
Re: Plaque to hon. Robert Baldwin		1022
Lived 100 years ago		1022
A great reformer		1022
Laid great foundation		1022
Canada example of social harmony		1022
Do not appreciate difficulties of early days		1022
Accomplished much as a young man		1022
On Estimates, Department of Planning and Development		1036
Re: River Valley Conservation Surveys		1036
Re: Power of expropriation		1043

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Immigration	1044
	Expenditures for	1044
On Vote No. 120		1045
	Re: Statement by Dr. Faludi	1045
	Re: Does province decide location for industry	1045
On Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary		1053
	Re: Civil Defence	1053
	Disturbed at general remarks	1053
	Graphic picture painted	1053
	Could be true	1053
	Much more effort required	1053
	Re: Facilities inadequate	1053
	Re: Going much further in United States	1054
On Bill No. 94, In Committee		1064
	Re: Rates charged to ultimate consumer	1064
	Re: Wide powers to Board members	1065
	Should not be extended to employees	1065
	Re: Seizure of abandoned wells	1065
Re: Collection of Logging taxes		1076
Re: Chapter 216, Section 34, R.S.O.		1076
	Not an answer to question	1076
	Public information should be available on request	1076
	Information not referring to members of Legislature	1077
	If member accepts responsibility for asking, information should not be withheld	1077
On Bill No. 139, Second Reading		1079
	In agreement with principles	1079
	Forward-looking legislation not prerogative of any Government	1079
	Discrimination not tolerated	1079
	Argument for establishing better way of life	1079
On Estimates, Department of Provincial Treasurer		1120
	Gone to New York market extensively	1120
	Percentage of borrowings as between Canada and United States ..	1120
	Should hear from member of Racing Commission	1121
	Re: Junior Farmer's Establishment Loan Corporation	1125
	Re: Answer received before criticism voiced	1126
	Board started in generous way	1126
	Became progressively "tougher"	1126
	Fault lies in Board itself	1126
	Spending organization wrong place for Dr. Walters	1126
	Re: Board should be re-organized	1126
	No use as presently constituted	1126
	Re: 50 per cent. of applications refused	1127
On Estimates, Department of Public Welfare		1144
	Re: Means test	1144
	Severity of	1144
On Bill No. 68, In Committee		1146
	Re: Objection by organized agriculture	1146
On Bill No. 77, In Committee		1146
	On Section 16	1146
	Wardship removed at 18	1146
	Should be continued to 21	1146
	Terminated sooner if Judge directs	1146
On Section 31		1148
	Re: Age of Child competent to make decisions	1148
	Should be raised from 10 to 14 or 15	1148

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 77, In Committee		1157
Power of Lieutenant-Governor in Council		1157
Children's Aid Society self-governing		1157
To vary by-laws		1157
Not guaranteeing uniformity		1157
On Bill No. 112, In Committee		1159
Re: Eligibility of Deputy Reeves to sit in County Councils		1159
Re: Right of Appeal		1160
Should apply to all cases		1160
Re: Second explosion—R. L. Hearn Generating Plant		1185
Re: Changeover to 60-cycle power		1185
Re: Insurance coverage of machines		1185
Re: Appointment, Select Committee on Highway Safety		1188
Welcomes appointment		1188
Great work to be done		1188
Should investigate outside province		1188
Reference to <i>Life Magazine</i>		1188
On Bill No. 136, In Committee		1190
Re: Section 3		1190
Re: What machinery provided		1190
Re: Section 8		1190
Re: Appointment of Returning Officers		1190
Should reside in Riding		1191
Re: Definition of "Private Building"		1194
On Bill No. 138, In Committee		1197
Re: Power of Lieutenant-Governor in Council		1198
To confirm decision of Municipal Board		1198
Or direct a new hearing		1198
Re: Naming Board for re-hearing		1198
What is purpose		1198
On Estimates, Department of Public Works		1237
Re: Estimated cost of Millbrook		1237
Re: Projects under Conservation Act		1238
Re: Progress of Conestoga Dam		1238
On Estimates, Department of Travel and Publicity		1246
Re: Advertising agencies used		1246
Proportion spent in United States		1246
Proportion spent in Ontario		1246
Re: Reinstatement of Trade system		1246
Re: Number of Reception Centres		1246
On Notice of Motion No. 9		1249
Re: Request for information up-to-date		1249
Committee should meet as soon as possible		1249
Re: List of contractors whose books and records under seizure		1249
One with large contracts		1249
Re: Investigation of seized records should be expedited		1249
Re: Monies withheld from contractors		1249
Expedite cases against those who may be guilty		1249
Allow balance to continue contracting		1249
Re: Checking other than Fort William		1250
Re: Seizures indicated suspicion of something wrong		1250
Re: Were two not seized, tested and found all right		1250

PHILLIPS, HON. MACKINNON (Minister of Health) :

Re: Third Annual Report, Alcoholism Research Foundation	276
Congratulation to president and officers	276
Re: Treatment and rehabilitation	276
Congratulations to Executive Director and Director	276
Re: Consideration of first two Reports	276
Re: New Alcohol Clinic and Hospital	276
.....	277
Re: Biochemical changes in blood	276
Re: 1949 Legislation	276
Re: Description of "Alcohol"	276
Ethyl alcohol	277
Only one for beverage purposes	277
Great care used in distillation	277
Most aged whiskey gone by war's end	277
Purpose of aging liquor	277
Fusel oil	277
Butyl	277
Propyl	277
Amyl	277
Re: Distillation	277
One half to 2 oz. oils per Imperial Quart	277
Many liquors contain fusel oil	277
Is deadly poison	277
Law requires 2-year aging	277
Electrolysis experiments in Britain	277
Re: Capacity of new Clinic and Hospital	277
Open to all people in Toronto	277
Ratio of beds for male and female patients	277
50 to 52 per cent. successes	277
Re: "Social drinkers"	277
Re: Invitation to visit	277
Re: Efforts at rehabilitation paramount	278
Re: Accommodation ample at present	278
Additional beds in Hospitals	278
On Bill No. 92, First Reading	509
In three parts	509
Observation	509
Municipal rates	509
Certification	509
On Bill No. 93, First Reading	509
Re: Community Mental Health programme	510
Participation of public hospitals in	510
Units presently in operation	510
On Bill No. 100, First Reading	559
Legislation re care of poliomyelitis patients	559
Legislative authority for 1937 scheme	559
On Bill No. 106, First Reading	588
Financial assistance to Hospitals	588
Re: Operating expenses of	588
Re: Municipal contributions	588
Re: Decreased value of Canadian dollar	588
Re: Improvement in Medical knowledge	588
Re: Indigent patients	589
Increase in rates for	589

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 123, First Reading		747
Congratulatory to Committee personnel		748
Purpose of amendment		748
Establishment of Cemetery Advisory Board		748
Designation of Inspectors		748
Licencing of Salesmen		748
Re: Supervision and care of Perpetual Care Funds		748
On Estimates, Department of Health		765
Re: Expansion of Hospital Beds		765
Increased grants for		765
Table of new bed facilities		765
Re: Payments of indigent costs		765
On basis of public-ward beds		765
Re: Hospital grants, 1953		765
Number of hospitalized persons		765
Cost of operation of Ontario Hospitals		765
Additions to		766
Re: Tuberculosis		766
Reduction in mortality rate		766
Incidence of in Indians		766
Re: Continuation of preventive programme		766
Re: Cancer		766
Ontario Treatment and Research Foundation		766
Doing splendid work		766
Re: Ontario Cancer Institute		766
Re: Ontario Cancer Society		766
Re: Cobalt bombs		766
Further installations of		767
Re: Incidence of heart disease		767
Research into		767
Grant for		767
Re: Indigent patients		767
Costs of		767
Re: Service to Civil Servants		767
Re: Comparison of salaries with service		768
Re: Chlorination of water		771
Congratulatory to Member for Brantford		771
Files re, pro and con		771
Re: Extract from letter, Canadian Medical Association		771
Re: Extract from letter, World Health Organization		771
Re: Alcoholic Research Foundation		772
Nothing to do with distillation processes		772
Has requested scientific information		772
Statement should have referred to "gallons" not "quarts"		772
Re: Victorian Order of Nurses		773
Re: Increase in Grant		773
Re: St. Elizabeth Visiting Nurses' Association		773
Great mass of evidence on		797
Implications not clear		797
Estimates, continued		798
Re: Examinations of expectant mothers		798
Re: Prevention of V.D.		798
Re: Training of Nursing Assistants		799

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Shortage in nursing field, 1950	799
	Reduction in	799
	Facilities for, not adequate	799
	Two admission standards desirable	799
	Re: Grants for beds, nurses	800
	Re: Grants for Training Schools	800
	Re: Incidence of venereal diseases	800
	Decline in	800
	Re: Sanatoria for Consumptives	801
	Payments for	801
	Re: Psychiatric services	802
	Re: Printing and Stationery	803
	Largely for Mental Hospitals	803
	Re: Clothing for Bailiffs	803
	Re: Psychiatric treatment	803
	Great progress being made	803
	Re: Care of mentally-ill children	804
	No punishment permitted	805
	Sufficient provision for	805
	Method of determination of	805
On Bill No. 92, In Committee		936
	Re: Section 3	936
	Re: Director of Mental Health	936
	Re: Section 8	936
	Re: Psychiatric units	936
On Bill No. 141, First Reading		1073
	Act 1943 provided for 7 to 10 members	1073
	Amendment omits maximum	1074

PORTER, HON. DANA (Attorney-General):

	Re: <i>Hansard</i>	122
	Re: Deletions from	122
	Does not read	122
On Report of Select Committee on Election Act		129
	Simply tabling of	129
	Discussion should be general	129
		130
	Ample opportunity for sectional discussion will be provided	129
	Discussion may be advantageous	130
	Members' views should be expressed	130
	Further discussion if desired	130
	Recommends acceptance of Motion to adjourn debate	131
Re: Trans-Canada pipe line		147
	Contracts under Federal Government control	147
On Bill No. 35, Second Reading		162
	Re: Statement of payments made	162
	Must be itemized	162
	By amendment not now required	162
On Bill No. 41, Second Reading		163
	Re: Affidavits outside Ontario	163
	Re: Certification of person taking	163
On Bill No. 48, Second Reading		164
	Re: Salaries of Surrogate Court Judges	164
Re: Trials of Paul Cachia		197
	Twice convicted	197
	Re: Remarks by hon. member for Riverdale	198

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Trials by different Judges and juries	198
	Previous remarks a serious reflection upon certain Court officials ..	198
	Will conduct complete investigation	198
Re: Alleged confession		198
	Introduced by "back-door methods"	198
	Made to 2 Police Officers	198
	Came into possession of Crown Attorney	198
	Denies contents disclosed	198
	No attempt to influence Judge	198
	Judge no power to convict	198
	First trial, conviction on evidence	198
	Confession not produced	198
Re: Second trial		198
	Different officials	198
	Confession not produced	198
	Obtaining convictions not function of Crown	199
	Duty to place all facts before Court	199
Re: Third trial		199
	Confession not produced	199
Re: No compensation for wrongful imprisonment		199
	Line would be difficult to draw	199
Re: Severance of Crown Attorney from Crown		217
	Evidence insufficient to warrant prosecution	217
	Restitution made	217
Re: Magistrate at Fort William		218
Re: Available information should be given to Crown		220
Re: Importation of Natural Gas		366
	Decision re—Federal Government matter	366
	Exhaustive enquiries made at request of Federal Government	366
	Will supply all information to Federal Government	366
On Bill No. 58, Second Reading		381
	Principle is sound	381
	Should be no objection to "destitute"	381
	Some responsibility should be imposed on children	381
Re: Irregularities in Department of Highways		387
	Re: Issuance of search warrants	387
On Speech from the Throne		480
	Speeches by Leader of Opposition duplicates	480
	Amendment by	480
	Not a vote of want of confidence	480
		485
Re: Investigation into Department of Highways		481
	Will be carried out to fullest degree	481
Re: Announcement of seizures of records		481
	Reason for	481
	Justification for	481
	Method of	481
	Should be made in House	481
Re: Unemployment		481
	Not as great as anticipated	481
	Dominion-Provincial Conference re	482
Re: Joint Economic Committee		482
	Urged by Prime Minister	482
	Has been frequently repeated	482

Re: "Windfall" from Federal Government	482
Amounting to \$40 million	482
Tax fields released to Federal Government	482
Has been advantageous to Government	482
Leader of Opposition's perspective not proper	483
Re: Provincial Government's treatment of Municipalities	483
Subsidies 1953-54	483
Extract from article in Welland <i>Tribune</i>	483
Whole story not told to people of Welland, by Leader of Opposition	484
Percentage of Municipal expenditures	484
Re: Further grants desired	484
Re: Work of Select Committees	485
Have served very useful purpose	485
On Bill No. 75, Second Reading	513
Re: Extension of Juvenile Courts system	513
Situation in Ottawa	513
On Bill No. 76, Second Reading	514
Re: Sale of property	514
Re: Fictitious "Mrs. Smith"	514
Sufficient to cancel licence	514
Re: Legislation sufficient	515
Differentiation between "broker" and "salesman"	516
On Bill No. 94, First Reading	554
Re: Future fuel requirements	554
Re: Problems faced re Alberta gas	554
Growth of consumption in 12 years	554
Consumption in 1940	554
Consumption in 1952	554
Potential consumption in 1964	554
Comparison in terms of coal	554
Comparison in terms of electric power	554
Coal consumption not reduced by increased use of electricity and oil	554
Coal largest single source of energy	555
All forms of energy required for industrial expansion	555
Province must co-operate in Alberta gas	555
Central Canada dependent on U.S. for coal	555
Condition will continue	555
Imported energy must be supplemented	555
Re: Hydro-electric power	555
Limit to water-power resources	555
Possibility of new gas developments in Ontario	555
Factors involved in supplying Western Gas	555
Pipe line will be largest in world	555
Over 2,000 miles long	555
30 inches in diameter	555
Delivery of 100 billion cubic feet annually	555
Equivalent to 7 million or 8 million tons of coal	555
One-half deliverable to Ontario	555
Re: Problems of supply and distribution	555
Great prospect for increasing natural gas supply in West	555
Continuous supply for 20 years	555
Basis for financing	555
Must be conditioned to amount of gas presently available	555
Future expansion necessary to make construction worthwhile	555

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Indications of future possibilities	556
	Rock formation same as United States	556
	Extends to Canadian North	556
	One-half size of U.S. formation	556
	500,000 producing oil wells in U.S.	556
	10,000 in Canada	556
	Present known reserves only fraction of potential	556
	Re: Problem of financing	556
	Delivery to Central Canada at competitive price	556
	Economic price expected	556
	Sufficient to warrant further drilling	556
	Re: Capital Costs	556
	Must be borne by producers	556
	Re: Gas in natural state	556
	Contains many constituent elements	556
	Butane	556
	Propane and sulphur	556
	Must be separated from deliverable gas	556
	Re: Gathering system essential	556
	Requires network of smaller pipe lines	556
	Re: Capital cost estimated at \$200 million	556
	Re: Cost of Trans-Canada pipe line	556
	Approximately \$300 million	556
	Plus additional costs of operation	556
	Interest must be paid on	556
	Further cost to bring to consumers	556
	Re: Cost of change-overs	556
	Capital investment in Central Canada	556
	Possibly \$200 million	556
	Total investment may reach \$700 million	557
	Trans-Canada pipe line under Federal jurisdiction	557
	B.N.A. Act, Section 92(10) (a)	557
	Corporation formed under Act of Parliament	557
	Purpose of Bill to provide comprehensive system of controls	557
	Re: Appeals from decisions of Board	557
	Certain Acts appealed	557
	Well Diggers' Act	557
	Fuel Supply Act	557
	Natural Gas Conservation Act	557
	Natural Gas Conservation Amendment Act	557
	Re: Amendments to other Acts	557
	Public Utilities Act	557
	Municipal Franchises Act	557
	Re: Control of natural gas in jurisdiction of Fuel Board	557
	Provisions re Ontario's production of gas	557
	Re: Protection of market	557
	Re: Markets for present production	557
	Connection of pipe line with United States lines	558
	Pipe line inter-provincial	558
On	Bill No. 99, First Reading	558
	Re: Prohibiting parking on private property	558
	Authority for By-law covering	558
Re:	Irregularities, Department of Highways	594
	Seizures of certain records re	594

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 114, First Reading		618
Re: Recording of By-laws		618
On Bill No. 117, First Reading		618
Re: Specifying negligence, etc.		618
On Bill No. 94, Second Reading		620
Re: Amendment to Section 16		620
Re: Government sub-committee		623
To explore all aspects of problem		623
No Governmental statement of policy		623
No commitment for specific amounts		628
Will be privately-owned		628
Financed and operated by		628
Provincial taxing resources not pledged		628
Re: Original Transcontinental Railway		628
Built by private enterprise		628
Re: Exploration of markets		629
Re: Domestic markets for gas		629
For use in houses		629
For use by industry		629
On interruptible basis		629
Re: Objectives of company		629
Uninterrupted consumption of gas		629
Public distributing system not desirable		629
Would create competition		629
Gas line competes with Hydro to some extent		630
Gas better for some uses		630
Ideal for space heating		630
Company's problem to sell gas		630
Project an enormous one		630
Government should not compete with free markets		630
Government Commission not desirable		630
No justification for		631
Surveys in co-operation with Federal Government		631
Fairly accurate estimates obtained		631
Re: Ratio between average supply and energy consumed		631
Not as great as considered		631
Re: Importation of gas from United States		631
Subject of negotiations		631
Information re Ontario gas available to Federal Government		631
Joint effort to serve best interest of all		631
Re: Potential of Ontario production		632
Re: Feeder lines to northern municipalities		632
May require amendments		632
Will give consideration to		632
Proper steps to prevent unequal distribution to municipalities		632
Only concerns three or four provinces		632
Re: Powers of Fuel Board		633
Re: Conversion of equipment required		633
Re: Toronto arrangements		633
Requires skilled workmen		633
Comparison of British Thermal Units as between natural and manufactured gas		633
On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General		703
Total of		703
Re: Probation services		703
Has aroused considerable interest		703

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Has been in effect many years	703
	Salaries for	703
	Providing for additions	703
Re: Post of Director of Probation Services		704
	Created in 1952	704
	After complete survey	704
	17 Probation Officers—1953	704
	All Provincial employees	704
	Increased to 41 by end of 1953	704
	9 additional in 1954	704
	Estimated 70 by end of year	704
Re: Qualifications of Probation Officers		704
	Two Standards of, required	704
	Educational	704
	Practical experience in Welfare work	704
Re: Duties of Probation Officers		704
	Pre-sentence reports	704
Re: Jurisdiction re		705
	Always under Department of Attorney-General	705
Re: Services in Juvenile and Family Courts		706
	Paid by Municipalities	706
Re: Re-appointments		706
	Available to all courts	706
	Not a new departure	706
	Number on probation not immediately available	706
	Expanded system not reported	706
Re: Cost-of-living bonus		707
	Not departmental matter	708
	Set by government policy	708
Re: Compensation for wrongful imprisonment		708
	Disagrees with <i>Saturday Night</i>	708
Re: Case of Ronald Power		710
	Facts concerning	710
Re: Legislative Counsel		711
	Salaries of	711
	Minimum	711
Re: Registrar of Regulations Branch		711
	Special Expenses, Administration of Justice Expenses Act ...	712
	Re: Section 11	712
Re: Vote 29, On Item 10		712
	Re: Decrease in Maintenance	712
	Re: Purchase of spectograph	712
	Uses of	712
Re: Vote 29, On Item 6		712
	Re: Clothing of prisoners	712
Re: Vote 29, Re: "Probation Officers"		714
	Differentiation between Statutory and Ordinary	714
Re: Vote 29, Items 7 and 8		715
	Re: "Crime comics"	715
	Not provincial matter	715
	Governed by Criminal Code	715
	No juveniles in Department of Attorney-General	716

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Vote 31, Items 5 to 10		719
Conferring power on Official Guardian		719
Re: Item 10		719
Payments to Children's Aid Societies		719
Re: Salary to Supervising Coroner		719
Re: Vote 34		720
Third Judge, County of Carleton		720
Re: Vote 34, Item 13		721
Payment for preparing plans		721
Re: Operation of Division Courts in Toronto		722
Re: Vote 35, Item 6		724
Agreement with City of Niagara Falls		724
Re: Policing Rainbow Bridge		724
Re: Five-day week, not effective		725
Creates no dissatisfaction		725
Compensated for		725
Re: Registrations for Provincial Police		725
On Estimates, Department of Insurance		726
Re: Blue Cross		726
Placed under Department of Insurance by Legislation		726
Re: Functions of Department of Insurance		726
Standard of financial reserves desired		726
On Bill No. 129, First Reading		779
Substitution of "Chief Election Officer" for "Clerk of the Crown in Chancery"		779
Re: Advances against indemnities		779
Re: Expense allowance		779
Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways		781
Re: Seizure of books and records		781
Deposited in lawyer's office		781
On Bill No. 136, First Reading		846
Recommendation re \$200 deposit not included		846
Re: Returning Officers		846
Re: Use of automobiles		846
On Bill No. 94, In Committee		1063
Re: Fixing of rates		1064
Re: Protection of public		1064
Re: Powers broadened to include any new utility		1064
Re: Consumers Gas Company, an exception		1064
Re: Powers limited to scope of Act		1065
Re: Implication of "Employee"		1065
Re: Power of Seizure of Abandoned Wells		1065
Used only in limited way		1065
Re: Where hazardous situations created		1065
Re: Gas used primarily for domestic consumption		1066
Re: Backlog of requested		1066
On Bill No. 96, In Committee		1067
Authority for line to pass through Municipalities		1067
On Bill No. 114, In Committee		1150
Section 2, Deleted		1150
Balance re-numbered		1150
Re: Section 52(a) subsection 4 repealed		1150
Substitution therefor		1150
Bill held over		1150
Re: Section 52, subsection 2		1157
Amendment to		1157
A matter of convenience		1157

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 112, In Committee		1160
Re: Proposed amendment		1160
No purpose in giving reasons		1160
Re: Difference between granting and revoking		1160
Re: Commission has complete discretion		1160
Not a proper subject for court action		1160
A matter of Municipal policy		1161
Re: Licencing taxicabs		1161
Appeal in order if licence revoked		1161
Not prior to issuance		1161
On Bill No. 136, In Committee		1190
Re: Enumerate in same way		1190
Re: Appointment of Returning Officers		1190
Is ideal situation		1191
Provides great flexibility		1191
Difficulties in securing		1191
Residence unimportant		1191
Satisfactory work required		1191
Re: Result of election in Kenora		1193
Re: Definition of "private building"		1194
On Section 23		1195
Re: Financing of Communist Party candidates		1195
Re: Amendment, numbered "25"		1197
Re: Amendment, numbered "26"		1197
Re: Re-numbering former Sections 25 and 26		1197
On Bill No. 139, In Committee		1201
Re: Bill permissive		1201
Re: Penalties for violations		1201
On Bill No. 129, In Committee		1205
Re: Amendment		1205
New Section 10		1205
Re: Sections 10 and 11 be re-numbered as "11" and "12"		1205

PRINGLE, J. A. (PC Addington):

On Report of Select Committee on Indian Affairs	1090
Pleasure at serving on Committee	1090
Indians were first citizens	1090
Pleasure to visit Reserves	1090
Re: Tyendannaga Reserve	1090
Will gain responsibilities of citizenship	1090
Re: Enfranchisement of Indians	1090
Re: Indians very intelligent	1090
Re: Education of Indians	1090
Re: Assistance of Federal Government	1091
Re: Shortage of maps in Schools	1091
Re: Indian students in Cornwall Collegiate	1091
Re: Six Nations Fairs	1091
Re: Lack of full use of land	1091
Re: Packaged liquor on Reserves	1091
Re: Not a drunken Indian seen	1091

PRYDE, T (PC Huron):

On Report of Select Committee re Cemeteries	317
Re: Adequate perpetual care funds	317
Re: Supervision	318
Re: Field officers	318

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Establishment of new cemeteries	318
	Re: Abandoned cemeteries	318
	Re: Advisory Board	318
	Re: Early burials	318
	Re: Statement by hon. Mr. Gladstone	319
On	Bill No. 79, Second Reading	543
	No property for park purposes in Huron	543
	Re: "The Pinery"	543
	Favours the Bill	544
	Re: Park in Bayfield	544
On	Report Select Committee on Reform Institutions	579
	Commendatory to Mr. Leavine	579
	Report non-partisan	579
	Re: Allocation of subjects to Committee members	579
	Was assigned "quarries"	579
	Then "Industries in Institutions"	579
	Re: Institutional activities	579
	Some producing things of value	579
	Agriculture and forestry	579
	Manufacture of licence plates	580
	Abattoir	580
	Cannery	580
	Machine Shop	580
	Furniture Factory	580
	Woollen Mill	580
	Brick and tile	580
	Re: Brampton Reformatory	580
	Not a productive project	580
	Vocational Training at	580
	Re: Activities should not be minimized	580
	Re: Goods sold to other Departments	580
	Department of Reform Institutions should be given full credit	580
	At market values	580
	Re: Probation	580
	Meaning confused in minds of many	580
	Suspended sentence not a discharge	580
	Re: Segregation	580
		582
	Need for increasing	580
	Is of great importance	581
	Re: Present Estimates not sufficient for suggested expansion	581
	Re: Hypothetical question	581
	Hospitals or Penal Institutions	581
	Re: Alex. G. Brown Memorial Clinic and Hospital, Mimico	581
	Instituted by present Minister	581
	Experiment will be emulated	581
	Enjoyed working with Committee	581
	Learned a great deal from it	582
	Commendatory to Department	582
	Re: Report will prove valuable	582
On	the Budget	1094
	Regrets at passing of three Members	1094
	Re: Provincial revenue	1094
	Analysis of	1094
	Re: Gasoline Tax	1094
	Re: Lands and Forests	1095

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Liquor Control Board	1095
	Re: Succession duties	1095
	Re: Expenditures	1095
	Re: Highway safety	1096
	Re: Safety publicity	1096
	Re: Examination centres	1096
	Re: Spot checks by O.P.P.	1096
	Re: Ample warning signs in Ontario	1096
	Re: Safety campaign in Exeter	1096
	Re: Industrial Advisory Board	1096
	Re: Department of Planning and Development	1096
	Re: Industrial Promotions Branch	1096
	Tribute to	1096
	Re: County Plan	1097
	Co-operatively can do much	1097
	Re: Parks and recreational areas	1097
	Budget outstanding	1097
	Expenditures for human betterment	1097
	To build a strong Ontario	1097
	Aim of Government	1097

REAUME, A. J. (L Essex North):

Re: Brotherhood week	121
Windsor proclamation	121

ROBARTS, J. P. (PC London):

On Speech from the Throne	366
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	366
Congratulatory to Mr. Letherby	367
Re: Southwestern Ontario	367
Re: "Parks" policy	367
The Pinery	367
Re: Increase in population in Southwestern Ontario	367
Re: St. Lawrence Power Development	367
Re: Port Stanley	367
Construction of grain elevators at	367
Re: Fanshaw Dam	368
Re: London Flood—1937	368
Re: Preventing floods—1954	368
Has paid for itself in services	368
Re: Older citizens	368
Ratio to younger people increasing	368
Re: Modern control of disease	368
Decline in death rate	368
Re: Employment of older citizens	368
Why not acceptable to industry	369
Caught in "actuarial vice"	369
By present retirement schemes	369
Arising from depression	369
False premise under present economy	369
Re: Prejudices against older workers	369
Research has proved them wrong	369
Re: Should be permitted to work when physically able	369

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Inflation perpetual	369
	May have certain benefits	369
	Alternative to being permitted to work	369
	Become increasing burden on tax payers	369
	Re: Appointment of Select Committee to investigate	369
	Will benefit private industry	370
	Industry under misconception	370
	Man's usefulness not ended at 65	370

ROBERTS, A. KELSO (PC St. Patrick):

On Select Committee on Companies' Act	143
Main report presented last year	143
Followed by Statute	143
Further recommendations made to Committee	143
Present report unanimous	143
Re: Schedule of Draft Bill	143
Re: Part IV—Mining Companies	143
Re: Amendment to Section 121	143
Re: Part V—Co-operative Corporations	144
Amendment to Section 124, subsection 3	144
Further section added to Part V	144
Re: Part VI—Insurance	144
Additions re Farm Mutuals	144
Re: Millers Insurance Companies	144
Re: Section 308—of General Part	144
Re-drafted for clarification	144
Re: No libellous statements in notices	144
Re: Addition to Section 322 b	144
Discussion Page 3171 et seq. of proceedings	145
Re: Congratulations received	145
Extract from letter from C. Parent, Q.C.	145
Re: Minority shareholders	145
Re: <i>Hansard</i>	145
Re "Turophilo"	145
Definition of	146
On Bill No. 15, Second Reading	269
Purpose of	269
Has developed Brazilian electricity	269
Similar Bill at Ottawa	270
On Speech from the Throne	292
Regret at passing of W. B. Harvey	292
Congratulations to newly-elected members	292
Re: Discrimination	292
Re: Universal Declaration of Human Rights	292
Extract from Article I	292
Extract from Article II	292
Extract from Article VIII	292
Article XXIII	292
Article XXIV	292
Article XXVI	292
Legislation dealing with	293
Re: Racial Discrimination Act, 1944	293
Re: Instances of—Canada	293
Instances of—United States	293
Re: Statement by Premier Chen Cheng	293

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Estimates, Department of Education		735
Re: Vote 41, Item 39		735
Re: Summer Camps		735
On Estimates, Department of Health		801
Re: Health Insurance Contracts		801
Re: Shortage of hospital beds		801
Re: Blue Cross		801
Unable to provide service owing to shortage of beds ...		801
Should be equivalent arranged		801
On Estimates, Department of Mines		954
Re: Preliminary Report		954
An excellent idea		954
Should be adopted by other departments		954
On Bill No. 83, In Committee		1158
Re: Amendment to Section 5		1158
Re: Council of Metropolitan Toronto		1158
Re: By-law limiting speed to 30 m.p.h.		1158
On Bill No. 136, In Committee		1192
Re: Appointment of Returning Officers		1192
Wider discretion in larger centres		1192

ROBSON, R. (PC Hastings East):

On Estimates, Department of Agriculture	656
Re: Price spreads	656
Farmers not averse to investigation	656
Re: Efforts of canners and producers to co-operate	656
Re: Dairy Branch	657
Re: Export markets for cheese	657
Re: Establishment of Research Committee	657
Re: Aid to Cheese Producers' Association	657
Re: Proper packaging	657
Would increase home consumption	657
Re: Grants to rural lines	664
Refund to Hydro	664
Re: Municipal Commissions	665
Re: Cost of establishing utilities	666
On Report, Select Committee on Indian affairs	1088
Pleasure at serving on Committee	1088
Local Indians interested in Committee	1088
Both Indians and Committee benefitted	1088
Re: Sale of intoxicants	1088
Some Indians against	1088
Privilege should be extended to Indians	1088
Education of Indians	1088
Federal Government assisted in	1088

ROOT, J. (PC Wellington North):

On Bill No. 51, Second Reading	82
Supports principle	82
Re: Conference of 1947	82
Re: Government's advanced leadership	82
Re: Clause 66	82
Re: Clause 89	82
Re: Clause 101	82
Will be supported by rural people	82

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Report of Select Committee re Cemeteries		315
Congratulatory to Chairman		316
Congratulatory to Department officials		316
Re: Adequate perpetual care		316
A legal charge against estate		316
By-law covering unopened graves		316
Re: Repossession of unused space		316
Re: "High-pressure selling"		317
Re: Advisory Board		317
Re: Provincial field officer		317
Re: Abandoned cemeteries		317
Definition of		317
Re: Authority of Local Councils		317
On the Budget		758
Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker		758
Welcome to newly-elected members		758
Regret at absence of Minister of Agriculture		758
Re: "Wonderful Budget"		758
Elicits confidence of people		758
Some details of		758
Re: Constituency of Wellington North		758
Description of constituency		758
Finest rural constituency in Ontario		758
Re: Highways in		758
Grants for		758
Appreciation to Minister, for		759
Re: Agriculture		759
Table of agricultural statistics		759
Re: Decline in farm prices		759
Table of declines		760
Re: Loss of export markets		760
Re: Trade and financial policies of Federal Government responsible for		760
Re: What assistance has Ontario given?		760
Re: Hydro		760
Rural electrification		760
Cost of, unchanged in 10 years		760
Research at O.A.C. and O.V.C.		760
Re: Development of markets		760
Government assistance, re		760
Re: Policies of many departments		760
Re: Per-capita consumption of food		760
Table of		761
Re: Municipal financing		762
Re: Present taxes		762
Extract from <i>Hansard</i> , 1953		762
Federal Government not fair to Municipalities		762
Re: Grants to Municipalities		762
Re: Decentralization of people and centralization of tax dollar		763
Re: Ontario a good heritage		763
Re: Pioneer village desired		763

SALSBERG, JOSEPH B. (LP St. Andrew):

Re: Passing of Dr. McPhee	10
Re: Welcome to living former Premiers	10
Re: <i>Hansard</i>	14
Re: Printing of former proceedings	14

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Failure to be placed on Committees		29
Reason unknown		29
Service on former Committees		29
Re: Reference of irregularities to Public Accounts Committee		34
Investigation should not be left until after Court action		34
Reference to Committee—a bar to other procedures		35
Re: Passing of Agnes MacPhail		39
Re: Member of Public Accounts Committee		46
Re: Unemployment in Toronto		47
Suggested methods of assistance		48
On Bill No. 51, Second Reading		86
A "symphony of praise" for government		86
Agrees with in principle		86
Does not go far enough		86
Pioneering work left to rural companies		87
Bell Telephone Co.—a monopoly		87
Will help small companies		87
New policy required		87
Telephones should be public utility		87
Re: Hydro services		87
Assistance to rural areas		87
Re: Borrowing power of province		87
Hopes suggestions will be implemented		88
Re: Printing of annual reports		119
Printing contracts		119
Re: <i>Hansard</i>		122
Deletions from		122
Re: Report of Select Committee on Election Act		130
General discussion desirable		130
Moves adjournment of debate		130
Hopes government will not implement all recommendations		132
Bill a major piece of legislation		132
Recommendation further infringes the rights of the people		132
Will narrow number of candidates		132
Re: Permanent Returning Officers		132
Should be known to be impartial		132
Re: Constituency machinery should be above suspicion		132
Re: Repeal of Section 169 of present Act		133
Re: Elections should be less costly		133
Re: Report requires plain speaking		133
Re: Extract from <i>Maclean's</i> Magazine		133
Re: Contributions to campaign funds		133
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway		147
Re: Secret agreement between Canada and United States		147
Re: Construction should be under Canadian Government control		147
Ontario's position should be defined		148
.....		149
Re: Compensation for wrongful imprisonment		199
On Speech from the Throne		240
Appreciation to Mr. Speaker		240
Re: Civil Service		240
Should be unionized		240
Re: Press in Legislature		241

Re: Address by hon. member for Riverdale	241
Should not be too critically approached	241
Re: Abuse of prisoners by Police	241
In obtaining confessions	241
Re: Address by hon. member for Port Arthur	241
Should be in Cabinet	241
Re: Congratulatory to mover and seconder of Reply	242
Re: Prophecy re Niagara Falls	242
Re: Programme to meet needs of people required	242
Re: Rent Controls	242
Government should have retained	243
Re: Government's role in strikes	243
Re: Picket line at Noranda	243
Re: Asking for special Session	243
Request refused	243
Re: Control by corporations in North	244
Re: Issues in North remain	244
Re: Department of Highways	245
Irregularities in Department	245
Not discovered by officials	245
Present system corrupting people	245
A profiteering, inflationary period	245
Re: Election funds	245
Source of	245
Should be made known	246
Will reveal information re his own	246
Extract from <i>Daily Star</i> , Jan. 12, 1954	246
Re: Political advertising	246
Extract from <i>Maclean's Magazine</i>	247
Extract from <i>Telegram</i> , Aug. 23, 1953	247
Re: Opposition in House	248
Should not be self-righteous	248
Re: Highway Estimates, 1952	248
Passed in six minutes	248
Re: Opposition does not probe enough	248
Re: Committee on Public Accounts	248
All information should be made available	248
Also Ottawa investigation	248
Re: Hydro	248
No vendetta with	248
Thorough study of should be made	249
Re: Committee on Government Commissions	249
Re: "Slush Funds"	249
Suggested Select Committee on Hydro	250
Members should be fully informed	250
Re: Government not facing problems	251
Re: Unemployment	251
Re: Party loyalty	251
Re: Ottawa quotations	251
Re: Extract from Union's Brief at Ottawa	252
Re: Industrial decline	252
Re: Extract from <i>Toronto Star</i> , Feb. 23, 1954	252
Re: Statement by Mr. Drew, Feb. 18, 1954	252
Extract from Ottawa <i>Hansard</i> , Feb. 15, 1954	253
Something must be done	253

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Unemployed employables	253
	Government should give leadership	253
	Temporary assistance should be granted	253
	Should proceed with Public Works	253
Re: St. Lawrence Seaway		261
	Re: Future economic development of Ontario	261
	Re: Refusal of United States to co-operate	261
	Reasons for	261
	Recent change in attitude	261
	Re: Amendment to previous Bill	262
	Re: Should be under Canadian control	262
		266
	Re: Secret understanding—Ottawa-Washington	262
	Re: Unilateral tolls	263
	Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i> , Feb. 23, 1954	263
	Re: Article in <i>Canadian Tribune</i>	263
	Extract—Feb. 22, 1954	264
	Re: Ontario should take positive stand	264
	Re: Extract from statement in monthly statement, Bank of Nova Scotia, October-November, 1953	264
	Re: Original plan for seaway	265
Re: Canadian natural gas pipe line		266
	A vital issue for Ontario	266
	Should be all-Canadian	267
	Re: Consumers' Gas Co. campaign	267
	Was scandalous	267
	Gas line should be public utility	267
	Government action looked encouraging	267
	New "hitch" developed	267
	Should fight for all-Canadian line	267
	Pipe should be manufactured in Ontario	267
Re: Markets—home		268
Re: Markets—new		268
Re: Statement by Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe re employment		268
Re: Ontario Trade Delegation to Europe		268
Re: Market for Cheese		269
Re: Canada at crossroads		269
Re: Facing serious challenge		269
Re: Passing of W. B. Harvey		279
Re: Reading of address by hon. member for Bellwoods		291
Re: Boards of Trade Conference		342
	Was assistance for unemployed requested?	342
Re: Bill No. 68		345
	Re: Reference to Committee on First Reading	345
	Delegation of House responsibilities go non-elected personnel	345
Re: Report re Lake Levels		361
	Errors in precipitation data	361
	Value of report	361
	Constructive recommendations should be implemented	361
	Re: Involvement of high politics	361
	Delay in presenting report	361
	Report contains a lesson to all	361
Re: Importation of natural gas		365
	Should advise the House	366

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 54, Second Reading		379
Interested parties not aware of		379
Should be referred to Labour Committee		379
On Bill No. 58, Second Reading		380
Re: Continuous amendments to		380
Re: Definition of "dependent parent"		380
Re: Last amendment not satisfactory		380
Re: Assumption of responsibility by younger members of families ..		380
Resulted in children leaving homes		380
Restricted incomes of younger people		381
Present amendment not satisfactory		381
On Bill No. 61, Second Reading		382
Re: "Fly-by-night" nursery operators		382
Should be controlled		382
Re: Convening Committee on Public Accounts		387
On Bill No. 78, First Reading		421
Re: Appointment of Committee on Redistribution		421
Must be partisan		421
Should not be proceeded with		421
On Bill No. 67, Second Reading		511
Re: Burial of indigents		512
On Bill No. 76, Second Reading		513
Re: Sale of property		514
Thought legislation covered		514
Vendor received less than anticipated		514
Fictitious "Mrs. Smith"		514
Act requires further amendments		514
Will produce all documents		516
On Bill No. 56, In Committee		521
Re: Further power to Municipal Board		521
Assumption of power		521
Re: Municipal Act		521
Revision of, overdue		521
Re: Passing of Charles G. MacOdrum		529
Showed interest in Labour		529
On Bill No. 79, Second Reading		541
Re: Administration of Provincial Parks		541
House should be acquainted with		541
Department should be specified		541
Re: Establishment of new departments		541
On Bill No. 90, Second Reading		546
Re: Refusal to refer Bill to Committee		546
An evasion of duty and responsibility		546
Seeks an end to practice		546
Minister afraid to face labour		546
Re: Accident-prevention work		546
Commission's representations should be implemented		546
On Bill No. 94, First Reading		557
Re: Authority over Consumers' Gas Company's pipe line		557
Re: Passing of Joseph D. Nault		593
Re: Trade-union work		593
Will be missed by House		593
On Supplementary Estimates		598
No objection to grant to Dental College		598
Re: Yardstick for measuring grants		598

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Grant to Public Service Superannuation fund	598
	Why not also for teachers with small pensions	598
	Re: 65-69 age group	601
On	Bill No. 94, Second Reading	622
	Subject of historic proportions	622
	Unhappy regarding legislation	622
	Is hopelessly inadequate	622
	Government policy hot and cold	622
	Government failed to give leadership	622
	Obtaining cheap type of fuel	622
	All-Canadian pipe line important	622
	Re: Public-ownership administration	623
	Re: Sub-committee of government	623
	Functions of	623
	Visits by	623
	Article, Toronto <i>Star</i> , Jan. 5, 1954	624
	Government considering public ownership	624
	Article, Toronto <i>Star</i> , Jan. 20, 1954	624
	Government Commission should be appointed	625
	Re: Government's complete capitulation	625
	Believes in public ownership	625
	Objects to American ownership	625
	United States domination	625
	Profits limited to 8 per cent.	625
	If publicly-owned, could reduce rate	625
	Re: Consumers' Gas Company	626
	Is a national problem	626
	Government should give leadership	626
	Re: Pressure on government	626
	Another Bill should be substituted	626
	Controls needed	626
	Bill not routine	627
	Present situation differs from Hydro	627
	By passing Bill great opportunity missed	627
	Re: Manufacture of pipe, for	633
On	Bill No. 77, Second Reading	635
	Legislation of advanced character	635
	Guided by interested parties	635
	Re: "Emotionally-neglected children"	635
	Re: Trafficking in babies	635
	Causes of	635
	Reasons for	636
	Amendments required	636
Re:	Committee on Mining	648
	Why no representative of labour	648
	Re: Enlarging Committee	649
	Re: Government missing opportunity	649
On	Estimates, Department of Agriculture	653
	Re: Marketing Branch	653
	Re: Price Spreads	653
	Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i>	653
	Extract from proceedings Ontario Agricultural Council	654
	Re: Peaches in North Bay	654
	Enquiry essential	654

Minister's reply not satisfactory	655
Denies Mr. Murdoch's statement re cause of increasing spread	656
Farmers and labour affected by "Big Interests"	656
Re: Decline in farm income	656
Re: Milk Control Board	659
Funds for not justified	659
Board is a dictator	659
Powers not understood by members	659
Decides days of work	660
Result of	660
Decision arbitrarily made	660
Labour councils opposed	660
Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i>	661
On Bill No. 78, Second Reading	693
Opposed to principle of	693
Shows lack of consistency	693
Not consistent with Ottawa's attitude	693
Re: Riding of Mr. Diefenbaker	693
Gerrymandered by Liberals	693
Re: Riding of St. Andrew	693
Re: Intention of "smart boys"	694
Re: Select Committee re	694
Should be impartial	694
On Bill No. 103, Second Reading	695
Should go to Labour Committee	695
Only place for proper consideration	695
Matters referred to other Committees	696
Inhibitions of Minister of Labour must be broken down	696
Minister shying away from Committee	696
On Bill No. 106, Second Reading	697
Re: Grants for indigent patients	697
How arrived at	697
Minimum costs should be ascertained	697
Full cost should be borne by province	697
On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General	705
Re: Probation	705
Better under Department of Reform Institutions	705
On Item 13	708
Compensation for wrongful imprisonment	708
Re: Article in <i>Saturday Night</i>	708
Re: Case of Ronald Power	708
Re: Address by Mr. Macaulay	709
Re: Statement from Gallery	709
Government should compensate	709
Re: Vote 29, Items 7 and 8	715
Re: Juvenile and Family Courts	715
Re: "Crime Comics"	715
Read by juveniles in Attorney-General's Department	716
Will be sent to proper authority	718
Re: Appointment of Parents-Teachers	718
Re: Toronto Collection agencies	722
Service in most distant courts	722
To increase mileage costs	722
Cases should be tried in nearest court	722
Should be legislation providing	722

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Estimates, Department of Insurance		725
Re: Increase in Blue Cross Rates		725
		728
Re: "Railroading" of Estimates		727
Re: Labour demanding investigation of Blue Cross		730
On Estimates, Department of Education		731
Re: New Ryerson Institute		731
Re: Vote 48		733
Re: Toronto Teachers' College		733
Regrets selection of new site		733
Interested parties not in favour		733
Re: Vote 41, Item 39		734
Re: Summer camps		734
Re: Editorial, Toronto <i>Star</i> , July, 1944		735
Camps promised for north country		735
Re: United States text books		736
On Vote 50		738
Re: Grants		738
Promise re not being kept		738
Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i>		738
Re: "Frills"		738
Should be restored		738
Re: Recreational facilities		738
Should be expanded		739
Including Sundays		739
Re: Cultural Activities		740
As branch of Department of Education		740
Will be adopted in time		740
Grants for required		740
Examples of need		740
No excuse for refusing		741
Interest evinced by Mr. Drew		741
Government should give leadership		741
Will be approved by many people		742
Re: Stratford Shakespearean Festival		742
Re: Conference with professional organizations		742
On Estimates, Department of Health		773
Re: Victorian Order of Nurses		773
Tribute to		773
Grant should be increased		773
Re: Alcoholism Research Foundation		773
Responsibility of Department of Health		773
Effects of large consumption of alcohol		773
Is not a prohibitionist		773
Nor a "teetotaler"		773
Re: Alarming increase in consumption		773
Is primarily a social problem		773
Foundation doing good work		774
Re: Educational campaign		774
Re: Labelling bottles		774
Re: Signs in liquor stores		774
Re: Extended to Schools		774
Re: Examination of expectant mothers		798

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 110, Second Reading		785
Explanation by Minister only		785
Other procedure very wrong		785
Re: Delay in second reading		792
Motion re		793
Not accepted		793
Re: Bill contemptuous of trade-union movement		794
Bill should not be rushed through		794
Should go to Labour Committee		794
Re: Procedure re introduction		794
Labour denied opportunity for presentations		794
Statement by Mr. Diefenbaker in House of Commons		795
Re: Bill re dairy industry		795
Was held on request		795
Bill not explained		796
"Hallelujah" to Minister		796
On Estimates, Department of Health (continued)		798
Re: Training facilities for Nurses		800
Should be extended		800
Re: Psychiatric services		801
Re: Beds for mental health patients		802
Re: Annual requirements		802
Re: Recommendation in Ontario Health Survey report		802
Re: Increase in, not adequate		802
Re: Shortage of psychiatrists		803
Improvement in situation		803
Re: Care of mentally-ill children		804
Re: Orillia Tragedy		804
Re: Trained personnel not available		804
Re: Difficulties of staff—known		804
Re: Extract—Toronto <i>Telegram</i> , Feb. 10, 1954		804
Re: Methods of punishment		804
Not satisfactory		804
On Estimates, Department of Highways		828
Re: Irregularities in Highways Department		828
Re: No question of Minister's honesty		828
Re: Obligation of members		828
Re: Parliament is supreme		828
Re: Every detail should not be discussed		828
Re: Minister should have spoken earlier		828
Re: Must not over-shadow other issues		829
Re: Low tenders		829
Recompense for		829
Re: Firms refusing to tender		829
Re: Suspension of Chief Engineer		829
On Bill No. 55, In Committee		839
Re: Statements on Tax Bills		839
Re: Portion received from Federal Government		840
On Estimates, Provincial Auditor		850
Complimentary to Provincial Auditor		850
Re: Enlargement of staff		850
Should audit all provincial activities		850
Should have over-all responsibility		850
Would provide better administration		851

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Estimates, Department of Labour		856
Re: Correspondence—Department and Dominion Glass		856
Reason for request		856
Experience with other correspondence		856
Re: Workmen's Compensation Board		856
Customary to mention in Estimates		856
Proud of Board		856
But need for improvement		856
Re: Increased compensation		856
Re: Compensation for injuries in past		857
Should be increased		857
Re: Industrial accident-prevention work		857
Dealt with by Royal Commission		857
Workers not represented in set-up		857
Extract from Report of Royal Commission		858
Re: Government's refusal to implement		858
Re: Fatal accident at Massey-Harris		858
Responsibility not Minister's alone		859
Re: Lack of awareness of risks		858
Re: Government's slow progress		858
Re: Government's policy not the best		860
Re: Recommendations of Royal Commission		
should be followed		860
Extract from brief, by Ontario Federation of Labour		861
Re: Apprenticeship training		863
Re: Payment of Unemployment Insurance to		
young unskilled labour		863
Trade training while unemployed		863
Re: Inadequacy of Inspection Branch		864
Should increase expenditures for		864
Re: Fair Employment Properties' Act		866
Law cannot be enforced		866
Even if government desired		866
Re: Extract from <i>Toronto Star</i> , May 7, 1954		866
Discrimination of women still exists		866
Re: Practices in other provinces		867
Re: Toronto incident		867
On Report, Select Committee re Indian Population		893
Was report presented to responsible Indian bodies?		893
On Bill No. 58, In Committee		895
Re: Indiscriminate use of Act		896
Re: Original Act used harmfully		896
On Bill No. 68, In Committee		897
Re: Bill very confusing		897
As are Board's names		897
Re: Re-arrangement of authority		897
Re: Bill should be clarified		897
Re: Explanation required		897
Re: Regrets power of Milk Board		897
Should not over-ride wishes of working men		898
On Bill No. 76, In Committee		898
Re: "Phantom Mrs. Smith"		898
Re: Material now available		898
On Bill No. 87, In Committee		901
Re: Amount required for adequate pension		901

On Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests	918
Re: Different policy required	918
Re: Report of Royal Commission	918
Re: Many misdeeds	918
Some wilful, others not	918
Re: Granting of areas by Liberal Government	918
Without tender or competition	918
Re: Establishment of impartial commission	919
Re: Promises when in Opposition	919
Should be kept when in power	919
Forgetting things we want to forget	920
Point 7 of 22 points	920
Re: Pressure on government	920
Re: Complete implementation of Commission's recommendations	920
Re: Forest Management by series of Commissions	920
Re: Ontario "sold out by robber barons"	921
Statement of man who knew situation	921
Re: Fish Hatcheries	922
Re: Fishing in lower Muskoka	922
Should be improvement in	922
Re: Landing aircraft in northwest	922
Is legislation sufficient	929
Re: Administration of provincial parks	930
On Bill No. 91, In Committee	931
Accurate estimates of surplusses	931
Re: Infringement on jurisdiction of Provincial Auditor	932
On Bill No. 51, In Committee	936
On Section 88	936
On Bill No. 92, In Committee	937
Re: Director of Mental Health	937
Act does not specify qualifications	937
First section should be amended	937
Re: "Psychiatrist" should be clearly defined	938
On Estimates, Department of Mines	947
Re: Mining Policy	947
Re: New Mining Developments	947
Re: Mining a heritage to the people	947
Re: Export of ores	947
Re: Statement by Mr. Lyle	948
Re: Inland Steel Company	948
Re: Granting of exclusive rights	949
Re: Extract from <i>Telegram</i> , March 14, 1953	949
Re: Conservative statements in Ottawa	949
Ontario should follow Ottawa lead	949
Statement by Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe	949
Not advocating high protection	950
Re: Export of nickel ore	950
Re: Amendment to Mining Act, 1917	950
Sections 1, 2 and 3	950
Re: Suspension of Act	950
Reason therefor	950
Re: Mining roads	950
	956
Re: Estimates for Office Natural Gas Commissioner	952
Re: Administration of Fuel Board	952
Re: Claims re fumes—Sudbury	953

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Financing of access mining roads	956
	Not by Department of Mines	956
	Re: Opening of subway—Toronto	969
	Statement of Prime Minister desired	969
On	Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs	970
	Re: Toronto partial-exemption policy	970
	Not approved by Minister	970
	A threat to poorer sections	970
	Re: Bill 80—1953	970
	Re: Extract from <i>Hansard</i> , 1953	970
	Re: Extract from <i>Toronto Star</i> , July 9th	971
	Re: Contradiction in Minister's statements	971
	Re: Statement by hon. Mr. Frost	971
	Not quoted verbatim	971
	Re: Matter important in future	971
	Re: Method of handling aroused indignation	972
	Re: Fee for registering births	973
	Should be abolished	973
	Re: Metropolitan Assessment Scheme	975
	A big "Schemozzle"	975
	Re: Prime object, equalization of assessment	976
	Same yardstick not used	976
On	Bill No. 19, In Committee	980
	Re: Evasion of income tax	980
On	Bill No. 108, In Committee	983
	Re: Discontinuance of payments	983
On	Bill No. 111, In Committee	983
	Exception to Section 1, subsection 3	983
	Re: Amendment to	983
	Should be deleted	983
	Re: Fees for entering parks	983
	Should not be policy	983
	Parks should be open to all	983
	Re: Section 2	984
On	Bill No. 110, In Committee	996
	Bill should not now be considered	996
	No opportunity to consider	996
	Re: Memo from Ontario Federation of Labour	996
	Re: Denial of hearing labour organization	997
	Re: Section 1, subsection 2	998
	Re: Trade Union Councils	998
	Re: Penalties against Unions	998
	Re: Denial of certain rights	998
	Re: Violations by unit of council	998
	Would affect entire council	998
	Re: Collective bargaining agency clearly defined	998
	Re: Section 2	999
	Extract from	999
	Re: Section 6	1001
	The "Heart" of the Bill	1001
	Is adequate	1001
	Re: Conciliation processes	1001
	Reduction in time limit	1001
	Press announcements of important changes	1002

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Reasons for delay	1002
	Re: O.F.L. Bulletin	1002
	Extracts from	1002
	Re: No basic solution offered	1002
	Re: Methods of "stepping up" negotiation processes	1002
	Re: Refusal to grant Conciliation Board	1002
Re:	Section 18, amendment to Section 59	1006
	Re: Employers provoking strikes	1006
	Re: Extract from Section 18	1006
	Re: Not impossible to antagonize workers	1006
Re:	Section 24, subsection 2	1007
	Re: Decertification	1007
	Re: Proof of membership	1007
	Increasing tendency to decertify unions	1007
	Criticism of Labour Board	1007
	Engineered by anti-union employers	1008
	Causing increasing concern	1008
	Amendment should be referred to Unions	1008
Re:	Plaque to Robert Baldwin	1023
	House unanimous in honouring	1023
	Re: Toronto resident of	1023
	Re: "Little Rebel"	1023
	Was fearless in thoughts and actions	1023
	Re: Union of National Groups	1023
	Re: Canada a bilingual state	1024
On	Estimates, Department of Planning and Development	1037
	Re: Housing shortage	1037
	As serious as ever	1037
	Re: Government's failure to recognize crisis	1037
	Is simply "doodling"	1037
	Re: Toronto's housing crisis worse than ever	1037
	Re: On verge of tragedy in family life	1037
	Re: Statement by Miss Florence Philpot	1037
	Not just "sounding off"	1037
	Re: Loss of life by fire	1037
	Incidents of	1038
	Re: Not enough being done by governments	1038
	Re: People who need houses cannot afford to buy	1038
	Low interest rates required	1039
	Unions requesting subsidies	1039
	Re: Land Assembly field	1039
	Too far from Toronto	1039
	Re: Report of Housing Authority prior to first War	1040
	Re: Statement by Mr. Hanna, 1913	1040
	Re: Land Assembly has some merit	1041
	Handed to private builders	1041
	Profiteering in houses	1041
	Large-scale efforts required	1041
	Re: Power of expropriation	1044
	Should be used re land speculators	1044
	Re: Trade and Industry Branch	1045
	Should expand	1045
	Should change objectives	1045
	Re: Opening markets for Canadian industries	1045
	Re: Should create markets abroad	1045

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Effects of economic recession	1045
	Re: Branches of foreign industry locating in Ontario	1046
	Re: Prefer British factories to American	1046
	Re: Emphasis should be on movement of Ontario products	1046
On	Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary	1051
	Re: Art Committee	1051
	Previous activities of	1051
	Number of paintings purchased in 1953	1051
	Re: Queen's Printer	1051
	Production of reports	1051
	Not satisfactory	1051
	Effects of lack of records	1051
	Re: Printing by few selected shops	1052
	Re: Reason for delays required	1052
	Re: Civil Defense	1054
	No defense against atomic attack	1054
	No defense against hydrogen bomb	1054
	Re: Need for emphasis on peaceful understandings	1054
	Re: Civil Service Commission	1055
On	Bill No. 52, Second Reading	1058
	Government resistance not understood	1058
	Checks-off favoured by workers	1058
	Changes in Economy	1059
	Formerly dues paid direct to Unions	1059
	Physically impossible to collect dues	1059
	Re: Rand formula	1059
	Re: Closed union shops	1060
	Re: Provincial security legislation	1060
	Re: National Labour Relations Statute	1060
	Re: Check-off in Provincial Government	1060
On	Bill No. 94, In Committee	1063
	Re: Section 14	1063
	Re: Establishment of Committee	1063
	Not as anticipated	1063
	Should have power to operate	1063
On	Bill No. 96, In Committee	1067
	Re: Municipalities should determine location of pipe line	1067
On	Bill No. 139, Second Reading	1080
	Re: Legislation welcomed with mixed feelings	1080
	Prefers not be necessary	1080
	Efforts made since 1943	1080
	Legislation since	1080
	Re: Incident in Town of Dresden	1081
	Re: Condition of Licencing	1081
	Shall be no discrimination	1081
	Re: Incident re negroes in town near Dresden	1081
	Re: Application for insurance policy	1081
	Required religion to be stated	1081
	Re: Folder by American Tourist	1081
	Camp operator	1081
	"Gentiles only"	1081
	Re: Discrimination against job seekers	1081
	Re: Period of economic recession	1082
	Re: Demagogic racial agitation	1082
	By pro-Fascist groups	1082

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Act more satisfactory than 1944 Act	1082
	Penalty clauses	1082
	Re: Appointment of Commission	1082
	Re: Anti-discriminatory legislation in United States	1082
	Educational programme desired	1083
	Re: Trouble at Dresden	1086
	Denies being cause of	1086
	Purpose of visiting	1086
	Addressed no meetings	1086
	LPP no organization in Dresden	1086
On Report, Select Committee on Indian Affairs		1089
	A forward step	1089
	A measure of atonement for past sins	1089
	Re: Outstanding Indian leaders	1089
	Re: Pauline Johnson	1089
	Poems by	1089
	Extracts from	1089
	Indians still feel former wrongs	1089
	Report should not be completion of task	1089
	Should have full equal rights	1090
On Estimates, Department of Provincial Treasurer		1117
	Re: Amount required to pay United States loans	1117
	Going too heavily into American market	1118
	Ottawa loans in Canada	1118
	Ontario should follow lead	1118
	Re: Money not borrowed at lowest rate	1119
	Re: Sale of provincial bonds	1119
	At 4½ per cent.	1119
	An Excellent Return	1119
On Vote No. 140, "Theatre Branch"		1122
Re: Censor Board		1122
	Not happy about censorship	1122
	Re: Difficulties with	1122
	Re: British pictures preferred	1122
	Re: Salaries of Board should be increased	1123
	Re: Advisory Committee to Board	1123
	Re: Grading of pictures	1123
	Conflicting opinions re	1123
	Re: "The Sinner"—A German picture	1123
	By Hitler's chief movie producer	1123
Re: Housing mortgages		1127
	Change of policy	1127
On Estimates, Department of Public Welfare		1135
	Re: Marian Hill Charitable Institution	1135
	Re: Mothers' Allowances	1138
	Has caused hardship in some cases	1138
	Mothers working over 50 per cent. of time not eligible	1138
	Agrees with policy	1138
	Flexibility in application needed	1138
On Vote No. 146		1139
	Re: Old-Age Assistance	1139
	Government's responsibility	1139
	Scale should be increased	1139
	To prevent starvation	1139
	Has mentioned subject before	1139
	Estimate for, decreasing	1139

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	No excuse for not supplementing	1139
	Situation in Toronto	1140
	Extract from <i>Telegram</i> , March 26, 1954	1140
	Situation different in rural areas	1140
	Toronto should not wait for Federal Government	1141
	Supplementary grants in effect in other provinces	1141
	Disagrees with Hon. Paul Martin	1141
	Recent experience in Toronto	1141
	Change of policy necessary	1142
	Debate with Attorney-General desired	1142
	Re: Statement by Toronto Welfare Commissioner	1143
On Bill No. 77, In Committee		1148
Re: Financing unmarried mothers		1148
Stop "black marketing" in babies		1148
Re: Recommendation of Canadian Welfare Council		1149
Extract from		1149
On Bill No. 112, In Committee		1159
Re: Section 11		1159
Re: Revocation of or refusal to grant licences		1159
Re: Reason should be made known		1159
Re: Commission not obliged to give reasons		1159
Information may be inaccurate		1159
Citizens unfairly dealt with		1159
Re: Need for carefully scrutinizing all applications		1159
Amendment to Section 11, subsection 1		1159
Re: Repeal of Section 263, subsection 4, The Municipal Act		1159
Re: Newspaper editorials on		1160
Cannot understand why reasons refused		1161
Commission acting on information from various sources		1161
Channeled by police		1161
Amendment negatived		1161
On Bill No. 109, In Committee		1163
On Section 6		1163
Re: Assistance to tobacco growers in Delhi area		1163
On Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions		1168
Children 7 years of age in Training Schools		1168
Departmental report		1168
Re: Table of ages		1168
Re: Advisory Board of Training Schools		1168
Presentation to Committee on Commissions		1168
Establishment of more recreational centres		1168
Re: Is Advisory Board necessary		1168
Cannot have knowledge of each individual case		1168
Should find other means re young children		1168
Present method solves nothing		1168
Re: Providing specialized institutions		1169
Re: Approved foster homes		1169
List of private homes should be available		1170
Re: Children "hitting back" at society		1170
Re: Should be segregated		1170
Re: Parole Board		1171
Present status of		1171
Re: Board disorganized		1171

Re: Resignation of Chairman	1171
Irritation developed in Committee	1172
No public announcement re	1172
Re: Inmates should be usefully employed	1174
Re: Mimico brickyard	1174
Re: No "chain-gang" methods	1174
Re: Mercer Reformatory	1175
Should be dismantled	1175
Statement by former Minister	1175
Re: No facilities for segregation	1176
Re: Girls' Training Schools	1176
Was Committee's report re Galt truthful	1176
Re: Statement in press, re	1176
Statements denied	1176
Re: Clarification needed	1176
Extract of statement, <i>Globe and Mail</i>	1177
Re: If statement true, policy of Department seriously questioned ..	1177
Girls should be properly clothed	1178
Re: Implied criticism	1178
Re: Over-spending admitted	1178
On Report, Select Committee on Reform Institutions	1179
Congratulatory to Chairman and members	1179
Requested investigation for number of years	1179
Re: Impatience at repetitions	1179
Re: Efforts to obtain	1179
Re: Press statements attacked	1180
Re: Committee's conclusions justify efforts	1180
Re: Should not reject future proposals so quickly	1180
Re: Accustomed to rejections	1180
Re: Some ideas of Committee far-fetched, outlandish, and undemocratic	1180
Were very disturbing	1180
Re: Woodsheds	1180
A shocking statement	1180
Re: Disagrees that failure to use corporal punishment caused Guelph riots	1181
Re: Committee's report on drug addicts	1181
Should be implemented	1181
Implementation increased	1181
Re: Requiring special legislation	1181
Re: Committee was worthwhile	1181
Re: Pre-sentence reports	1182
By panel of experts	1182
Re: Extension of probation	1182
Re: Implementation of report	1182
Will improve situation	1182
On Bill No. 136, In Committee	1192
Re: Appointment of Returning Officers	1193
No difficulty in St. Andrew	1193
Should be impartial	1193
Appointment of Ministers suggested	1193
Re: Experience in St. George's riding	1193
Re: Should provide honest elections	1193
Re: Section 23	1195
Totally inadequate	1195

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Reporting monies collected	1195
	Re: Contributions exceeding \$50	1195
	Campaign funds not reported by old-line parties	1195
	No annual financial report	1195
	Re: Article in <i>Macleans</i> Magazine	1195
	Re: Cannot be eliminated entirely	1195
	Because of "privileged interests"	1195
	Re: Will make known sources for LPP candidates	1195
	Composed of small individual amounts	1195
	Workers receive no compensation	1196
	If sources not disclosed, old-line Parties misleading banks and large corporations	1196
	Re: Advertising space for old-line Parties	1196
	Not reported	1197
	Re: Radio time	1197
On Bill No. 142, In Committee		1201
	Are annual loans necessary?	1201
On Bill No. 139, In Committee		1202
	Re: Amendment to amendment negatived	1202
	Re: Appointment of anti-discrimination Commission	1202
	Will strengthen Bill	1202
	Re: Commissions in a number of States	1202
On Report, Select Committee re Allowances to members of Select Committees		1204
	Re: Does not approve report	1204
	Re: Remuneration should be higher	1204
	Not morally justified at this time	1204
	Until old-age pensions increased	1204
	Only by way of comparison	1204
	Will vote against the Bill	1204
On Bill No. 129, In Committee		1206
	Re: Amendments	1206
	Objected to	1206
	Not morally justified	1206
On the Budget		1207
	A backward glance at Session	1207
	An unusual amendment	1207
	An indication of changes	1207
	An important contribution to public thinking	1208
	Re: Liberal leadership	1208
	Re: Check-off	1208
	Re: Highway issues	1208
	Should not overshadow critical social and economic problems	1208
	Re: Frustration amongst government supporters	1208
	Due to large numbers	1208
	Failure to face certain issues	1208
	Re: Appointment to Cabinet	1208
	Re: Need for re-organization	1208
	Re: Election in 1954	1208
	Re: Will be no by-elections	1209
	Government afraid	1209
	Re: Announcement of election by Mr. Drew	1209
	Re: Government's inability to accept criticism	1209
	Re: No need to show impatience	1209

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Reference to funds for cultural activities		1209
Re: Reference to "Crime Comics"		1209
Re: Committee on Commissions		1209
		1213
Re: Opposition met with resistance and hostility		1210
Re: Roving Committee on Commissions preferable		1210
Re: Enquiries re Hydro		1210
Two hours allotted for report		1210
Re: Reconversion programme		1210
Re: Canadian Comstock Co. Ltd.		1211
Explanations not satisfactory		1211
Re: Inability of insurance companies to secure business		1212
Re: Ontario Northland Railway		1212
Not audited by provincial auditor		1212
Auditing of		1213
By private concern		1213
Reports not available to members		1213
Re: Questioning in Committee not completed		1213
Re: Committee should present report		1213
Not critical of Chairman		1214
Committee an improvement		1215
Re: The Budget		1215
Shows absence of independent thinking		1215
Shows failure to give leadership		1215
Re: Government trailing behind Ottawa		1215
Re: Bold action required		1215
Re: Does not advocate reduction in taxation		1215
Re: Use of surplus to meet basic needs		1215
Re: Unemployment		1215
Government should act independently		1216
Re: Statement by Judith Robinson		1216
Re: Purpose of remarks		1216
Re: Not to revive Conservative Party		1216
To inspire Ministers to act independently		1216
Unemployment—a crisis		1216
No sign of creating employment		1216
No funds to relieve the hungry		1216
No effort to open markets		1216
No leadership in Seaway		1216
No leadership re pipe line		1216
Re: Not necessary to declare war on Ottawa		1217
Re: Emergency Dominion-Provincial Conference		1217
Re: Necessary action to take		1217
Calling of National Conference		1217
Increased assistance to old-age pensioners		1217
Complete medical, dental and hospital care, for		1217
Increased Mothers' Allowances		1217
Development of Housing project		1217
No less than 50 per cent. of cost of education		
be paid to municipalities		1217
Relieve municipalities of all costs of unemployment relief,		
hospitals costs for indigents, and post-sanitoria		
care of tubercular		1218
Elimination of amusement tax		1218
Tax all nickel production		1218

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: International Nickel Co.	1218
	Dividends paid by	1218
	Re: Increased tax on iron ore for export	1218
	Re: Open markets for agricultural and industrial products ..	1218
	Re: Establishment of Forestry Commission	1218
	Re: Quotation closing Premier's Budget Address	1218
	Should be given reality	1218
	Government failing in elementary obligations	1218
On Estimates, Department of Public Works		1236
	Vote 151, Item 4, "Insurance"	1236
	Variations in expenditures	1236
	Re: Insurance, other departments	1236
	Re: Maintenance Staff	1236
	Greater portion for temporary and casuals	1236
	Not good policy	1237
On "Miscellaneous"		1237
	Re: Records of Works of Art	1237
	Re: Large-scale construction	1238
	By Department or by contract	1238
Re: Education of people to beauties of Ontario		1244
	Re: Missing many opportunities	1244
	Aspect neglected	1244
	Re: Prevalence of rag-weed	1245
	Re: Areas of relief	1245
	Re: Department should advertise areas of relief	1245
Re: Hours of "guest days" in motels and hotels		1247
	Many hours unreasonable	1247
	Suggested amendment to Tavern and Hotel Keepers Act	1247
	Matter could be on agenda of Hotel Keepers' Conference	1247
Re: Chief Engineer		1251
	Return of	1251
Re: Book <i>Alice in Wonderland</i>		1255
	Donor unknown	1255
	Typewritten page inserted	1255
	"Confusion Worse Confounded"	1255
	Profound Study of Present Session of Legislature	1255
	Extract from	1256
	A valuable gift	1256
	Appreciation to donor	1256
Re: Calling a special Session of Legislature		1275

SANDERCOCK, W. E. (PC Hastings West) :

On the Budget	1264
Congratulatory to Prime Minister	1264
Budget acceptable in Riding	1264
Re: Increased assistance to Hospitals	1264
Re: Proud of Riding	1264
Re: By-pass around Belleville	1265
Hopes soon completed	1265
Road—Belleville to Trenton	1265
Airfield between	1265
Re: Type of road construction	1265

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Accidents on highways	1265
	Increased danger at night	1265
	Re: Accidents at Railway Crossings	1265
	Re: Protection with luminous paint	1265
	Re: Belleville a railroad town	1265
	Re: Motor vehicles crossing tracks	1265
	Re: Efficiency of railway men	1265
Re: School construction programme		1265
Re: Students desiring to teach		1266
Re: Department of Welfare		1266
	Tribute to Minister	1266
	Encouraging people to help themselves	1266
	Co-operation with Service Clubs	1266
Re: Bethlehem Steel Corporation		1266
	Re: Size of operations	1266
	Re: Potential shipments	1266
	Re: Pre-production expenditures	1266
Re: Uranium discoveries near Bancroft		1266
Re: Tribute to Leader of Opposition		1266
Re: Member for St. Andrew		1266
	Complaints re hay fever	1266
Re: Congratulatory to Mr. Speaker		1267

STEWART, W. J. (PC Parkdale):

Re: Report, Select Committee on Reform Institutions	387
Appreciation of confidence in Committee	388
Appreciation to Committee personnel	388
Each member assigned a definite responsibility	388
Farm administration—Mr. Oliver	388
Dairying, etc.—Mr. Manley	388
Lumbering—Mr. Dempsey	388
Discipline and segregation—Mr. Grummett	388
Commitments and sentences—Mr. Nickle	388
Medical and dental services—Mr. Leavine	388
Spiritual matter, etc.—Mr. Downer	388
Custodial care, etc.—Mr. Johnston (Parry Sound)	388
Quarries, etc.—Mr. Pryde	388
Education, etc.—Mr. Morrow	388
Appreciation to hon. Minister	388
Appreciation to Deputy Minister	388
Appreciation to Attorney-General and Staff	388
Committee's work unrestricted	388
All meetings—public and open	389
Thanks to colleagues	389
For long hours of effort	389
No partisanship at any time	389
Appreciation to Secretary and Reporter	389
Appreciation to voluntary organizations	389
John Howard Society	389
Elizabeth Fry organization	389
Canadian Council of Churches	389
Salvation Army	389
Roman Catholic organizations	389
Appreciation to officials of American institutions	389

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Work of Committee	389
	Visits made by	389
	Interviews with inmates	390
	Re: Youthful inmates	390
	Re: Interview with Chief Justice McRuer	390
	Re: Activity of womens' organizations	390
	Re: Cost of investigation	390
	Infinitesimal compared to cost of one riot	390
	Holding of 153 meetings	390
	Examination of over 400 witnesses	390
	No personal criticism of Ministers, present or past	390
	Report on analysis of Department	390
	Recommendations in	390
	Effort at honest, unbiased investigation	390
	Commendation of certain institutions	391
	Past a heritage; future our responsibility	391
	No evidence of political domination	391
	Treatment of prisoners	391
	2 schools of thought	391
	Neither correct in extreme	391
	Reasonable measures desired	391
	Administered with common sense	391
	Measured by experience	391
	Re: County Jails	391
	Re: District Jails	391
	Re: Industrial Farms	391
	Should be increased in number	391
	Re: Burwash as "Provincial Prison"	391
	Re: "Hard Labour"	391
	Is non-existent	391
	Re: Care of inmates	392
	Ontario surpasses all other institutions	392
	Greater educational opportunities	392
	Re: Juvenile delinquency	392
	All causes thoroughly examined	392
	Youth a good time for reformation	392
	Campaign to increase parents' responsibility	392
	Housing shortage a contributing factor	392
	Re: Recommendations	393
	Highlights of	393
	Re: Division of responsibility	393
	Not revised since 1859	393
	Statements re inmates, March 31, 1953	393
	Re: Definite sentences	393
	Extract from Archambault Report—1938	393
	Re: Brief to hon. Minister of Justice	393
	Re: Divided authority in Ontario	393
	Re: Rights of Parole Board	393
	Control only of indefinite sentences	393
	Should have control over all inmates	393
	Inmates serving more than 2 year aggregate should not be provincial responsibility	393
	Re: Longer indefinite sentences	394
	Re: Co-operation from organized labour	394
	Re: Definition of "mental illness" should be clarified	394

Re: Time off for good behaviour	394
Re: Expunging of records	394
Re: Central place of execution	394
Location should be left to province	394
Should be in existing institution	395
Re: Variety of uses for jails	395
Re: Riotous conduct should be an offence	395
Re: Drug peddlers	395
Re: Change of name of Brampton Institution	395
Re: Salaries	395
Factor in guard turn-over	395
More attractive salaries required	395
Recognition of valorous conduct	395
Re: Burwash Institutions	395
Housing in—a problem	395
Housing in Guelph also a problem	395
Government should not go into housing programme	395
Acquisition of land adjacent to institution	395
By Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	395
Re: Extension of reforestation at Burwash	396
Re: Acquisition of additional farm lands	396
Custodial Institutions should be modernized	396
Safety appliances	396
Gang locks	396
Re: Chaplaincy service	396
Re: Light industries at Burtch	396
Re: "Hostel inmates" at Mimico	396
Re: Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic	396
Should be enlarged	396
Should be available to both male and female inmates	396
Re: Sale of Mercer Reformatory	396
New institution should be of cottage type	396
Re: Training School for Boys—Cobourg	396
Should be disposed of	396
New school at Bowmanville required	396
School for incorrigibles required	396
Re: Multiplicity of controls	396
Not conducive to proper management	396
Re: Many jails antiquated	397
Should be operated by government	397
A number could be closed	397
Re: Better facilities for visitors required	397
Facilities at Don very poor	397
Re: More thorough examination of incoming inmates	397
Re: Mental cases	397
Should not be remanded to jails	397
Re: Beds in detention wards of general hospitals	397
Federal and provincial grants for	397
Re: Segregation	397
Facilities for very inadequate	397
Special care re sex deviates	397
Dormitories not feasible	397
Re: Idleness in jails	397
Facilities for hard labour should be explored	398
Re: Spiritual guidance	398
Requires more emphasis	398

INDICES—*Continued*

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Physical examinations at time of arrest	398
	Re: Security	398
	Facilities for safe admission of prisoners required	398
	Re: Extension of facilities for treatment of alcoholics	398
	Re: Research into sex-deviate problems	398
	Re: Probation	398
	Re: Establishment of Commission of correction	398
	Re: Establishment of Reception and Diagnostic Centre	398
	Re: Provision for appeal from decisions of Parole Board	398
	Re: Pre-sentence reports	399
	Re: Cost of incarceration as compared to Probation	399
	Re: After-Care services	399
	Re: Increasing efforts of Rehabilitation officers	399
	Re: Continuation of acceptance of co-operation by volunteer organizations	399
	Re: Transporting released inmates to homes, in North country	399
	Re: "Tightening up" of Institutions	400
	Re: Establishment of adolescent courts	400
	Re: Only two alternatives	400
	Build more institutions, or	400
	Reduce inmate population	400
	Re: Awakening of people to greater responsibility	400
	Re: Recidivists	400
	Re: Cost of custodial institutions	400
	Re: Costs of Training Schools	400
	Re: Variation in jail costs	401
	Re: Tables appended to report	401
	Re: Human values cannot be measured in dollars	401
	Re: Work provided in only one jail	401
	Re: Jail Farm—Langstaff	401
	Should be returned to Toronto	401
	Re: No surpassing Ontario in humane treatment and kindness, good food and opportunity	401
	Re: All prisoners still treated as persons	401
On	Estimates, Department of Health	767
	Re: Incidence of heart disease	767
On	Estimates, Department of Planning and Development	1040
	Re: Remarks, member for St. Andrew	1040
	Nothing but condemnation	1040
	What better place than Ontario	1040
	No gas chamber in Ontario	1040
On	Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions	1172
	Re: Parole Board	1172
	Re: Resignation of Chairman	1172
	Re: New appointment delayed	1172
	No criticism by Committee of industries in reformatories	1174
	Idleness complained of, confined to jails	1174
	Work should be provided wherever possible	1174
	Re: Production of Food	1174
	For institutional consumption	1174
	Re: Idleness in Industrial Farms	1174
	Light industry should be provided	1174
	Situation should be dealt with	1174
	Re: Female institution similar to Brampton for males	1175

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Visit to Mercer enlightening		1175
Re: Conditions in Mercer		1175
Re: Girls' Training Schools		1176
Girls' School at Galt		1177
No judgment on newspaper articles		1177
Figures furnished by Department		1177
Re: Department's co-operation		1177
Re: Figures re cost of clothing		1177
Re: Reading statements out of context		1178
Re: Extract from Report, page 73 et seq.		1178

THOMAS, T. D. (CCF Ontario):

On Report of Select Committee on Election Act	140
Re: \$200 deposit	140
Re: Advanced polls	140
Re: Should be no election first two weeks of August	140
Re: St. David's Day	276
St. David a native of Wales	276
On Report of Select Committee re Cemeteries	314
Congratulatory to Chairman	315
Congratulatory to Health officials	315
Re: Advisory Board	315
Re: Division under-staffed	315
Re: Cemeteries in Ontario riding	315
Re: Statement by Toronto Burial Trust Company	315
Re: Municipal cemeteries	315
Re: Report on Lake Levels	358
Congratulatory to Chairman	358
Levels decreased since Committee appointed	358
Re: Erosion	358
Effect on Chicago sidewalk	358
Re: Tribute to General McNaughton	358
On Speech from the Throne	456
Regrets at passing of W. B. Harvey	456
Congratulatory to Messrs. Jolley and Noden	456
Shortest speech on record	456
No mention of Housing	456
Three important things in life	456
School	456
Church	456
Home	456
Education not beneficial in poor home conditions	456
Re: Statement by J. A. Edmison	456
Congratulatory to Chairman, Reform Institution Dept.	456
Re: Housing	456
Lack of	456
Crowded conditions of	456
High rentals for	457
Surface of relief not scratched	457
Shortage of	457
Statement by Mr. Hees, M.P.	457
Re: Unemployment	457
Increase in	457
Suggestion for reducing	457
Statement by Prime Minister	458
Effect on—by Korean War	458

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Hospitalization	458
	Re: Increased Blue Cross rates	458
	Re: National plan for	458
	CCF receiving support	458
	Re: Article in "Hospital Highlights"	458
	By A. J. Swanson	458
	Original plan would have temporary deficits	458
	Government intention re-desired	459
	Re: Supplementary Pensions	459
	Indirectly a cost-of-living bonus	459
	Re: Joint payments	459
	Municipalities should not be burdened	459
	Example of pension refusal	459
	Re: Local Improvement—District of Ajax	459
	Re: Opening of hospital in	459
	Re: Good administration by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	459
	Industries in	460
	Re: Application by Pickering Co-operative	460
	Re: Operation Producer Dairy at Ajax	460
	Re: Was well supported	460
	Re: Application refused	460
	Re: Amendment to amendment	460
	Amendment to amendment negatived	485
	Re: Article in <i>Globe and Mail</i>	489
	Statement in	489
	Was incorrect	489
	<i>Hansard</i> report accurate	490
	On Bill No. 56, In Committee	522
	Re: Subsection No. 7	522
	Re: Improvement District of Ajax	522
	Chairman will be absent	522
	Vice-Chairman cannot sit	522
	No representation on County Council	522
	On Estimates, Department of Agriculture	658
	Re: Increase in placements	658
	On Estimates, Department of Attorney-General	712
	Vote 29, On Item 10—Department of Attorney-General	712
	Re: Decrease in maintenance	712
	On Estimates, Department of Education	734
	Re: Vote 41	734
	Re: "Guidance"	734
	Re: Article—Oshawa <i>Times Gazette</i>	736
	Re: Meeting of Board of Education	736
	Re: "Canadian Trades Alphabet"	736
	Extracts from	736
	On Estimates, Department of Highways	834
	Method of granting subsidies	834
	Re: Service road in Oshawa	835
	On Estimates, Department of Labour	861
	Re: Workmen's Compensation rates	861
	As fixed at lesser percentage	861
	Incident in Ontario constituency	861

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Approximate corrections of Estimates	862
	Re: Youths working after 11 p.m.	868
On Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs		977
	Re: Provincial-Municipal Committee	977
On Estimates, Department of Planning and Development		1044
	Re: Canada House, London	1044
	Re: Major Armstrong	1044
	Salary and allowances of	1044
On Estimates, Department of Provincial-Secretary		1050
	Re: Page boys in Assembly	1050
	Re: Continuing education	1050
	Re: Engagement of teacher	1050
	Re: Standardization of hose couplings	1053
	Re: Federal assistance for	1053
On Bill No. 52, Second Reading		1055
	Re: Amendment to	1055
	Re: Voluntary revocable check-off	1055
	Re: Check-offs for other purposes	1055
	Why not for Union dues	1055
	Re: Labour requesting equal privileges	1056
On Estimates, Department of Public Welfare		1136
	Expression of thanks to Minister and Staff	1136
	Re: Burials of indigent immigrants	1136
	Fee for	1136
	Re: Incident in Ontario riding	1137
	Re: Lady recently widowed	1137
	Position of Department re	1137
	Re: Disabled persons' pensions	1144
	Number now receiving	1144
	Increase over last year	1144
On Bill No. 128, In Committee		1162
	Re: Percentage for perpetual care	1163
On Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions		1171
	Re: Grant to John Howard Society	1171
On Estimates Department of Travel and Publicity		1244
	Re: Northern Great Lakes Area Council	1244
	Re: Premises, 21 Lombard Street	1248
	Has it been vacated?	1248

VILLENEUVE, O. F. (PC Glengarry):

Re: Report, Select Committee on Lake Levels	345
A detailed and comprehensive study	345
Commendatory to Dr. Langford	345
Committee unanimous	345
Commendatory to Secretary	345
Terms of Reference	346
Lack of fundamental information re erosion	346
Studies guided by cardinal principles of research management	346
Re: Shipping through Soo canals	346
Re: Hydro development	347
Re: Municipalities bordering Great Lakes	347
Percentage using waters for sewage disposal	347
Re: Population between Lake Huron and Kingston	347
Re: Fishing Industry	347
Re: Impartial analysis of erosion difficult	347

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Organization and methods	347
	Sound technical advice necessary	347
	Departmental	347
	U.S. Corps of Engineers	347
	Shore Erosion Division of Ohio Department of National Resources	347
	American Shore and Beach Preservation Association	347
	Re: Visits to Ontario shoreline	348
	Re: Analysis of Report	348
	In Seven Divisions	348
	Physical characteristics	348
	Great Lakes in Ontario's development	348
	Shore erosion and inundation	348
	Lake Levels	348
	Jurisdictional aspects	349
	Nature of Provincial participation	348
	Lakeshore protective measures	348
	Services of J. W. Murray	348
	Re: Effect of Power Development	350
	Re: Regulation of flow of St. Lawrence	350
	Re: Hearings by International Joint Commission	350
	Re: Recommendations	351
	Re: Prohibition of use of land where necessary in re erosion	352
	Re: Acquisition of land for park and recreational areas	352
	Employment of adequate shore protective measures	352
	Page 146 of report	352
	Re: Permission of Minister of constructing protective works	352
	Re: Co-relation of all available data by Department of Planning and Development	352
	Re: Financial Assistance to municipalities	353
	Re: Experimental protective works	353
	Re: Survey by Department of Planning and Development if requested	353

WARD. A. T. (PC Kent East):

On Bill No. 79, Second Reading	543
Re: Rondeau Provincial Park	543
Not paying its way	543

WARDROPE, G. C. (PC Port Arthur):

On Bill No. 51, Second Reading	82
Interest in rural telephone personal	83
Purposes of	83
Re: Part VI (page 26) of	83
Re: Efforts by Mr. McDonald	83
Re: Port Arthur Commission	83
Re: Extension of lines	83
Re: Section "f", page 28 of	83
Re: Section "b", page 28 of	84
On Speech from the Throne	226
Congratulatory to Speaker	226
Congratulatory to Hon. Mr. Gemmell	226

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Welcome to newly-elected members	226
Re: Highways investigation		226
	Instituted by government	226
Re: Government's honest history		226
Re: Pre-judgment of suspected personnel		227
	By Metropolitan Press	227
	Not afforded British Justice	227
Re: Civil Service		227
	Affording excellent service	227
	Fear caused by investigations	227
	Little people being sacrificed	227
Irregularities not condoned		227
	Re: Statement by Mr. Wren	227
	Re: Statement of irregularities could not be correct	227
	Construction of roads in northwestern Ontario	228
Re: Resolution to Hon. Mr. Doucett		228
Re: Public not responsible for irregularities		228
Re: Extract from <i>News-Chronicle</i> and <i>Times Journal</i>		228
	By Senator Patterson	228
Re: Method of handling investigation praised		229
Re: Mining		229
	Expansion of in northwest	229
	Roads into mining areas	229
	Development of Manitouwadge	229
	Extract from <i>News-Chronicle</i> , re	230
	Minerals a great imponderable	231
Re: White Paper on Forestry		231
	Re: Former waste of timber	231
Re: Pulp and paper industry in northwest		231
	Re: Reduction in sales of pulp	231
	Re: Exports of pulp	232
	Re: Forestry schools	232
	All near Toronto	232
	Should be nearer the industry	232
	Re: Timber dues on jack pine	232
	Are too high	232
	Re: Freight Rates	232
	Are too high	232
	Re: Forestry employees on casual basis	233
Re: Statements by Ontario Leader of CCF		233
	CCF not friends of Labour	233
	Thus done nothing	233
	Re: Services rendered to north by Government	233
	Re: Building figures in Port Arthur	233
	Highest in history	234
	Re: Hydro services in north	234
	Re: Ontario not subservient to United States	234
	Re: Epilogue at dinner by Abitibi Power & Paper Company's President	234
	Re: Prime Minister a creator of good public relations	234
	Will give fair deal to all in any investigation	234
	Cautious treatment of delegations	235
On Bill No. 79, Second Reading		541
	Re: Parks in Northwest	541
	Re: Sibley Peninsula	541
	Re: Silver Islet	541

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture		665
Re: Hydro in Eastern Ontario		665
Rates for		665
Re: Rates in Western Ontario		665
Re: Purchase of power from C.N.R.		665
Re: Hydro at Nakina and Hornepayne		666
Is badly needed		666
On Estimates, Department of Highways		825
Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways		825
Extract from <i>Telegram</i>		825
Re: "Ballyhoo" and "Guesswork"		826
Re: Full report must be available		826
Re: Improvement in methods of awarding contracts possible		826
Re: Ontario receiving value for money		826
Re: Ontario Liberal Leadership		826
Re: Appointment of Highway Commission		826
A ridiculous suggestion		826
For personal benefit		826
Re: "Brainwashing"		826
Will match witnesses 3 to 1		827
Re: Investigation commenced by Government		827
Re: Select Committee unnecessary		827
Re: Exaggerated statements adversely affecting province		827
Re: "Political circumlocution"		827
Re: People not responsible for irregularities		827
Should not have to suffer for		827
Re: Road construction should proceed		827
On Estimates, Department of Mines		956
Re: Access Mining Roads		956
Report on, awaited		956
On Report, of Mining Committee		993
Most important report this Session		993
Re: Responsibility, Department of Lands and Forests		993
Re: Benefit from access roads		993
Of assistance in firefighting		993
Economically essential		993
Re: Hearst and Pasha areas		993
Re: Manitouwadge Lake find		993
Re: Statement by Mr. Hamilton		993
Re: Northern wealth helps Southern Ontario		994
Re: No time to bury head in sand		994
On Estimates, Department of Planning and Development		1036
Re: Community Planning Branch		1036
Re: Manitouwadge Mining Site		1036
Re: Tribute to Prime Minister		1186
Extract from Toronto <i>Daily Star</i>		1186
Correctness admitted by Opposition		1186

WARRENDER, HON. W. K. (Minister of Planning and Development):

Re: Conference with Eastern Ontario Associated Boards of Trade	340
Re: Decentralization of industry	340
Industries helpful to small communities	340
Requested further assistance	340
Re: Efforts of Department of Planning and Development	341

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Over-all regional plan		341
Re: First conference		341
Re: Two-fold objective		341
Development at provincial level		341
Development at local level		341
Many benefits anticipated		341
Re: Optimum land use		341
Re: Equalization of assessment		341
Re: Closer working with transport officials		341
Re: Intra and inter-area development		341
Re: If large areas growing larger, not by design of Department of Planning and Development		341
Re: Objective is to guide industry		341
On Bill No. 104, First Reading		560
Re: Sections 1 and 3		560
Act administered by Minister of Planning and Development		560
Creation of authority dealt with by Minister of Public Works		560
Re: Section 2		560
Act will apply throughout Ontario		560
Re: Section 4 (formerly section 3)		560
Governs representation		560
Re: Section 5		560
New section 6(a)		560
Re: Amalgamation of adjoining water sheds		560
Re: Section 6		560
New provisions in Section 15		560
Re: Agreements with land owners		560
Section 7		560
Re: Applications for review		560
Limit of time for action		560
On Bill No. 105, First Reading		561
Re: Section 1		561
Definition of "Planning Area"		561
Functions of Board outlined		561
Re: Section 3		561
Appointments to Planning Boards		561
Requires approval of Minister		561
Re: Section 5		561
Re: Auditing of accounts and transactions		561
By auditor of designated municipality		561
Re: Section 6		561
Re: Copies of official plans		561
In municipalities designated by Minister		561
Re: Filing of one duplicate original		561
Re: Section 7		561
Re: Committees of adjustment		561
Re: Section 8		561
Re: Authority of Committees of Adjustment re changes of uses		561
Committee should be flexible		561
Re: Appeals to Municipal Board		561
Procedure simplified		561
Re: Section 9		561
Definition of "re-development"		562
Re: Section 10		562
Re: Sub-division control		562

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Section 11	Applicants for approval of sub-division plans must be owner of land	562
Re: Instances of misrepresentation	Re: Instances of misrepresentation	562
On Estimates, Department of Planning and Development	On Estimates, Department of Planning and Development	1027
Re: Community Planning Branch	Re: Community Planning Branch	1027
Official plans	Official plans	1027
Areas of sub-division control	Areas of sub-division control	1027
Plans of sub-divisions	Plans of sub-divisions	1027
Street Names	Street Names	1028
Zoning by-laws	Zoning by-laws	1028
Committees of adjustment	Committees of adjustment	1028
Dispositions by	Dispositions by	1028
Miscellaneous activities	Miscellaneous activities	1028
Issuance of publications	Issuance of publications	1028
Attendance at council meetings and planning boards	Attendance at council meetings and planning boards	1028
Convening of 3 Planning Conferences	Convening of 3 Planning Conferences	1028
Co-operation with University	Co-operation with University	1028
Assistance in general surveys	Assistance in general surveys	1028
Re: Future activities	Re: Future activities	1028
Conference of land surveyors	Conference of land surveyors	1029
Regional Planning	Regional Planning	1029
Responsibility of Planning Boards	Responsibility of Planning Boards	1029
Re: Housing Branch	Re: Housing Branch	1029
Activities of	Activities of	1029
Grants to Housing Authorities	Grants to Housing Authorities	1029
Re: Lack of serviced land	Re: Lack of serviced land	1030
Re: Municipalities and approximate number of lots	Re: Municipalities and approximate number of lots	1030
Re: Housing shortage	Re: Housing shortage	1030
In Greater Toronto area	In Greater Toronto area	1030
Re: Construction of Rental Houses	Re: Construction of Rental Houses	1030
Locations of	Locations of	1030
Re: Development of Regent Park (South) area	Re: Development of Regent Park (South) area	1031
Re: Provincial Contributions to housing projects	Re: Provincial Contributions to housing projects	1031
Re: Conservation Branch	Re: Conservation Branch	1031
Re: Establishment of Authorities	Re: Establishment of Authorities	1031
Re: Completion of River projects	Re: Completion of River projects	1031
Re: Reforestation	Re: Reforestation	1032
Re: Recreational areas	Re: Recreational areas	1032
Acquisition of	Acquisition of	1032
Re: General conservation programme	Re: General conservation programme	1032
Re: Trade and Industry Branch	Re: Trade and Industry Branch	1032
Functions of	Functions of	1032
Activities of	Activities of	1032
Industrial development	Industrial development	1032
Re: Chicago office	Re: Chicago office	1033
Re: Municipal Industrial Promotion	Re: Municipal Industrial Promotion	1033
Re: Information services	Re: Information services	1033
Re: Industrial Research	Re: Industrial Research	1033
Re: Immigration Branch	Re: Immigration Branch	1034
Re: Research Council of Ontario	Re: Research Council of Ontario	1034
Grants-in-aid	Grants-in-aid	1035
Group Research	Group Research	1035
Scholarships	Scholarships	1035

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Scientific liaison	1035
	Recommendations	1035
Re: Ontario House, London, England		1035
	A clearing house for information	1035
	Re: Four Divisions of	1036
	Trade and industry	1036
	Immigration	1036
	Public Relations	1036
	Administration	1036
Re: Mineral developments maps		1036
	Tribute to cartographer	1036
	Tribute to Staff	1036
Re: Manitouwadge Mining Site		1036
	Will assist in every way	1036
Re: River Valley Conservation Surveys		1037
Re: Government is not "doodling"		1041
Re: Acute housing shortage in Metropolitan Toronto		1042
Re: Bill No. 80, 1953		1042
Re: Activities of Department re Housing		1042
	Summaries of	1042
Re: Cannot compel municipalities to make agreements		1043
	Re: Land Assembly	1043
	Re: Location of	1043
	Re: No other land available	1043
Re: Power of expropriation		1043
	Used on 2 occasions	1043
	Atikokan	1043
	Scarborough	1043
Re: No expenditures for immigration		1044
	Procedure re	1044
Re: Salary and allowances to Major Armstrong		1045
	Province does not decide location of industry	1045
Re: New regional set-up		1045
	Advisory capacity only	1045

WEAVER, E. L. (PC St. David):

On Bill No. 26, In Committee	641
Amendment to Section 2	641
Re: Exemption of buildings at C.N.E.	641
To avoid double bookkeeping	641

WELSH, HON. G. A. (Provincial Secretary):

Re: Staffs, Opposition's	68
Statement by Mr. Wren	68
Statement incorrect	68
Permanent staff for Opposition	68
Sessional staff for Opposition	68
Proportion of, comparatively	68
Re: Printing of Annual Reports	120
Re: Printing contracts	120
On Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary	1047
Not Revenue-producing Department compared to others	1047
Re: Best record for revenue	1047
Amount of	1047
Re: Activities of Department	1047
Re: Companies incorporated	1047
Re: Forecast exceeded	1047

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Expenditures of Department	1047
	Re: Civil Defence	1047
	Expenditures post-conversion programme	1047
	26 counties standardized	1047
	Of balance, 14 surveyed	1047
	Re: Co-operation of Federal Government	1047
	Method of surveying and standardizing	1047
	Re: Variations in hose connections	1048
	Re: Two major factors of attack	1048
	Fire	1048
	Panic	1048
	Roads mapped and planned	1048
	Re: Auxiliary traffic-control officers	1048
	Re: Fair amount of fire equipment	1048
	Re: Sarnia disaster	1048
	Re: Change in thinking	1049
	Change of methods resulting in	1049
	Re: Comparison of power of bombs	1049
	Effect on Toronto	1049
	Re: One potential enemy	1049
	Re: Bombers will get through despite precautions	1049
	Re: Toronto not an important target	1049
	Re: Pilots have more than one objective	1049
	Some "dandy" alternative targets	1049
	Locations of	1049
	Re: Civil Defence must attack	1050
	Re: Steps must be taken to prevent panic and fires	1050
	Re: Emphasis changed by Hydrogen Bomb	1050
	Re: Page Boys in Assembly	1050
	Qualifications of	1050
	Re: Continuing education	1050
	Re: Engagement of Teacher	1050
	Salary of	1050
	Arranged through Speaker's Office	1050
	Re: Art Committee	1051
	Activities of	1051
	Expenditures of, 1953	1051
	Re: Queen's Printer	1052
	Re: Printing of Records	1052
	Procedure of	1052
	Generalities ordinarily not true	1052
	Re: Standardization of Hose Couplings	1053
	Progressing rapidly	1053
	Federal assistance for	1053
	Re: Danger of war pushed back	1053
	Re: Not training C.D. workers but instructors	1054
	Re: Publicized efforts in U.S.	1054
	Re: Air-raid shelters in U.S.	1054
	Re: Air-raid shelters in England	1054
	Re: Air-raid shelters in Canada	1054
	Must know what to protect against	1054
	Re: Ontario not lagging in Civil Defence	1054
	Re: Civil Service Commission	1055

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
On Bill No. 65, In Committee		1062
Amendment to Section 31		1062
Amendment to Section 35		1062
Amendment to Section 286		1062
Corporations Act, 1953		
On Bill No. 131, In Committee		1163
Amendment to subsection 5		1164

WHITNEY, N. (PC Prince Edward-Lennox):

On Report, Select Committee re Cemeteries	313
Cemetery Important	313
Re: Good work by local people	314
Re: Commendatory of Chairman	314

WREN, ALBERT (L Kenora):

Re: Appointment of Public Accounts Committee	36
Re: Cost of Witnesses	36
Re: Staffs, for Oppositions	68
Comparisons by Provincial Secretary ridiculous	68
Government staff unlimited	68
Re: Duties of Opposition	68
Research necessary	68
Re: Lands and Forests, White Paper on	158
Congratulations on recovery of Minister	158
Re: Increasing unemployment	158
Re: Exports of raw wood	158
Should be limit to	158
Re: In-balance in quotas	158
Re: Services of Departmental staff	158
Re: Programme	159
Not adequate	159
No provision for emphasis	159
Re: Lumber Industry	159
Re: Timber dues	159
Are too high	159
Re: Research Activities	159
Should be accelerated	159
Re: Costs of timber operations	159
Re: Paper mill at Sioux Lookout	160
Re: Operation of inland mills	160
Not successful in Ontario	160
Re: Fish and wildlife	160
Re: Business Colleges	173
Activities should be reviewed by Committee on Education	173
No mention of Brockville School	173
Some require supervision by Department	173
On Speech from the Throne	209
Re: New school at Kenora	209
Appreciation of Minister's efforts	209
Re: Remark by member for Riverdale	209
Re: "Electoral bottoms"	209
Re: Four steps	209
Re: Strength of Opposition	210
Re: Need for Economist in Opposition	210

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
Re: Ontario Liberal Convention		210
For selection of Leader		210
For strengthening Opposition		210
Re: Parade of praise		210
Re: Northwestern Ontario		210
Potentialities and actualities in		211
Common economy and problems		211
Developments in		211
Steep Rock Iron Mines		211
Red Lake Gold Mines		211
Manitouwadge area		211
Smelters should be erected in		211
Nickel and copper discoveries		211
Hydro development		211
Re: Tourist Industry		211
Tourist operators		211
Government grants for		211
Re: Transportation and access roads		212
Access roads need not be highways		212
Re: Minaki Tourist Centre		212
Re: Mining Access roads		212
Re: Hospital Services		212
Hospital districts required		212
Taxing unorganized districts		212
Indigent patients		212
Resulting deficits		212
Assistance from Department of Health		212
Examples of indigency		212
Re: Liquor Problem		213
Re: Watered whiskey		213
Re: Elimination of liquor permits		213
Are a general nuisance		213
Re: Suppliers of beer		213
Should be available in stores		214
Re: Health		214
Re: Health insurance scheme		214
Re: Costs of		214
Re: Saskatchewan Plan		214
Re: Select Committee to study		214
Marginal-income bracket most affected		214
Re: White Paper on Lands and Forests		215
Re: Fishing licences		215
Should not be imposed		215
Abolition of radio licences		215
Re: Highway Scandal, Fort William		215
A very serious matter		215
Newspaper reports of		215
Function of Public Accounts Committee		216
Public Confidence undermined		216
Provincial Party Organizations		216
Re: Activities produces campaign funds		216
Re: Administration of Justice		216
Re: Severance of Crown Attorney from Government		216
Re: Disbarment notice, O.W.N.		216

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	No prosecution launched	217
	Destroys public confidence in administration of justice ..	217
	Laying of charge matter for Crown	217
	Does restitution eliminate prosecution	218
	People reluctant to believe in government's sincerity	218
	Case of Crown Attorney should not become practice	219
Re: Losses in north country		219
	Statement in 1952-1953 Public Accounts	219
Re: Fort William trials		219
	Special report to House required	219
	Secret session if necessary	219
	Royal Commission should be appointed	219
	Veil of secrecy should be lifted	219
	Information available to investigating body	220
Re: Method of handling tenders		220
	Should be opened in public	220
	Too much secrecy in re	220
Re: Personal thanks to Mr. Speaker		220
Re: Kenora Hockey Team		455
	Enroute to Japan	455
	Will meet Russian opponents	455
On Bill No. 94, Second Reading		621
	Northern people interested in pipe line	621
	Many aspects need clarification	621
Re: Market for Alberta gas		621
Re: Future of Ontario gas producers		621
	Potential of not explored	621
	Large resources of with deeper drilling	621
Re: Financial position of Alberta		621
	Limitation of fields of taxation	621
Re: Review of Ontario gas situation desirable		622
	Survey and exploration work inadequate	622
	Estimate for, insufficient	622
On the Budget		752
Re: Constituency of Kenora		752
	Extract from <i>Globe and Mail</i>	752
Re: Thistle Hockey Team at Tokyo		752
Re: Financial assistance for team		752
Re: Highways, in		753
	Snow-plowing of in north	753
	Declaration of termination	753
	Letter from Deputy Minister, Dec. 31, 1953	753
		832
	Re: Policy of Department	753
Re: Newspaper advertisement re continuation of snow-plowing		753
Re: Contradictory statements		753
		832
Re: Standing Committees of House		753
	Work of increasing	753
Re: Concurrent meetings of		753
Re: Extended Sessions required		753
Re: Work of should be reported to House		753
Re: Failure of Labour Committees to meet		754
	Labour leaders not "parasites"	754
Re: Labour		754
	Clear division between labour and management	754
Re: Voluntary revocable check-off		754

INDICES—Continued

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Labour should not affiliate with political party	754
	Fear in connection with mining strike	754
	Exemplified in Great Britain	754
	No coincidence mine labour leaders were CCF	754
	Dues partially used for political purposes	754
	Should be no check-off for political parties	754
	Re: Condition of gold mining industry	755
	Large section of population dependent on	755
	Re: Irregularities, Department of Highways	755
	Challenge by Minister for statement	755
	Challenge accepted	755
	Re: No comprehensive statement by Minister	755
	Re: No comprehensive statement by Provincial Auditor	755
	Own investigations necessary	756
	No condonation of offenders	756
	Minister's responsibility for policy making situation possible	756
	Aggregate tenders impressive	756
	Confined to no particular Division	756
	Not proper pre-engineering	756
	Minister responsible for awarding contracts	756
	Minister either misinformed or without proper advice	756
	Re: adjustments in contracts	756
	Ministers should have been aware of	756
	Re: Questioning of engineers and others	756
	Resulted in confusion of	756
	Re: Attempts at "brainwashing"	757
	Re: Interviews with engineers and contractors	757
	Not connected with work	757
	Present situation due to Department's policies	757
	Re: Policies the responsibility of Minister	757
	Re: Minister only must explain	757
	Could have been given without prejudice	757
	Public could have better assessed the situation	757
	Re: Correction of "unhealthy situation"	757
	Re: Opposition not sufficiently aggressive	757
	Re: Formation of Highways Commission	757
	Re: Personnel of	757
	Re: Minister's duty to make full disclosure	758
	Re: Select Committee, re	758
	Re: Responsibility to	758
	Will produce evidence to	758
	If Minister's statement not forthcoming, should step down	758
On	Estimates, Department of Highways	822
	Re: Discussion on high-level policy desired	823
	Procedure from tender to payment	823
	Re: Granting of contracts at less than engineer's estimates	823
	Re: Situation at Sioux Lookout	824
	Re: Snow-plowing of roads other than King's Highways	832
On	Report. Select Committee re Indian population	892
	Re: Largest Indian population in Kenora Riding	892
	Re: Different type of Indians in North	892
	Re: Rev. Canon Sanderson	892
	Gave excellent impression	892

Re: Indians in Kenora and Sioux Lookout areas	892
Spread over wide geographical area	892
Two superintendents very efficient	892
Re: Gifford Swartman	892
Re: His work with children	892
Re: Blackhawk Hockey Team	892
Champion of Northwestern Ontario	892
Two years previous never on skates	892
Demonstrates ability of Indians	892
Responsibility re Indians	892
Largely on churches	892
Difficulty in securing proper teachers	892
Re: Education essential	893
Re: Extending liquor privileges to Indians	893
Will create temporary problems	893
Requires patience and tolerance	893
Re: "Indian list"	893
Very obnoxious term	893
Re: Appointment of Indian as liaison officer re Indian affairs	893
Re: Federal Government should train young Indians for	893
Re: Whole-heartedly supports report	893
Re: Brothers in armed services, now brother citizens	893
On Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests	912
Re: Conditions in Northwestern Ontario	912
Re: Search parties in bush	913
Searches expensive	913
Suggests organized search party	913
Available on call	913
Re: Lumber industry causing concern	913
Adjustment of due essential	913
Re: Proper development of spruce timber areas	913
Large areas infected with bud worm	913
Re: Obtaining concessions	913
Re: Access Roads	913
Difficulties in re use of	913
Lumber and pulp companies responsible for fires	913
More accessibility required	913
Re: Zoning of Tourist areas	914
Re: Ownerships largely in American hands	914
Re: Financial assistance to Canadians in re	914
Re: Salaries	914
To important officials	914
Are inadequate	914
Not commensurate with responsibilities	914
Of law-enforcement officers is inadequate	914
Re: Angling licences	915
Should not be demanded	915
Re: Abolition of certain fish hatcheries	915
Of grave concern to fishing public	915
Re: Natural processes of forest should not be tampered with	915
Re: Mississagi operations	915
Not originated by present Minister	915
Should be thoroughly reviewed	915
Re: Seizure of certain assets	916
Re: Large investments in woods' operations	916
Re: Additional information required	916

INDICES—*Continued*

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Requests meeting of committee	916
	Re: Saw-log timber dues	925
	Re: Freight rates for timber movement	926
	Re: Alternative to pulpwood exports	926
	Re: No relief expected	927
	For those who started after policy effective	927
	Re: Mill production	927
	Re: Properly-organized search parties	929
On Bill No. 136, In Committee		1191
	Re: Appointment of Returning Officers	1191
	Resident of riding concerned	1191
	Situation in Kenora	1191
	Returning Officers from Southern Ontario	1191
	Causes constant confusion	1191

YAREMKO, R. John (PC Bellwoods):

On Report of Select Committee on Election Act	135
Re: Changes in Old Act required	135
Re: Absentee voters	135
Re: Requirements for proper elections	135
Re: Conduct of elections	136
Re: Appointment of enumerators	136
Re: Control of elections	136
Re: Party funds	136
Re: \$200 deposit	136
Varies in each jurisdiction	137
Re: Section 165, subsection 3	137
Re: Dissemination of political information	137
On Speech from the Throne	285
Re: Traffic accidents and deaths	285
List of casualties	285
Affects all ages	285
Cause of	285
Unreasonable speed	285
Disregard of others' rights	285
Engineering no cure	285
Re: Highway 401	285
Many accidents on	285
Re: Safety signs	286
Re: Re-examination for physical fitness	286
Re: Re-examination of motor vehicles	286
Re: Responsibility of car manufacturers	286
New models constantly produced	286
Very little provision for safety	286
Re: Directional signals	286
Should be standard equipment	287
Re: Safety reflecting tape	287
Re: Accidents should concern all members of House	287
Re: Dominion-Provincial conference re accidents	287
Re: Level Crossings	287
Should be abolished	287
Port Credit accidents	287
Re: Double licence plates	287
Re: Opening of Workmen's Compensation Building	288

NAMES and CONSTITUENCIES	SUBJECTS	PAGES
	Re: Malton Rehabilitation Centre	288
	85 per cent. successes	288
	Re: Lyndhurst Lodge	288
	Re: No Sales Tax—Ontario	288
	Re: Housing	289
	Requires all services	289
	Life in suburbs	289
	Industry attracting people or vice versa	290
	Re: Industrial expansion	290
	Re: Increase in natural birth rates	290
	Re: Suburban expansion	290
	Re: Purchase of homes by new Canadians	291
	Re: Prevention of Communism	291
	Re: Commemoration of independence	291
	Re: Reading of speech	291
	Re: People's democracies	292
On	Estimates, Department of Attorney-General	723
	Re: Toronto Collection agencies	723
	No benefit from mileage charges	723
On	Bill No. 139, Second Reading	1083
	Supports measure unreservedly	1083
	Putting will of people into words	1083
	Re: Member resorting to "smears"	1083
	Re: Should be no label placed on any group	1083
	Re: Legislation favoured by majority	1083
	Re: Mutual understanding required	1083
	Re: Two great races in province	1084
	Have been added many other races	1084
	Re: Discrimination should be viewed personally	1084
	Re: Loneliness if other races not accepted	1084
	Re: Many become Canadian citizens	1084
	Re: Hon. Robert Baldwin	1084
	Re: His principles handed down	1084
	Re: New principles in Bill	1084
	Re: Legislature proud to enact legislation	1085
On	Bill No. 112, In Committee	1160
	No editorials re	1160

DEPARTMENTS

Estimates, Department of Agriculture:

	PAGES
Doucett, Hon. G. H.	649
Manley, P.	653
	657
	659
	663
Oliver, F. R.	653
Salsberg, J. B.	653
	656
	659
Murdoch, Wm.	655
Robson, R.	656
	664
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	658
Frost, Hon. L. M.	659
Challies, Hon. G.	661
	664
Wardrope, G. C.	665
Nixon, H. C.	666

Estimates, Department of Attorney-General:

Porter, Hon. Dana	703
Salsberg, J. B.	705
Oliver, F. R.	706
Nixon, H. C.	707
Chartrand, A.	711
Grummett, W. J.	711
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	712
Frost, Hon. L. M.	717
Yaremko, John	723

Estimates, Department of Education:

Dunlop, Hon. W. J.	730
Salsberg, J. B.	731
Grummett, W. J.	732
Oliver, F. R.	732
Chartrand, A.	732
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	734
Roberts, A. Kelso	735

Estimates, Department of Health:

Phillips, Hon. Mackinnon	765
	798
	801
Stewart, W. J.	767
Grummett, W. J.	767
Manley, P.	767
Nixon, H.	767
Gordon, G. T.	768
Salsberg, J. B.	773
	798
Frost, Hon. L. M.	796

Morrow, D.	799
Oliver, F. R.	800
Roberts, A. Kelso	801
Cowling, A. H.	801
Chartrand, A.	802

Estimates, Department of Highways:

Doucett, Hon. G. H.	809
Oliver, F. R.	821
	830
Frost, Hon. L. M.	821
Wren, Albert	822
	832
Dunbar, Hon. G.	824
Wardrope, G. C.	825
Salsberg, J. B.	828
Nixon, H. C.	829
Cowling, A. H.	831
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	834

Estimates, Department of Insurance:

Salsberg, J. B.	725
Porter, Hon. D.	726
Frost, Hon. L. M.	726

Estimates, Department of Labour:

Daley, Hon. C.	851
Salsberg, J. B.	856
	866
	868
Fishleigh, H. F.	861
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	861
Cowling, A. H.	867
Oliver, F. R.	867

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests:

Gemmell, Hon. W. S.	905
Wren, Albert	912
Oliver, F. R.	916
Frost, Hon. L. M.	917
Salsberg, J. B.	918

Estimates, Department of Mines:

Kelly, Hon. P. T.	944
Salsberg, J. B.	947
Oliver, F. R.	951
	955
Grummett, W. J.	953
	955
Roberts, A. Kelso	954
Herbert, Robert	954
Wardrope, G. C.	956

Estimates: Department of Municipal Affairs:

Dunbar, Hon. G.	957
Salsberg, J. B.	970
Frost, Hon. L. M.	975
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	977
Oliver, F. R.	978

Estimates, Department of Planning and Development:

Warrender, Hon. W. K.	1027
Wardrope, G. C.	1036
Oliver, F. R.	1036
Salsberg, J. B.	1037
Stewart, W. J.	1040
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	1044
Nixon, H. C.	1046

Estimates, Office of Provincial Auditor:

Frost, Hon. L. M.	847
Oliver, F. R.	849
Grummett, W. J.	850
Salsberg, J. B.	850

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary:

Welsh, Hon. G. A.	1047
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	1050
Salsberg, J. B.	1051
Grummett, W. J.	1053
Oliver, F. R.	1053

Estimates, Department of Provincial Treasurer:

Salsberg, J. B.	1117
Frost, Hon. L. M.	1117
Collings, W. H.	1120
Oliver, F. R.	1120

Estimates, Department of Public Welfare:

Goodfellow, Hon. W. A.	1127
Salsberg, J. B.	1135
	1139
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	1136
	1144
Grummett, W. J.	1137
Chartrand, A.	1143
Oliver, F. R.	1144

Estimates, Department of Public Works:

Griesinger, Hon. William	1230
Salsberg, J. B.	1236
Oliver, F. R.	1237

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions:

PAGES

Foote, Hon. J., V.C.	1164
Grummett, W. J.	1167
	1170
Salsberg, J. B.	1168
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	1171
Stewart, W. J.	1172
Cowling, A. H.	1172
Dunbar, Hon. G. H.	1173
Fishleigh, H. F.	1173

Estimates, Department of Travel and Publicity:

Cecile, Hon. Louis	1239
Thomas, T. D. (Ontario)	1244
Salsberg, J. B.	1244
Grummett, W. J.	1245
Oliver, F. R.	1246

Estimates, Miscellaneous:

Frost, Hon. L. M.	742
------------------------	-----

Estimates, Supplementary:

Oliver, F. R.	596
--------------------	-----

O F B I L L S

	PAGES
BILL No. 1—An Act respecting the Frontenac High School District—	
Mr. Pringle:	
First Reading	47
Second Reading	270
In Committee	378
Third Reading	510
Royal Assent	1296
 BILL No. 2—An Act respecting the Toronto East General and	
Orthopedic Hospital—Mr. Macaulay:	
First Reading	46
Second Reading	270
In Committee	378
Third Reading	510
Royal Assent	1296
 BILL No. 3—An Act respecting the Sudbury Community Young	
Men's, Young Women's Christian Association—Mr. Harvey:	
First Reading	337
Second Reading	510
In Committee	641
Third Reading	695
Royal Assent	1296
 BILL No. 4—An Act respecting the Town of Fergus—Mr. Root:	
First Reading	47
Second Reading	270
In Committee	378
Third Reading	510
Royal Assent	1296
 BILL No. 5—An Act respecting the City of Hamilton—Mr. Elliott:	
First Reading	337
Second Reading	1145
In Committee	1198
Third Reading	1256
Royal Assent	1296
 BILL No. 6—An Act respecting the Town of Mimico—Mr. Brandon:	
First Reading	47
Second Reading	270
In Committee	378
Third Reading	510
Royal Assent	1296
 BILL No. 7—An Act respecting the Homes of the Friendless and	
Infants' Home—Mr. Elliott:	
First Reading	337
Second Reading	619
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296

	PAGES
BILL No. 8—An Act respecting the Town of Hespeler—Mr. Myers:	
First Reading	170
Withdrawn	554
BILL No. 9—An Act respecting the Township of Toronto— Mr. Kennedy:	
First Reading	172
Second Reading	619
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296
BILL No. 10—An Act respecting the City of London— Mr. Robarts (London):	
First Reading	336
Second Reading	1145
In Committee	1156
Third Reading	1186
Royal Assent	1296
BILL No. 11—An Act respecting the Town of Paris—Mr. Nixon:	
First Reading	171
Withdrawn	554
BILL No. 12—An Act respecting Royal Botanical Gardens— Mr. Connell:	
First Reading	337
Second Reading	619
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296
BILL No. 13—An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls— Mr. Jolley:	
First Reading	336
Second Reading	619
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296
BILL No. 14—An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys— Mr. Edwards:	
First Reading	337
Second Reading	894
In Committee	1156
Third Reading	1186
Royal Assent	1296
BILL No. 15—An Act respecting Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited—Mr. Roberts (St. Patrick):	
First Reading	47
Second Reading	270
In Committee	378
Third Reading	510
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 16—An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines—**Mr. Jolley:**

First Reading	172
Second Reading	510
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 17—An Act respecting the Ross Memorial Hospital—**Mr. Letherby:**

First Reading	336
Second Reading	894
In Committee	980
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 18—An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas—**Mr. Robarts (London):**

First Reading	172
Second Reading	894
In Committee	982
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 19—An Act to incorporate the Hamilton Foundation—**Mr. Elliott:**

First Reading	337
Second Reading	894
In Committee	980
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 20—An Act respecting St. Michael's College—**Mr. Roberts (St. Patrick):**

First Reading	337
Second Reading	619
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 21—An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough—**Mr. Beckett:**

First Reading	336
Second Reading	511
In Committee	641
Third Reading	692
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 22—An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 1)—**Mr. Sandercock:**

First Reading	337
Second Reading	894
In Committee	981
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 23—An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 2)—

Mr. Beckett:

First Reading	171
Second Reading	894
In Committee	981
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 24—An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec—Mr. Nixon:

First Reading	47
Second Reading	1068
In Committee	1156
Third Reading	1186
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 25—An Act respecting the City of Ottawa—Mr. Morrow:

First Reading	336
Second Reading	894
In Committee	981
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 26—An Act respecting the City of Toronto—Mr. Weaver:

First Reading	172
Second Reading	510
In Committee	641
Third Reading	692
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 27—An Act to incorporate the London Foundation—

Mr. Robarts (London):

First Reading	171
Second Reading	894
In Committee	1068
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 28—An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West—

Mr. Murdoch:

First Reading	337
Discharged	943

BILL No. 29—An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston—

Mr. Edwards:

First Reading	47
Second Reading	270
In Committee	378
Third Reading	510
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 30—An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie—Mr. Jolley:

First Reading	337
Second Reading	619
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 31—An Act respecting the Town of Oakville**(Private Bill)—Mr. Hall:**

First Reading	337
Second Reading	1145
In Committee	1156
Third Reading	1186
Royal Assent	1296

**BILL No. 32—An Act to amend the Territorial Division Act—
Mr. Dunbar:**

First Reading	6
Second Reading	378
In Committee	518
Third Reading	595
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 33—The Department of Education Act, 1954—Mr. Dunlop:

First Reading	17
Second Reading	40
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1296

**BILL No. 34—An Act to amend the Administration of Justice
Expenses Act—Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	17
Second Reading	40
In Committee	270
Third Reading	377
Royal Assent	1296

**BILL No. 35—An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel
Mortgages Act—Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	17
Second Reading	162
In Committee	894
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 36—An Act to amend the Coroners Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	18
Second Reading	41
In Committee	271
Third Reading	377
Royal Assent	1296

PAGES

BILL No. 37—An Act to amend the County Courts Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	18
Second Reading	41
In Committee	271
Third Reading	377
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 38—An Act to amend the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	18
Second Reading	162
In Committee	895
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 39—An Act to amend the Crown Attorneys Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	18
Second Reading	41
In Committee	271
Third Reading	378
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 40—An Act to amend the Division Courts Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	18
Second Reading	163
In Committee	894
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 41—An Act to amend the Evidence Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	18
Second Reading	163
In Committee	895
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 42—An Act to amend the Insurance Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	19
Second Reading	41
In Committee	271
Third Reading	378
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 43—An Act to amend the Judicature Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	19
Second Reading	163
In Committee	894
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 44—An Act to amend the Jurors Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	19
Second Reading	41
In Committee	271
Third Reading	378
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 45—An Act to amend the Magistrates Act, 1954—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	20
Second Reading	41
In Committee	271
Third Reading	378
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 46—An Act to amend the Mechanic's Lien Act—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	20
Second Reading	41
In Committee	271
Third Reading	378
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 47—An Act to amend the Minor's Protection Act—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	20
Second Reading	163
In Committee	895
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1296

BILL No. 48—An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	20
Second Reading	164
In Committee	895
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 49—An Act to amend the Warehouse Receipts Act—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	20
Second Reading	165
In Committee	895
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 50—An Act to amend the Wills Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	21
Second Reading	165
In Committee	895
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 51—The Telephone Act, 1954—Mr. Challies:

First Reading	37
Second Reading	88
In Committee	981
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 52—An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act—
Mr. Thomas (Ontario):**

First Reading	37
Negatived	1062

BILL No. 53—An Act to amend the Mining Act—Mr. Kelly:

First Reading	93
Second Reading	174
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 54—An Act to amend the Operating Engineers Act, 1953—
Mr. Daley:**

First Reading	93
Second Reading	379
In Committee	524
Third Reading	595
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 55—An Act to amend the Department of Municipal Affairs
Act—Mr. Dunbar:**

First Reading	94
Second Reading	380
In Committee	838
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 56—An Act to amend the Municipal Act—Mr. Dunbar:

First Reading	94
Second Reading	380
In Committee	519
Third Reading	595
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 57—An Act to amend the Conveyancing and Law of
Property Act—Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	94
Second Reading	380
In Committee	895
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 58—The Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954—Mr. Porter :

First Reading	95
Second Reading	382
In Committee	896
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 59—The Bees Act, 1954—Mr. Thomas (Elgin) :

First Reading	170
Second Reading	382
In Committee	840
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 60—An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act—
Mr. Thomas (Elgin) :**

First Reading	170
Second Reading	382
In Committee	840
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 61—The Plant Diseases Act, 1954—Mr. Thomas (Elgin) :

First Reading	170
Second Reading	383
In Committee	841
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 62—An Act to amend the Livestock and Livestock
Products Act—Mr. Thomas (Elgin) :**

First Reading	170
Second Reading	383
In Committee	841
Third Reading	868
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 63—The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education
Act, 1954—Mr. Dunlop :**

First Reading	171
Second Reading	270
In Committee	896
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 64—An Act to amend the Public Service Act—Mr. Welsh :

First Reading	171
Discharged	1068

BILL No. 65—An Act to amend the Corporations Act, 1953—**Mr. Welsh:**

First Reading	171
Second Reading	511
In Committee	1062
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 66—An Act to amend the Corporations Information Act—**Mr. Welsh:**

First Reading	171
Second Reading	511
In Committee	896
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 67—An Act to amend the Unemployment Relief Act—**Mr. Goodfellow:**

First Reading	257
Second Reading	512
In Committee	897
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 68—An Act respecting the Milk Industry—Mr. Goodfellow:

First Reading	257
Second Reading	764
In Committee	897
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1155
	1297

BILL No. 69—An Act to amend the Professional Engineers Act—**Mr. Welsh:**

First Reading	259
Second Reading	512
In Committee	898
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 70—An Act to amend the Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act—Mr. Dunbar:

First Reading	259
Second Reading	383
In Committee	523
Third Reading	595
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 71—An Act to amend the Municipal Drainage Act—**Mr. Dunbar:**

First Reading	259
Second Reading	383
In Committee	523
Third Reading	596
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 72—An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act—Mr. Dunbar :

First Reading	260
Second Reading	383
In Committee	524
Third Reading	596
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 73—An Act to amend the Infants Act—Mr. Porter :

First Reading	260
Second Reading	512
In Committee	898
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 74—An Act to amend the Credit Unions Act, 1953—
Mr. Porter :**

First Reading	260
Second Reading	512
In Committee	898
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 75—The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954—
Mr. Porter :**

First Reading	260
Second Reading	513
In Committee	898
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 76—An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business
Brokers Act—Mr. Porter :**

First Reading	261
Second Reading	516
In Committee	898
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 77—An Act to consolidate and revise the Children's Protec-
tion Act, the Children of Unmarried Parents Act, and the
Adoption Act—Mr. Goodfellow :**

First Reading	337
Second Reading	637
In Committee	1157
Third Reading	1186
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 78—An Act respecting Representation of the People in the
Legislative Assembly—Mr. Frost (Victoria) :**

First Reading	420
Second Reading	693
In Committee	1190
Third Reading	1256
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 79—The Provincial Parks Act, 1954—Mr. Challies:

First Reading	421
Second Reading	544
In Committee	640
Third Reading	692
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 80—The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act—Mr. Doucett:

First Reading	425
Second Reading	537
In Committee	640
Third Reading	693
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 81—An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act—
Mr. Doucett:**

First Reading	425
Second Reading	531
In Committee	898
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 82—An Act to amend the Trees Act—Mr. Gemmell:

First Reading	426
Second Reading	517
In Committee	640
Third Reading	693
Royal Assent	1297

**BILL No. 83—An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act—
Mr. Doucett:**

First Reading	426
Second Reading	536
In Committee	1159
Third Reading	1186
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 84—The Schools Administration Act, 1954—Mr. Dunlop:

First Reading	427
Second Reading	511
In Committee	899
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 85—An Act to amend the Public Schools Act—Mr. Dunlop:

First Reading	427
Second Reading	511
In Committee	899
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 86—An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act—

Mr. Dunlop:

First Reading	427
Second Reading	511
In Committee	899
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 87—An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act—

Mr. Dunlop:

First Reading	427
Second Reading	511
In Committee	902
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 88—An Act to amend the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act—

Mr. Gemmell:

First Reading	428
Second Reading	517
In Committee	641
Third Reading	693
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 89—An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act, 1952—

Mr. Gemmell:

First Reading	428
Second Reading	517
In Committee	641
Third Reading	693
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 90—An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act—

Mr. Daley:

First Reading	428
Second Reading	547
In Committee	931
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 91—The Financial Administration Act, 1954—

Mr. Frost (Victoria):

First Reading	452
Second Reading	695
In Committee	931
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 92—The Mental Health Act, 1954—Dr. Phillips:

First Reading	509
Second Reading	584
In Committee	939
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 93—An Act to amend the Mental Hospitals Act—**Dr. Phillips:**

First Reading	509
Second Reading	584
In Committee	939
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 94—An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	554
Second Reading	633
In Committee	1067
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 95—An Act to amend the Public Utilities Act—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	558
Second Reading	637
In Committee	1067
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 96—An Act to amend the Municipal Franchise Act—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	558
Second Reading	637
In Committee	1067
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 97—An Act to amend the Gas Pipe Lines Act, 1951—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	558
Second Reading	637
In Committee	1067
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 98—An Act respecting Persons who bore or drill Wells**For Water—Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	558
Second Reading	637
In Committee	939
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1297

BILL No. 99—An Act to amend the Petty Trespass Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	558
Second Reading	637
In Committee	939
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 100—An Act to amend the Public Health Act—**Dr. Phillips:**

First Reading	559
Second Reading	693
In Committee	939
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 101—An Act to amend the Ontario School Trustees'**Council Act, 1953—Mr. Dunlop:**

First Reading	559
Second Reading	638
In Committee	939
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 102—An Act to provide Protection for Persons working
in Trenches—Mr. Daley:**

First Reading	559
Second Reading	695
In Committee	940
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 103—An Act to amend the Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953—
Mr. Daley:**

First Reading	559
Second Reading	695
In Committee	940
Third Reading	944
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 104—An Act to amend the Conservation Authorities Act—
Mr. Warrender:**

First Reading	560
Second Reading	697
In Committee	982
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 105—An Act to amend the Planning Act—Mr. Warrender:

First Reading	561
Second Reading	697
In Committee	982
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 106—An Act to amend the Public Hospitals Act—**Dr. Phillips:**

First Reading	588
Second Reading	697
In Committee	982
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 107—An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act—**Mr. Goodfellow:**

First Reading	589
Second Reading	764
In Committee	982
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 108—An Act to amend the Mother's Allowance Act, 1952—**Mr. Goodfellow:**

First Reading	589
Second Reading	764
In Committee	983
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 109—An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing**Act—Mr. Goodfellow:**

First Reading	590
Second Reading	1145
In Committee	1163
Third Reading	1187
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 110—An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act—**Mr. Daley:**

First Reading	590
Second Reading	784
In Committee	996
Third Reading	1145
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 111—An Act to amend the Public Parks Act—Mr. Dunbar:

First Reading	591
Second Reading	763
In Committee	983
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 112—An Act to amend the Municipal Act—Mr. Dunbar:

First Reading	591
Second Reading	763
In Committee	1159
Third Reading	1187
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 113—An Act to amend the Assessment Act—Mr. Dunbar:

First Reading	591
Second Reading	763
In Committee	1162
Third Reading	1187
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 114—An Act to amend the Registry Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	618
Second Reading	763
In Committee	1157
Third Reading	1187
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 115—An Act to amend the Land Titles Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	618
Second Reading	764
In Committee	1150
Third Reading	1155
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 116—An Act to amend the Magistrate's Act, (No. 2)—**Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	618
Second Reading	778
In Committee	984
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 117—An Act to amend the Judicature Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	618
Second Reading	778
In Committee	984
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 118—An Act to amend the Security Transfer—**Mr. Frost (Victoria):**

First Reading	646
Second Reading	764
In Committee	984
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 119—An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act—**Mr. Frost (Victoria):**

First Reading	646
Second Reading	764
In Committee	984
Third Reading	996
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 120—An Act to amend the Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953—Mr. Dunbar:

First Reading	646
Second Reading	764
In Committee	1150
Third Reading	1155
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 121—An Act to amend the Homes for the Aged Act—
Mr. Goodfellow:**

First Reading	671
Second Reading	1017
In Committee	1151
Third Reading	1155
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 122—An Act to amend the Grand River Conservation
Act, 1938—Mr. Warrender:**

First Reading	672
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1151
Third Reading	1155
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 123—An Act to amend the Cemeteries Act—Dr. Phillips:

First Reading	748
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1162
Third Reading	1187
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 124—An Act to amend the Theatres Act, 1953—Mr. Nixon:

First Reading	748
Second Reading	1113
In Committee	1188
Third Reading	1256
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 125—An Act to amend the Disabled Persons' Allowance
Act, 1952—Mr. Goodfellow:**

First Reading	778
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1151
Third Reading	1155
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 126—An Act to amend the Community Centres Act—
Mr. Goodfellow:**

First Reading	778
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1151
Third Reading	1155
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 127—An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations
Act—Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	778
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1152
Third Reading	1156
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 128—An Act to amend the Fire Marshals Act—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	779
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1152
Third Reading	1156
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 129—An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act—
Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	779
Second Reading	1145
In Committee	1205
Third Reading	1256
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 130—An Act respecting Certain Lands in the City of Port
Arthur, occupied by the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur—
Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	779
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1152
Third Reading	1156
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 131—An Act to amend the Public Service Act—Mr. Welsh:

First Reading	780
Second Reading	1145
In Committee	1163
Third Reading	1187
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 132—An Act to amend the Liquor Licence Act—Mr. Welsh:

First Reading	780
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1152
Third Reading	1156
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 133—An Act to amend the Pharmacy Act, 1953—

Dr. Phillips:

First Reading	780
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1163
Third Reading	1187
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 134—An Act to amend the Travelling Shows Act—

Mr. Frost (Victoria):

First Reading	780
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1152
Third Reading	1156
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 135—An Act respecting the Royal Conservatory of Music,
of Toronto—Mr. Dunlop:**

First Reading	845
Second Reading	1018
In Committee	1152
Third Reading	1156
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 136—An Act to amend the Election Act, 1951—Mr. Porter:

First Reading	846
Second Reading	1068
In Committee	1190
Third Reading	1257
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 137—An Act to amend the Voters' List Act, 1951—
Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	846
Second Reading	1068
In Committee	1197
Third Reading	1257
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 138—An Act to amend the Controverted Elections Act—
Mr. Porter:**

First Reading	846
Second Reading	1068
In Committee	1197
Third Reading	1257
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 139—An Act to promote Fair Accommodation Practices in
Ontario—Mr. Frost (Victoria):**

First Reading	873
Second Reading	1086
In Committee	1201
Third Reading	1257
Royal Assent	1298

BILL No. 140—An Act to amend the Municipal Act—Mr. Dunbar:

First Reading	875
Second Reading	1086
In Committee	1197
Third Reading	1257
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 141—An Act to amend the Ontario Cancer Treatment and
Research Foundation Act—Dr. Phillips:**

First Reading	1073
Second Reading	1156
In Committee	1200
Third Reading	1257
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 142—An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the
Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund—Mr. Frost (Victoria) :**

First Reading	1074
Second Reading	1156
In Committee	1201
Third Reading	1251
Royal Assent	1298

**BILL No. 143—An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of
money for the public service for the fiscal year ended the 31st day
of March, 1954, and for the public service for the fiscal year ended
the 31st day of March, 1955—Mr. Frost (Victoria) :**

First Reading	1295
Second Reading	1295
Third Reading	1295



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, February 11, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



Price per session, \$7.50. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, February 11, 1954.

Speech from the Throne, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor	3
The Territorial Divisions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	6
Passing of John Duncan McPhee, expressions of regret, Mr. Frost, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Salsberg	6
Loss to Federal Government of William Limburg Houck, expressions of regret, Mr. Frost, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Grummett	6
Former Premiers Welcomed	7
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	10

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

FOURTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF
THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, CONVENED ON THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 11, 1954, AT THREE O'CLOCK P.M.

MR. ALEX LEWIS, CLERK

Thursday, the eleventh day of February, 1954, being the first day of the Fourth Session of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Province of Ontario for the Despatch of Business pursuant to a Proclamation of the Honourable Louis O. Breithaupt, Lieutenant-Governor, of the Province.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1954

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met,

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province then entered the House and, being seated on the Throne, was pleased to open the Session by the following gracious Speech.

HON. L. O. BREITHAUPT
(Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker,
and Members of the Legislative
Assembly of Ontario:

It is with special pleasure that I welcome you today as you resume your duties in this Fourth Session of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Province of Ontario. Since we were last gathered here, the Coronation of our beloved Queen, Elizabeth the Second, inaugurated the second Elizabethan Age, amid the rejoicing of her subjects in our own Province and across her wide realm.

We meet today under conditions which we hope assure the lessening of international tension. After protracted negotiations, a truce has finally been achieved in Korea, from which we all hope will come an enduring peace. Meanwhile it is a source of thankfulness that so many families in Ontario have welcomed back to their homes members of the armed forces who so valiantly served and

fought to defeat aggression. We are proud of the contribution Canadians have made to this demonstration that the free nations of the world can, and will, unite and make sacrifices in a collective endeavour to prevent the subjugation of a people by force of arms. We trust that in the days to come we shall be able to devote our talents and resources to the ways of peace.

In a year marked by notable developments throughout Canada, the Province of Ontario has continued its spectacular economic growth and progress. Expansion has continued in nearly all phases of economic activity and in almost all parts of the province. New capital investment has been at the highest level ever reached in Ontario. Much new productive capacity has been brought into operation. Advances have been made in the modernization of equipment and in the application of scientific methods which have endowed our industry with great diversity and strength. Population has continued to grow at an unusually high rate, adding substantially to the size of both our labour force and our domestic market. The growth and development of Ontario have brought in their train many problems which will engage your consideration.

The impending construction of the St. Lawrence River power project, the last obstacles to which we are quite sure will shortly be cleared, will require legislation to give effect to plans now being prepared. The low-cost hydro-electric power which can be developed from this project will greatly augment our power resources and facilitate our economic expansion. Since the last meeting of this Legislature, great progress has been made towards the construction of a natural gas pipe line from Alberta and the western provinces to Ontario and other parts of central Canada. Legislation enabling the province to deal with the new problems which will arise from the importation of this new source of fuel and power will be introduced. The development of the St. Lawrence and the gas resources of the Canadian West will create new employment opportunities and fortify our long-term economic development.

Last year, faced with demands for new highways resulting from our ever-increasing highway traffic, and requirements for other public projects, the Government undertook a major expansion of its capital construction programme. That programme will be continued in many phases — highways, public buildings, hospitals, including the new Cancer Institute, and conservation projects.

During your deliberations here, you will be asked to consider and approve a legislative and financial programme for the social and economic betterment of the people.

New proposals will be made for amending the province's welfare legislation. It is gratifying to know that the pensions for disabled persons, in effect in Ontario in the last two years, are to be extended by Federal action across Canada. The Ontario Disabled Persons' Allowances Act, passed here at the 1952 Session, pioneered a new advance in welfare in Canada and is serving as a model for a nation-wide plan. Legislation will be introduced to consolidate in one act The Children's Protection Act, The Adoption Act and The Children of Unmarried Parents Act. This will bring Ontario's child welfare legis-

lation into conformity with the best in modern practice.

The House will be asked to approve a new provincial parks policy, which will increase the number of parks and afford to our people fresh opportunities for relaxation and enjoyment among the natural beauties of the Province. This measure will assure that the people of Ontario, through a public parks system, will have reserved for them now and in the future the means of enjoying the beauties of our countryside.

Many advances have been made in the field of health, as is evidenced in the reduction in the incidence of tuberculosis and other infectious diseases and the steadily rising longevity of our people. You will be asked to consider measures providing for advances on many fronts in the health programme, particularly in the battles against cancer and poliomyelitis. Further assistance will be given to our hospitals. You will be asked to give attention to means for eradicating noxious weeds which cause such discomfort, loss of efficiency and absence from work to sufferers from hay fever. New rehabilitation measures will be recommended, and as one of the steps it is proposed to appoint a co-ordinator who will work with the Departments of Health, Welfare, Education and Labour with respect to those services best suited for re-establishing in positions of useful employment men and women who have some physical handicap and require special assistance.

The work of the committees of the Assembly will be extended in conformity with the procedure introduced at the beginning of the Twenty-fourth Legislature. Very important matters will be submitted to the Committee on Agriculture for its consideration. Among these, will be an act for the stabilization of the Dairy Industry. This Act will embody features of The Milk Control Act, The Dairy Products Act, The Milk and Cream Act and sections of The Farm Products Marketing Act. Provisions will also be submitted for the over-all management and co-ordination of all activities relating to dairy producers. As these proposals involve major

changes in present legislation, they will be submitted to the Committee on Agriculture for the most thorough consideration.

The work commenced under The Rural Telephone Systems Act of 1951 to improve telephone services for the people of the rural parts of Ontario is now entering a new and important phase of its operations. In order that this work will be further advanced, legislation will be introduced establishing the Ontario Telephone Authority. Steps will be taken to continue the great progress made in supplying electric power to our rural people. In excess of eighty-five per cent. of all rural dwellers in Ontario are now supplied with electric power. This places our Province in the forefront of the world in rural electrification—a service which has contributed so vitally to the betterment of the standard of living and the way of life of our people.

With the completion of the forest inventory over a vast section of Ontario, we are now entering the second stage of a sound forest management policy based on sustained yield. This policy embraces the processing of our provincial resources in Ontario, the elimination of indiscriminate cutting, the integration of operations to secure the maximum value from sawlogs and pulpwood, and the provision of roads which will not only strengthen our forest protection and conservation services, but make possible the commercial utilization of mature or over-mature stands which are at present inaccessible. A White Paper on forestry, setting out long-term aims and objectives, will be submitted for your consideration. It represents the long-range thinking of recognized authorities on this important subject and will be referred to the Committee on Lands and Forests for study. Amendments will be introduced to The Crown Timber Act, 1952, designed to effect the regeneration of suitable species on cut-over areas of Crown Lands. Other amendments will be introduced to the several acts relating to conservation of forest, fish and wild life, and will be referred to the appropriate committees.

Owing to the increase in the population of the Province, a measure for redistribution affecting the membership of the House will be submitted for your consideration.

At the last Session of the Legislature, Select Committees of the House were set up dealing with The Companies Act, Election laws, Indian affairs, The Cemeteries Act, Boundary Lake and Water Levels, and Reform Institutions. Gratitude is expressed to the members of these Committees for the diligent manner in which they have devoted themselves to their important tasks. Reports will be received from these Committees and action taken. Procedures in the House will be revised to enable the convening of the Committees of the House at a much earlier date than heretofore, so that the Members may have time for consideration of the matters referred to them for review.

Legislation covering a wide field of other subjects of great interest and concern to our people will be introduced. This legislation will include the consolidation into three Acts of eleven Acts relating to education. These three new Acts will be The Department of Education Act, The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act and The Schools Administration Act. Part one of The Municipal Act will be revised. Amendments will be introduced to The Assessment Act, The Labour Relations Act, The Building Trades Protection Act, The Agricultural Societies Act, The Bees Act, The Conservation Act, The Community Centres Act, The Mental Hospitals Act, The Mental Health Act, The Public Hospitals Act, The Public Health Amendment Act, The Cemeteries Act, The Pharmacy Act, The Charitable Institutions Act, The Hydro-Electric Power Commission Act, The Trees Act, The Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, The Mining Act, The Mining Tax Act, The Planning Act, The Housing Development Act, The Corporation Act, and The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act.

The Public Accounts for the last completed fiscal year will be submitted to you for your study and consideration. It is gratifying to know that the financial

position of the province is strong, and that the confidence which is reflected in the strength of the province's credit enables us to meet our requirements in the future; sure in the knowledge that we have the ability to carry them out.

At this time in referring to you your important duties may I express the hope that your deliberations and decisions will be guided by Divine Providence.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Prayers.

3.20 O'CLOCK P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: I have obtained a copy of His Honour's Speech, which in order to prevent mistakes, I will read (Dispensed with).

THE TERRITORIAL DIVISIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunbar moved first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Territorial Divisions Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. Frost (Premier) moved that the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor to this House be taken into consideration tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, there are some matters to which I would like to refer, and I know that my good friend, the Leader of the Opposition, would like to join with me, and have something to say with regard to these matters.

We are met here today with two very familiar faces missing from this House, one is John Duncan McPhee, the hon. member for East Simcoe, who has passed into the Great Beyond.

Doctor McPhee was born of a pioneer family at the historic Narrows near Orillia, my native town, and I have always claimed Doctor McPhee as a fellow townsman, in addition to being a great friend during my lifetime.

He served his day and generation well, as a physician and healer of the ill, as Councillor and Reeve of his municipality, of Port McNicoll, and for some ten years or more, as a member of this Assembly for East Simcoe.

He served with great ability and had great qualities of heart and mind. We knew him as a quiet and self-effacing man, a good friend, a wise counsellor, one who served all classes and creeds and kinds of people to the best of his great abilities.

Doctor McPhee was a physician. He and his lovely wife knew his condition and his ailment, yet his zeal for service in his profession and in his public capacity led him to live fearlessly. On one of the last occasions on which we saw him, my wife and I were with Doctor McPhee and his wife in St. Paul's Cathedral in London, at the time of the Coronation of Her Majesty.

In reference to his determination to live his life, and to live it well, and to live it fearlessly, I am reminded of Browning's thought that "the last is the best," and of Kipling, who said:

"If you can force your heart and nerve
and sinew

To serve your turn long after they are
gone,

And so hold on when there is nothing
in you

Except the Will which says to them
'Hold on'."

That was John Duncan McPhee, our good friend from East Simcoe and Port McNicoll, who is very much missed in the House today.

His fine personality has left a blank which will be very, very difficult to fill.

Another familiar face which will be missed is that of William Limburg Houck, who, for nearly twenty years, with some short intermissions, was the hon. member for Niagara Falls in this House. He resigned last year to become a member of the Federal Parliament, I may say, a different but not a higher service than here, because I believe that services, municipal, provincial and federal, are all on the same level of importance, but Mr. Houck felt his

services could be given best to his country in the Federal Parliament, and he is there today.

I would like to acknowledge the distinguished service which he performed for his province, and as a member, for his constituency. For some years, he was the Vice-Chairman of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, a man of genial presence, and engaging personality, who always made his contribution here, and he will be missed, quite aside from any party or other connection or affiliation, because of his great qualities of friendship and understanding.

Today, we may refer to him more formally, but we all had the highest regard for "Bill" Houck.

At the openings of the Legislature, it is always a very great pleasure to have with us former Premiers of this province, and today we have all five of the surviving Premiers of Ontario—five in number. I think this is the first occasion in history, insofar as the recollection of those here which goes back very many years indeed, when all of the former Premiers of this province have been present at the opening of Parliament.

I well remember—as many of you will—some four years ago, when we had all but two. At that time, the hon. Mr. Hepburn and the hon. Mr. Drew were unable to be present with us.

As a matter of interest, there have been fifteen former Prime Ministers since Confederation. That, of course, does not refer to the days between the first Parliament of Upper Canada, which met on the banks of the Niagara River on the 17th of September, 1792, up to the Confederation year of 1867. Since that time, 1867, when Ontario became the Ontario of today, and one of the provinces of Canada, we have had fifteen Premiers. I shall refer to those who have passed on.

The first was John Sandfield Macdonald, 1867-1871, the member for the Seat now represented by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley), and, as a matter of fact, leading at that time a type of coalition government.

He was followed by Edward Blake,

1871-1872. He was a very brilliant man indeed. He remained in office only for a short time, leaving to become a member of the Federal House, where he served for many years, and was afterwards in the British Parliament. Mr. Blake's brother, S. H. Blake, was a well-known figure in the city thirty or thirty-five years ago.

He was followed by a very great person, Sir Oliver Mowat, 1872-1896. Sir Oliver was the Premier of this province for twenty-four years, and also the Attorney-General during that period. He fought many constitutional cases before the Privy Council, and in his day, wrote many of the basic statutes of Ontario.

He was followed by Arthur Sturgis Hardy, 1896-1899.

Then came Sir George Ross, 1899-1905, Sir James Pliny Whitney, 1905-1914, Sir William Hearst, 1914-1919, George Howard Ferguson, 1923-1930,—I am not giving them now in the order of the periods during which they held office—who is also deceased, who was Premier from 1923 to 1930.

Mitchell Frederick Hepburn, 1934-1942,

Gordon Daniel Conant, 1942-1943.

I am very glad to say that the remaining five are here today. Seated in front of the treasury benches we have three of these distinguished citizens, and we are privileged to also have two sitting in the House.

They are, in order of office, Ernest Charles Drury, who was the Premier some 35 years ago. Mr. Drury is here today. He is still serving his country in his community as the sheriff of that great county of Simcoe, and as the local registrar, and county court clerk. Despite the passage of time, he still has the vigour to carry on these offices.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Drury comes, of course, from the grand county of Simcoe, a resident of the old township of Oro, one of the historic townships of this province, closely connected with things which are dear to our hearts, one of which is the abolition of discrimination on the grounds of race, colour or

creed, because old Oro township was one of the stations of the underground railway in the days of the Civil War, and to this township came many of those fine people who escaped from slavery in the South, and settled in the township of Oro, from which fact it was given its name.

Mr. Drury was the first Premier of Ontario to come from Simcoe County, and his father before him was a member of the House and was one of Ontario's Ministers of Agriculture. So, in the Drury family we have had some grand citizens, who have left a fine impression on this province.

Then we have one who is well known to all of us. He was my desk mate in other years, Charles Stewart Henry, who was Premier some 20 years ago. Mr. Henry in his day and generation made a great contribution to the welfare of the province. Some ten years ago he retired to the position of Country Squire, living out in Oriole, and he tells me his peace is disturbed by the ever-increasing roar of expanding Metropolitan Toronto.

Then we have George Alexander Drew, who is the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in Ottawa. It is nice to see Mr. Drew here today. In less formal times, I would say "George." We are happy to see you here today looking younger, and I think more vigorous than in the days when you displayed such great vigour standing where I am standing today. It is a great pleasure to have him here.

Then we have seated in this House, another very distinguished citizen, in the person of Harry Corwin Nixon, the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. Nixon is the dean of this House, as his first appearance here was away back in 1919, even though his youthful appearance today belies that statement. He came into the House as a contemporary of Mr. Drury, who was his Leader at that time. Mr. Nixon was a member of Mr. Drury's Cabinet, going back 35 years. We all know Mr. Nixon, and all I can say is, that he is just like Old Man River, he rolls along, and it is a pleasure to see him here today, and

see him looking as youthful as he did the first time I saw him many years ago.

Then the fifth, in order of succession, is my grand old friend, who sits on my right, Thomas Laird Kennedy, who has served the province in many capacities, including being the Premier at one time. Perhaps his most distinguishing feature is the fact that for all these years he has been the hon. member for Peel. You all know Colonel Kennedy, and there is very little I need to say about him.

We all know the five gentlemen I have mentioned, but I think of all the members of the House, Colonel Kennedy is the most youthful. A short time ago, I met some friends who said they had seen Colonel Kennedy and his wife in Mexico, walking around very briskly, and taking part in the affairs down there.

It is a very great pleasure on this occasion to have the privilege of honouring all these gentlemen who have served the province well in their day and generation, according to the lights of things as they saw them.

I am very glad indeed to make reference to them at this opening of the Fourth Session of the Twenty-fourth Legislature.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would join at once with the hon. Premier in paying a tribute to the life of Doctor John McPhee, who was a member of this Legislature for some ten years.

Doctor McPhee, as we knew him, was a friend to all of us; he was a humanitarian in every respect; he belonged to that group of learned, yet practical men, the medical practitioners of this province, the men who have carved a niche for themselves in the very fabric of this province of ours.

We share with the hon. Premier the tribute to this Parliamentarian who has gone on, and left us in this Chamber.

In reference to my colleague, and my friend, Mr. Houck, the former member for Niagara Falls, who now has gone to a wider if not higher field in the Federal arena, I want to say, with the

hon. Premier, that we are all of us aware of the great contributions which Mr. Houck has made to the political life of this province, and all of us, on both sides of the House, have had the opportunity and pleasure of sharing his friendship over a long number of years.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Premier speaks of the five honoured guests we have in the House this afternoon, may I say it is indeed a unique occasion when at the opening of a legislative meeting we can have five former Premiers with us, looking very fit and well indeed.

Reference was made to the first on the list, Mr. Drury, from the County of Simcoe. Mr. Drury was elected Premier in 1919, in what was considered at that time to be a novel experiment in politics in this province and having consideration for the difficulties which were attached to that experiment, all of us in this House and in this province generally, have a very high regard for the capabilities Mr. Drury manifested, and which he has carried on into his administration at this time.

As the hon. Premier has correctly said, Mr. Drury has not actually retired from active community life of this province; he is carrying on in the office of Sheriff in Barrie, and the other offices attached thereto, and I think it bears repetition that he is making a contribution to the cause of conservation in this province, perhaps equalled by no other single person. I think all of us are cognizant of the great work Mr. Drury has done along the lines of conservation, which, in my judgment, and I think in the judgment of many of us here, is a very important matter.

When I come to our old friend, Mr. Henry, may I say that he has been a friend of many of us over a long number of years. He brought to this Legislature a very wide experience in municipal life. He brought to the House as well, an intimate, keen knowledge of agricultural problems; he was, in turn, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Highways, and he gave great service to the people of this province during the tenure of his membership in this Legislative Assembly.

When it comes to my friend, Mr. Drew, I have, of necessity, to be more cautious in my appraisal, because he belongs with the other three I have mentioned, in that he is still actively engaged in the political life of this province and this country.

These gentlemen have made great contributions to the political life of this province and this country, and are actively engaged in adding to those contributions, as the years go on. It can be said, Mr. Speaker, that they have "built better than they knew," and it can also be said that the people of this province and of this country are the benefactors of the great services we recognize in this Chamber today.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the hon. Premier and the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition, in offering our condolences to the family of the late Doctor McPhee.

As correctly stated by the hon. Premier, Doctor McPhee was a quiet, self-effacing man; he went quietly about his job in the House, and did his work, and those who met him knew him as a genial and quiet friend. I am sure he will be missed by all of us, and to look across at the purple-draped seat so recently occupied by the hon. member, reminds us that he will no longer be with us in this House.

As regards "Bill" Houck, who has gone on to Ottawa; I know I will miss him, because he was my desk mate, occupying the seat now occupied by the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand). "Bill" and I got to be good friends, as I know he was a friend of all in the House. We will all miss "Bill" in the debates in the House.

As for the former Premiers of this province, I am glad to see these fine, old gentlemen—of course, not all of them are "old gentlemen," and probably George Drew would not like being so referred to—but when I say that, I am looking particularly at Mr. Drury and Mr. Henry, men whom we have greeted here on many occasions. I am very glad to see them here, and I hope they will be with us on many more occasions, as

also our two former Premiers sitting in the House, and we would be glad to have their advice and counsel for many more years.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, since none of the others have spoken for me, I want to take this liberty and opportunity, with your permission, to also express my sympathy to the family of the late Doctor McPhee, and to the government, and to the Party to which he belonged.

During the years I have had the privilege of being in this House, and serving with him, I acquired a great respect for his sincerity, for his interest in public affairs, and I am sure that although the Party to which he belonged has unfortunately regained the seat so quickly, with all due regard to the hon. member who will replace him, I am sure Doctor McPhee will be missed, and we will all be aware of his absence.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the gentlemen who have headed the governments in the past; I cannot, like some of those who have spoken before me, indulge in memories and reminiscences, and even if I could, perhaps it would be wiser to refrain from so doing. I can only say I am very glad they are all with us. It is true that I did not always see eye to

eye with them. That, of course, is not unnatural. What surprised me from time to time was that they did not see eye to eye with me. That was surprising.

I am glad they are active, each in his own way, and I am glad, year after year, to see, if not all of them, some of them present here, some of those who have given up hope of heading governments, but have undoubtedly pieces of legislation they can look back upon with pride, and whose names are associated with legislation which sections of the population look upon as being an advance in the realm of life.

To those who are aspiring, all I can say is may they serve the people well, and also have the opportunity of contributing toward such legislation as will be of lasting benefit to a majority of the people.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. In the past, we have usually adjourned until two o'clock on Friday, but that will not be the case on our first adjournment. We will meet at three o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and I will arrange for the motion for two o'clock later on.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.55 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, February 12, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, February 12, 1954.

Notice of vacancies and writs for election of members, Rev. M. C. Davies	13
Introducing Mr. Arthur C. Jolley, Mr. Frost	13
Motion for provision for printing reports, Mr. Frost, agreed to	13
Motion for appointment of Standing Committees, Mr. Frost, agreed to	15
Motion to appoint Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House for the present Session	16
Presentation of Accounts, Mr. Welsh	17
Department of Education Act, Mr. Dunlop, first reading	17
Administration of Justice Expenses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	17
Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading ...	17
The Coroners Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	18
The County Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	18
The Deserted Wives and Maintenance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading ..	18
The Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	18
The Division Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	18
The Evidence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	18
The Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	19
The Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	19
The Jurors Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	19
The Magistrates Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	20
The Mechanics' Lien Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	20
The Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	20
The Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	20
The Warehouse Receipts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	20
The Wills Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	21
Invitation to view Subway in operation, Mr. Frost	21
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	21

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that I have received during the recess of the House notification of vacancies which have occurred in the Membership of the House by reason of the resignation of William L. Houck, Member for the Electoral District of Niagara Falls, and the death of John Duncan McPhee, Member for the Electoral District of Simcoe East, and have issued my Warrant to the Chief Election Officer for the issue of writs for the election of Members to serve in the present Legislature for the following Electoral Districts:

The Electoral District of Niagara Falls.

The Electoral District of Simcoe East.

I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Chief Election Officer and laid upon the Table a certificate of the result of a by-election held since the last Session of the House:

Electoral District of Niagara Falls—

Mr. Arthur C. Jolley.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg your permission to leave the Chamber, accompanied by the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch) to escort the member-elect for the riding of Niagara Falls, to the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present Mr. Arthur C. Jolley, member-

elect for the riding of Niagara Falls, who has taken the Oaths, signed the Roll, and now claims his right to a seat in this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

Motions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Moves that during the present Session of the Legislative Assembly provision be made for the taking and printing of reports of debates and speeches and to that end that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ an editor of debates and speeches and the necessary stenographers at such rates of compensation as may be agreed to by him; also that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports in the amount of eight hundred copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, to the Legislative Library, to each Member of the Assembly, to the Reference Libraries of the Province, to the Press Gallery, to the newspapers of the Province as approved by Mr. Speaker, and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the Assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say, in connection with this motion, that the motion introduced to-

day is different in wording, and purport, in relation to printing, than the motion I very violently argued, for some years.

This matter was referred to the Committee on Printing who overruled my point of view. So I very gladly bow to that; I accept that, and I trust that those who sometimes criticize me, will never again say that I would flout the wishes of a majority of this House in any way. I am very glad to accept the finding of the Committee, and I hope this will settle this issue for all time.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I naturally rush to compliment the government and the hon. Prime Minister upon their return to sanity in relation to this particular matter and also to say to the hon. Prime Minister that I recall last year, when opposing the thing he now supports in the Legislature, he said it was a matter to him, as Provincial Treasurer, of dollars and cents. If my recollection is accurate, I believe he said that the former mode of recording the speeches by the hon. members cost somewhere between \$10,000 and \$15,000, and that he felt that any innovation such as we have approved today, would cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

For the information of the hon. members, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister what an analysis of the situation has revealed in respect to the financial aspect of this problem? Is it going to cost \$100,000? What is the relation between the cost of the former method and the one which is proposed today?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I am quite sure that the reference to "\$50,000 or \$100,000" was a figure that he himself blew up. I do not think I was ever guilty of saying that. If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected.

The Standing Committee looked at this. I think the old method cost us about \$20,000. Under the new method,

the cost will be somewhere between \$32,000 and \$35,000 a year.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to congratulate the government on taking this step forward, because they took it so reluctantly, and we had to badger them for years, for the sake of only \$15,000, less than it costs to fill a hole in some secondary highway. I am sorry I mentioned that; I did not mean anything about highways; I was just using it as an illustration.

One of the arguments mentioned by the hon. Prime Minister was that it would cost between \$40,000 and \$50,000; now we find it will cost much less. I am sure all hon. members of the House are happy now, but I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he would consent to make some re-arrangement for the re-organization of *Hansard* of past years, so that we can handle them? At the present time, they are unwieldy; they are in enormous volume; we cannot move them, nor keep them in our libraries, nor private studies, nor at our homes. If they were necessary at the time, then I think they should be put into some form which is manageable.

I would most respectfully suggest—I do not want to appeal again to the government—that they spend a few thousand dollars to provide at least permanent copies of a size which hon. members, the Legislative Library, and other institutions can have a proper record of the proceedings of the Legislatures of the past years. I am not even emphasizing they be printed; there may be other forms which can be used at less expense, and at the same time, in a manner which will enable us to move *Hansard* without endangering our health, and becoming a patient in a hospital, for a special type of operation usually found necessary after lifting a terrific load. I hope the hon. Prime Minister will give this some thought and some consideration.

HON. MR. FROST: In connection with the cost, I forgot to say that the Committee of the House recommended

800 copies, and that is in the motion. At the time I intervened some years ago, copies were being printed in the thousands, and it amounted to a great bill.

One of the things which convinces me there is merit in the recommendation of the Committee, is the fact that they limited it to 800 copies, and in these matters, I have tried to be reasonable.

In response to the question by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)—a very long, double-barreled question—my answer is in the negative.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly in the same position as the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) who hesitated to compliment the government and then giving an explanation of why he was so inhibited.

I do not hesitate to compliment the government—which I do forthwith, on the step they have taken. I think it will be of benefit to have *Hansard* in a form easily carried around, easily referred to, and easy to store away.

Coming now to the question of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) to whom the hon. Prime Minister has given an answer, may I suggest that perhaps we could go back over the years 1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953, and bring the *Hansard* forward in a less bulky form, perhaps taking one set each year.

In 1949, we had very fine volumes of *Hansard*, and we are starting again in 1954. I think as time goes by, we could do one set per year, and we then need not be too much concerned with the cost, and eventually we would have a complete set from the time we started printing *Hansard*.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) nearly overwhelms me with his logic, and I will refer it to the Committee on Printing.

MR. OLIVER: I am now quoting from the remarks by the hon. Prime Minister as found at page 80 of *Hansard* last year, where he is quoted as having said:

"It is so easy to start something which at the beginning costs \$10,000 or \$15,000 and then suddenly goes up to \$100,000."

HON. MR. FROST: I agree.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moved, that Standing Committees of this House, for the present Session, be appointed for the following purposes: 1. On Privileges and Elections; 2. On Education; 3. On Private Bills; 4. On Standing Orders; 5. On Public Accounts; 6. On Printing; 7. On Municipal Law; 8. On Legal Bills; 9. On Agriculture; 10. On Game and Fish; 11. On Labour; 12. On Mining; 13. On Government Commissions; 14. On Lands and Forests; 15. On Travel and Publicity; 16. On Health; 17. On Conservation.

Which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as shall be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister if Number 17 referring to Conservation will be the only new committee to be set up?

HON. MR. FROST: That is the only new committee. The committees are the same as we have had in previous years, with the addition, as I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) will recollect, two or three years ago, of a committee on Government Commissions. There probably have also been other committees added, but that is the same list as last year, with the addition of the Committee on Conservation.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves, that a Select Committee of eleven Members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House, such Committee to be composed as follows:—

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk).

Allen (Middlesex South), Chartrand, Collings, Cowling, Grummett, Kerr, Mackenzie, Pringle, Pryde and Robson.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of four members.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, my reason for introducing this motion this afternoon is that I am anxious this Committee be convened and report to this House on Monday afternoon.

The purpose is that we have, as I think is evident from the Speech from the Throne, a heavy committee programme and I am most anxious the committees of the House should be convened early, so they may meet for organization, and they should have ample time to consider all matters which will be referred to them.

Last year, I regretted that the committee on Government Commissions apparently was convened quite late, and there was, perhaps, little opportunity for the members themselves to ask questions and discuss matters which were raised. That was not intentional. Profiting from that, I have asked that the committees be constituted and convened early, so that the members should have, in every case, ample time to discuss the matters which are referred to them, for consideration.

I am a believer in committees of the House dealing with matters of government. I am most anxious that the talents and abilities and views of the hon. members of the House should be reflected in the action that is here taken, and I do not know of any better opportunity to do that than in the more informal atmosphere which prevails in the committee. I quite realize that sometimes it is difficult in a House such as this with its strict procedure, even in discussions in the Committee of the Whole House, to discuss the pros and cons of matters, and I think much of that difficulty could be overcome by committee procedure.

I do not think that we have ever had in the history of the Province of Ontario, a duplication of the committee idea to the extent we have today, and I am most anxious they should proceed this year,

and that these committees will be constituted and convened early. Therefore, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members composing this Committee, with the Clerk of the House, meet before the sitting on Monday and name the memberships of these committees.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): If I am not too much out of order, I would like to ask if it is the intention to deal with the Redistribution Bill by a Select or Standing Committee?

HON. MR. FROST: I will deal with that at an early date. A Standing Committee, I think, has been the custom in the past in regard to other redistributions. I will give that consideration and advise the House at a very early date.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves, that Mr. T. R. Dent, the hon. member for the electoral district of Oxford, be appointed Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House for the present Session.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be out of order, I know the motion has been carried, but perhaps in view of the present situation we might retreat a little.

May I be permitted to say that it is a very great pleasure to propose the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Dent) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. I would like to say, also, before he ascends the rostrum that he has been a member of this House for eleven years this coming August. He is a very popular, worthy member of the House.

We all regret the fact that poliomyelitis has struck his household and we hope that his son may be afforded early and complete recovery.

The hon. member represents a very great county, a riding which I might have mentioned yesterday in referring to one of the former Prime Ministers, Sir Oliver Mowat, who belonged to a different party than the Government

in office today. However, although his Government and his administration were great, it was no more progressive in its legislation than that which is introduced in these days.

The hon. member came from that county as well. I would also like to say that the hon. member is not only the representative of a great riding, but the representative of a great industry, that of agriculture. It is a pleasure indeed for me to propose this motion.

Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wanted to say to you that so long as the system prevails which seems to indicate the government has the choice of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, I do not know that we could be more pleased than to have that appointment go to yourself, and I would like to say we feel your ingrained sense of fairness will ensure impartiality to all who come under your direction.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House the following:

(1) The Public Accounts for the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1953;

(2) The Report of the Provincial Auditor, 1952-53;

(3) The Twenty-seventh Report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario, for the twelve-months' fiscal year ending 31st of March, 1953;

(4) The Seventh Report of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario, for the twelve-months' fiscal period ending March 31st, 1953.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Moves first reading of a Bill intituled, "The Department of Education Act 1954."

Motion agreed to.

MR. OLIVER: Will the hon. Minister of Education give some intimation of what this Bill contains.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House that this is "over-all project," if you might call it such, consolidating twelve Education Acts, that is, twelve Acts affecting the Department of Education, into three. This is the first of that consolidation.

The three Acts which are being consolidated in this one now put forward, are the old The Department of Education Act, The Schools for the Deaf and Blind Act, and the Vocational Education Act. There are some sections in those three Acts which have become obsolete, and are not at all suitable for practise at the present day. Therefore, we have gone ahead with the idea of bringing all of those up to date.

May I assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that there is no new policy involved, no new principle introduced, but it is simply a consolidation and bringing up-to-date of those twelve Acts. This is the first one. There will be two more, I hope.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Expenses Act."

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill covers two points. In the first place, it repeals a section concerning the agreements which may be made between a county council and the clerk of the peace, for payments in lieu of fees. That is now being dealt with in the Crown Attorneys Act in a somewhat slightly different form. Secondly, it provides that the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto shall be deemed to be a city for the purposes of this Act.

I might say that this Bill, and the others which I propose to introduce today, will be referred to the Legal Bills Committee in due course.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act."

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill makes a change in the section of the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act which provide that the renewal statement must be filed annually to keep the chattel mortgage alive. Under the present Statute, the statement must contain a complete itemized list of the payments of principal and interest which have been made during the year.

This amendment simply provides that a lump sum may be inserted as to the amount of money paid during the year, and should add very much to the convenience of carrying out transactions of this kind.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that all these bills will go to the Legal Bills Committee.

THE CORONERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Coroners Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill confirms by Statute arrangements which have been made where the Chief Coroner of a city is also the Supervising Coroner, and the corporation of the city has appointed or appoints a secretary for him, the corporation shall be reimbursed quarterly out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the extent of one-third of the salary and the cost-of-living bonus, if any, of such a secretary, and one-third of the amount, if any, paid by the corporation under the Civic Pension Fund or plan in respect of such secretary.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The County Courts Act".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: The section repealed provides that the clerk of the peace shall, ex officio, be clerk of the county court, registrar of the surrogate court or local registrar when there is a vacancy. The provisions are now dealt with in The Judicature Act.

THE DESERTED WIVES AND MAINTENANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives and Maintenance Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment which authorizes judges of juvenile courts to try cases of husbands who have deserted their wives, and the jurisdiction in all cases will be given to the juvenile and family courts, and where there are no such courts, the cases are to be tried by a magistrate.

THE CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill covers in a more complete way the section which is to be repealed from the Administration of Justice Expenses Act, which has been introduced. It is considered this a more appropriate place for dealing with the provision for agreement between the crown attorney and a county for the computation of fees.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides that the cost of all books, forms, stationery and supplies, with respect to the division courts having jurisdiction in the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, shall be repaid by the clerk of the Metropolitan area, upon certification by an inspector.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Evidence Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is recommended by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada in an effort to bring about uniformity of law across Canada in the fields covered by these two sections.

Section 40 contains no new principles. It replaces the provisions repealed by section 2 of the bill and brings the terminology into line with the National Defence Act (Canada).

Section 41 replaces sections 40 and 41 of the present Act. It sets out the instances in which affidavits may be taken outside Ontario for use within Ontario. These instances are basically unchanged but are expressed in more appropriate language.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, this Bill amends The Insurance Act with reference to certain exclusions which may be made in an insurance policy by an endorsement approved by the Superintendent.

In the second place, it deals with cases where there may be more than one motor vehicle policy of insurance insuring a person named therein, and that person also is insured under another motor vehicle policy.

Section 11: The amendment provides that an insurer shall not be liable under an owner's policy or a driver's policy for loss or damage as set out in clause "g" where the coverage is expressly excluded by an endorsement approved by the Superintendent.

Section 2: Where more than one motor vehicle liability policy insures a person named therein and that person is also insured under another motor vehicle liability policy as an unnamed insured, the effect of the present provisions is that the driver's policy is primary insurance and the owner's policy is excess insurance. The amendment reverses this order and provides that

the owner's policy shall be primary insurance and the driver's policy excess insurance.

There might be two policies which cover the same damage, and if there is a claim for five thousand dollars, and there are two policies, each for five thousand dollars, then the owner's policy will be the one which pays. If a claim is for six thousand dollars, the owner's policy pays the five thousand dollars, and the other policy, the excess of one thousand dollars.

This does not affect in any way the rights of the insured; it simply affects the rights of certain insurance companies. This amendment has been asked for by the insurance companies.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

He said: The first amendment of The Judicature Act contained in this Bill provides that where the Chief Justice of the High Court is absent or for any reason is unable to act, his power shall be exercised and his duties performed by the Senior Judge of the High Court able to act in his stead.

Secondly, the Court of Appeals which may now sit in two divisions may come under this amendment, sit in one division or two or more divisions as the Chief Justice of Ontario may direct from time to time.

Then, finally, this Bill provides for the uniform provision dealing with the absence of or vacancy in the office of local registrars, county court clerks and surrogate registrars.

THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Jurors Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Under the present law, a juror who serves is not exempt from further service within any particular time after that occasion. A juror may possibly—and in many cases does—become liable to serve, even though he may have served within a year.

The Coroners' jurors differ, in that there is a three-year period of

exemption, and they cannot be compelled to serve on a jury within that time.

This amendment extends the provision to all jurors. There will be a three-year exemption in all cases.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Magistrates Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the first place this Bill provides that all magistrates have jurisdiction throughout Ontario, and, in the second place, every judge and deputy judge of a juvenile and family court be ex officio a magistrate in and for the area served by his court.

THE MECHANICS' LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, under The Mechanics' Lien Act, as it is now framed, a workman who earns \$10 a day or less cannot waive the benefits of the Act by agreement or otherwise, but if his wages are more than \$10 a day, he may do so.

At one time the figure was \$3, which prevailed until 1910; then it was raised to \$5 and continued until 1923. It is now \$10, and it is considered that \$10 is too little, under present-day circumstances, and that the figure should be raised to \$15, so that any workman who earns \$15 a day or less cannot waive the benefits of The Mechanics' Lien Act.

THE MINORS' PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment is to give jurisdiction in cases under this Act to juvenile and

family courts, and where there are no such courts, the cases will be tried in a magistrate's court.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the surrogate court judges are appointed by the province, whereas, of course, the county court judges and the high court judges are appointed by the federal government.

Heretofore, the county judges have almost invariably been appointed also as surrogate court judges by the province, and provision is made in the Act for the payment of their salaries for their services as Surrogate Judges. However, there is one case in particular which has arisen where one who is not a county court judge was appointed as a Surrogate Court Judge, and this provides that there be authority to pay for his services in that capacity.

THE WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Warehouse Receipts Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Warehouse Receipts Act is an Act which deals with the warehouse receipts given by warehousemen when they store goods for people. The receipt under the Act became almost a negotiable instrument in that the ownership of goods in storage could be changed by passing the receipt from hand to hand.

There is one provision in the Act which says it may be extended to cover certain other concerns, such as departmental stores, dyers and cleaners, which store garments, furs, and so forth, for people who secure this type of business from the ordinary warehousemen.

This section of the Act has never become effective, because it was provided that it would only come into force upon proclamation. That section has never been proclaimed, and it is considered it is not advisable nor necessary to proclaim it, and this Bill would repeal that section.

THE WILLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Wills Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is another which was recommended by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada, and also recommended by a number of eminent authorities on wills, for instance, by Dean Falconbridge, who was formerly a Dean of the Law School.

The section of this Act deals with the formalities required for the execution of wills, when made outside the jurisdiction of Ontario.

It is quite an involved matter, and has given rise to a great deal of judicial comment, and these sections have been prepared after prolonged studies by the authorities I have mentioned, for the purpose of improving the procedure as it now stands.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I believe that completes the business for today. As the hon. members know, it takes time to become organized, to have bills introduced and printed, and to bring other matters of business into consideration.

On Wednesday, there has been an invitation extended by the Toronto Transit Commission to the hon. members of this House, and I think to the hon. members of Parliament, the gentlemen of the Senate, and other bodies, to attend a reception and view the new subway development in Toronto.

Some days ago — indeed it may be some weeks ago — the Commission

asked if it would be possible on the 17th of February for the House to adjourn a little earlier, to permit the members to accept the invitation.

It seemed to me perhaps the best way of handling that would be to have the House meet on the 17th of February at two o'clock in the afternoon, which would permit of adjournment perhaps before four o'clock, which is the time set for the function.

It is not very often we are asked to do anything of this kind, but, on the other hand, it is not very often a subway is about to be opened in Canada. In fact, I think this is the first time it has happened in our country, and I am sure it would be a very fine thing to enable the hon. members to see that very unique work, and take the trip which is planned by the Toronto Transit Commission.

I would like to advise the House that on Tuesday I will probably move the House meet at two o'clock, instead of three, but that again, Mr. Speaker, depends, of course, on the amount of business on the Order Paper. As a matter of fact, in the first days of the Session, the Order Paper is usually light, but if it is necessary to call the House at two o'clock, I will advise the members on Tuesday.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he intends to proceed with the moving and seconding of the Address on Tuesday?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, sir, the mover and seconder will deliver their addresses on Tuesday.

I noticed in the paper there was a mistake in that it said that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault) would second the motion. As a matter of fact, the motion will be seconded by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Nodeu). That was, I suppose, due to a similarity in the pronunciation of their names.

Mr. Speaker: I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.02 p.m.





ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, February 15, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, February 15, 1954.

Reading and Receiving Petitions	25
Report of Committees	26
Presentation of Reports, Mr. A. G. Welsh	37
The Telephone Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Challies, first reading	37
The Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. T. D. Thomas, first reading	37
Passing of Miss Agnes MacPhail, expressions of regret, Mr. Frost, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Salsberg	37
The Department of Education Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Dunlop, second reading	40
The Administration of Justice Expenses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	40
Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	40
The Coroners Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
The County Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
The Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
The Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
The Jurors Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
The Magistrates Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
The Mechanics' Lien Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	41
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	41

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1954

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Corporation of the County of Frontenac praying that an Act may pass authorizing The Frontenac High School Board to present its annual estimates to the Council of the County of Frontenac only; and for other purposes.

Of The Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital praying that an Act may pass authorizing an increase in the number of elected governors from 12 to 30.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Fergus praying that an Act may pass changing the name of "The Groves Memorial Hospital" to "The Groves Memorial Community Hospital" and establish "The Groves Memorial Community Hospital Commission."

Of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass validating certain employees' retiring allowances; and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Mimico praying that an Act may pass authorizing payment of pensions to employees of the Corporation; and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of The Home for the Friendless and Infants' Home pray-

ing that an Act may pass dissolving the said Corporation and authorizing the transfer of its assets to Hamilton Hospital Associates, Inc.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Hespeler praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the said Town from the County of Waterloo.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass empowering the Corporation to declare certain areas of the Township to be thirty-miles-per-hour speed limit areas.

Of the Corporation of the City of London praying that an Act may pass confirming an Order of The Ontario Municipal Board annexing part of the Township of London to the said city.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Paris praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the said Town from the County of Brant.

Of the Board of The Royal Botanical Paris praying that an Act may pass enlarging the membership of the said Board.

Of the Corporation of the City of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws classifying and regulating tourist establishments.

Of the Corporation of the Town of St. Marys praying that an Act may pass confirming a by-law of the Town regulating a fixed rate of taxation for farming lands in the said Town.

Of the Corporation of Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the transfer of the Company to the

City of Sao Paulo in the State of Sao Paulo, United States of Brazil; and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of St. Catharines praying that an Act may pass vesting the St. Catharines Public Market in the Corporation, in fee simple, free from any trust; and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of St. Thomas praying that an Act may pass validating the annexation of certain lands by the City; and for other purposes.

Of Argue Martin, Q.C., Frank P. Goldblatt, et al, praying that an Act may pass incorporating The Hamilton Foundation.

Of the Corporation of St. Michael's College praying that an Act may pass empowering the College to confer degrees in theology including honorary degrees.

Of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass confirming the purchase of certain lands for industrial sites by the City.

Of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass enabling the Trustees of the R. A. Morrow Memorial Park to convey to the Corporation part of the Park for the site of a Memorial Community Centre.

Of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec praying that an Act may pass respecting the power of the Boards of the Convention to hold real and personal property.

Of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership of The Ottawa Transportation Commission; and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of Toronto praying that an Act may pass confirming a by-law respecting service and disability pensions for civic employees; and for other purposes.

Of Walter Juxon Blackburn, Verschoyle Philip Cronyn, Roy Watt Robertson, et al, praying that an Act may pass incorporating The London Foundation.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Sandwich West praying that an Act may pass terminating the corporate existence of the Town of Ojibway and restoring the lands contained therein to the said Township.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Palmerston praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership in The Palmerston Hospital Commission.

MR. PRINGLE (Addington): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the Standing Committees of the House and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Pringle from the Committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the Standing Committees of the House, presents the following report:

Your Committee recommends that the Standing Committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:—

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Collings, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Hall, Janes, Leavine, Lyons, Murdoch, Myers, Nixon, Oliver, Root, Stewart, Thomas (Ontario)—17.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand - Norfolk), Beech, Brandon, Chartrand, Child, Collings, Cowling, Dent, Downer, Fishleigh, Herbert, Janes, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Jolley, Kerr, Leavine, MacOdrum, Manley, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Nault, Nickle, Patrick, Pryde, Robson, Root, Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Wardrope, Whitney, Wren—32.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand - Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South),

Beckett, Brandon, Cathcart, Chartrand, Child, Collings, Cowling, Dent, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Herbert, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Jolley, Kennedy, Kerr, Leavine, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackenzie, MacOdrum, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Nickle, Nixon, Noden, Parry, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Reaume, Roberts, Root, Sandercock, Stewart, Villeneuve, Weaver, Wren, Yaremko—53.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand - Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Beech, Cathcart, Chartrand, Child, Connell, Dempsey, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Leavine, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackenzie, MacOdrum, Manley, Mapledoram, Morrow, Murdoch, Nault, Nickle, Noden, Parry, Patrick, Pryde, Robson, Salsberg, Sandercock, Stewart, Yaremko—33.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messrs. Beckett, Beech, Brandon, Cathcart, Chartrand, Child, Collings, Connell, Cowling, Downer, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Herbert, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Jolley, Kerr, Lyons, Mackenzie, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, Nixon, Oliver, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Roberts, Roberts, Robson, Root, Ward, Wardrope, Weaver, Whitney, Yaremko—47.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand - Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South),

Beckett, Brandon, Collings, Connell, Cowling, Dent, Fullerton, Gordon, Hunt, Kerr, Manley, Murdoch, Nickle, Parry, Roberts, Sandercock, Thomas (Ontario), Wardrope, Weaver, Yaremko—22.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Beckett, Beech, Brandon, Cathcart, Chartrand, Child, Collings, Connell, Cowling, Downer, Edwards, Elliott, Hanna, Harvey, Hunt, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Jolley, Kerr, Leavine, Lyons, Macaulay, MacOdrum, Manley, Morningstar, Murdoch, Myers, Pryde, Reaume, Roberts, Roberts, Root, Salsberg, Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Weaver, Whitney, Wren, Yaremko—42.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS

Messrs. Beckett, Chartrand, Dempsey, Downer, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Macaulay, MacOdrum, Murdoch, Nickle, Nixon, Noden, Pryde, Roberts, Roberts, Root, Sandercock, Wardrope, Weaver, Yaremko—21.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand - Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Cathcart, Child, Connell, Dempsey, Dent, Downer, Edwards, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Hall, Hamilton, Hanna, Harvey, Herbert, Hunt, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Kennedy, Leavine, Mackenzie, Manley, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, Nault, Nixon, Noden, Oliver, Parry, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Roberts, Robson, Root, Sandercock, Scott, Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Ward, Wardrope, Whitney, Wren—49.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON GAME AND FISH

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Beckett, Beech, Cathcart, Chartrand, Connell, Dempsey, Dent, Downer, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, Herbert, Hunt, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnstone (Bruce), Jolley, Lyons, Mackenzie, MacOdrum, Manley, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Murdoch, Myers, Nault, Nixon, Noden, Parry, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Robson, Root, Sandercock, Scott, Villeneuve, Ward, Wardrope, Weaver, Whitney, Wren—51.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON LABOUR

Messrs. Beech, Brandon, Child, Collings, Elliott, Fishleigh, Harvey, Herbert, Johnston (Parry Sound), Jolley, Kerr, Macaulay, MacOdrum, Manley, Mapledoram, Morningstar, Murdoch, Myers, Nault, Nickle, Reaume, Roberts, Robson, Salsberg, Stewart, Thomas (Ontario), Wardrope, Weaver, Wren—29.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON MINING

Messrs. Brandon, Dempsey, Elliott, Fullerton, Grummett, Harvey, Herbert, Hunt, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnstone (Bruce), Lyons, Macaulay, Mapledoram, Murdoch, Nickle, Noden, Oliver, Pringle, Pryde, Roberts, Sandercock, Stewart, Villeneuve, Ward, Wardrope, Weaver, Whitney, Wren—28.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Challies, Chartrand, Cowling, Elliott, Grummett, Hall,

Janes, Macaulay, MacOdrum, Nixon, Patrick, Villeneuve, Weaver, Whitney—15.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND FORESTS

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Cathcart, Connell, Dempsey, Fullerton, Gordon, Grummett, Herbert, Hunt, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Lyons, Mackenzie, Mapledoram, Myers, Noden, Oliver, Pringle, Scott, Villeneuve, Wardrope, Wren—23.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY

Messrs. Brandon, Cathcart, Cowling, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Harvey, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Jolley, Morningstar, Murdoch, Noden, Roberts, Roberts, Stewart, Thomas (Ontario), Whitney, Wren—19.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Beech, Connell, Downer, Edwards, Fishleigh, Fullerton, Johnston (Parry Sound), Kerr, Leavine, Manley, Mapledoram, Myers, Pryde, Reaume, Stewart, Thomas (Ontario)—17.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION

Messrs. Beckett, Cowling, Dempsey, Dent, Edwards, Hamilton, Hunt, Janes, Mackenzie, Mapledoram, Myers, Nixon, Oliver, Parry, Patrick, Pryde, Sandercock, Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Weaver—20.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of five members.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, may I say

that the membership of all those Committees can be added to or subtracted from if any of the hon. members of the House desire changes. I think the Committees are substantially the same as they were last year.

The Committee work this Session is, I think, going to be quite heavy. We have purposely taken steps to constitute the Committees so that the work may proceed without delay. Last year, I think some of the Committees met very late in the Session, with the result that they did not have the opportunity to go as fully into the matters referred to as they would have liked to do. The cure for that is to begin early. I wish the Clerk of the House and the others having to do with the organization of these Committees would see that they are called promptly. I would suggest that this start tomorrow morning, so the Chairmen of the Committees can be appointed after which the Committees will be ready to go ahead and function.

There is a matter to which I should like to refer particularly, but if the motion is put, I will have to refer to it before the Orders of the Day. However, I will bow to Your Honour's ruling if I am out of order.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the hon. Prime Minister's suggestion that other names could be added to the Committees, I noticed in regard to one Committee, at least, the Public Accounts Committee, I had asked that the name of Mr. Wren be included, but I do not think it was so included.

HON. MR. FROST: I will be very glad to arrange that at once.

MR. OLIVER: It will be a very interesting Committee and I would not want him to miss whatever may come before it.

HON. MR. FROST: The motion can be changed to add Mr. Wren's name, and if there are any further changes in the Committees, I would like

to know. I want to add something else as soon as Mr. Speaker puts the motion.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Regarding the motion, I do not want to start a fight over it, but I do want to utilize this opportunity of registering my extreme dissatisfaction with the way I have been placed on Committees in the last couple of years.

I am confident the hon. Prime Minister will agree, as he has indicated on a previous occasion, to discuss this matter with me privately, and see that justice is done.

There are certain Committees which I have asked to be placed upon, both last year and this year, and I do not know the reason why I was not placed on those Committees.

There are some Committees on which I served in the past, but I have been dropped from them because in each instance, I raised questions in a manner that evidently did not please certain people. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is no reason for punishing a member.

For instance, regarding the humble Committee on Printing, I did not ask originally to be placed on that, but I was, and I served on that Committee, and tried to serve conscientiously. Because I insisted on two occasions, at two Sessions, that the Queen's Printer be called before that Committee to answer questions, I was dropped from that Committee. I think that is poor business, and I do not think it is conducive to the proper conduct of the business of this House.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member is referring to something which happened in the twenty-third Parliament, but if he will let me know of his complaints, I will try to deal justly with them.

MR. SALSBERG: I could mention the names of a few Committees on which I have served, I think, with distinction, such as the Committee on Arts. The only time that Committee departed from the moth-eaten policy which prevailed for a long time was when I served on that Committee, Mr. Speaker,

and we departed from the "do nothing" policy and chartered a new course when we decided to buy works of art from artists of our province and to build up an important collection of works of art throughout the province.

For having done such a revolutionary thing, a former Prime Minister, not the present one, decided it would be too dangerous to have me continue on the Committee, and I was dropped.

I will not pursue the matter further. I have done enough by eliciting the statement from the hon. Prime Minister that he will privately lend his good offices to see I serve on Committees on which I may make a contribution to the welfare of the province. I will avail myself of the suggestion of the hon. Prime Minister and will see him privately, and with his suggestion made earlier, that names can be added, it will make it possible for my name to be added to some of those Committees. Otherwise, I shall be obliged to raise it again when somebody else's name is added and the matter will be before the House on a resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid you have been a little out of order. Mr. Pringle has presented the report on Standing Committees and moved its adoption.

HON. MR. FROST: Before you put the motion, it will be in order, I think, to say a few words. I have noticed you have not put the motion, and I should like to say that today initial steps are being taken to organize the Committees of the House. These Committees will organize and start to work, I hope, tomorrow, as I have mentioned, which is much in advance of the procedure of other years.

This is in conformity with the Government's policy of extending and developing the Committee form of consideration of governmental problems covering practically every phase of administration. The purpose is twofold: namely, to use the great talents and capabilities of the hon. members of the House, and, secondly, to translate these ideas and views of the various hon. members of the Legislature into

action, and to improve procedures and methods of government.

That, sir, I think is in line of improving the form of Parliamentary government. I think we have taken very great steps indeed here in that regard, in the last few years.

Amongst the Committees of the House is the Public Accounts Committee, mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). This Committee has very broad powers of enquiry, and may enquire into expenditures which are contained in or referred to in the Public Accounts.

In the past, this Committee has been used to enquire into items which an hon. member or members wanted to scrutinize.

I would suggest to the hon. members of the House, if they have not already done so, that they read the very able report by the Provincial Auditor, in which he referred to matters brought forward in the fiscal year 1952-1953.

Certainly irregularities have taken place in the Fort William Division of the Department of Highways, and I will have something further to say about this matter in the course of a day or so.

As a result of these irregularities, criminal action has been instituted, which does not, however, preclude civil action in civil courts if the evidence so indicates. For this reason, payments have been withheld from certain contractors, and the province is in a position to take civil action.

May I, at this time, speak in the highest terms of the work of the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Harvey Cotnam, F.C.A., who is a servant of this Legislature, and not of the government. I would ask the hon. members of the Legislature to read the Act relating to the Provincial Auditor, which was revised some three or four years ago.

For some months, the Auditor, with his staff, and a staff of engineers, have been conducting a most painstaking investigation into the matters involved. In addition to this, Messrs. J. D. Woods and Gordon, Limited, have been given an unlimited commission to investigate

and recommend. The Provincial Auditor quite properly asked that investigations should not be hampered by the disclosure of information which might prejudice the position of the province.

Undoubtedly, this has led to conjecture which could not possibly be accurate. Nevertheless, the Provincial Auditor and legal counsel have advised that the interest of the province should be protected and safeguarded, as it has been, for the following reasons:

1. The investigations are intricate, involving the services of both auditors and engineers. The premature disclosure of evidence might prejudice the investigations which have been so painstakingly conducted.

2. The auditor advises that these matters would without doubt result in court action, and in fact some matters are already before the Court. There the evidence can be presented fairly and impartially.

3. That not only criminal action is involved, but arising from this might be civil action as already stated.

On these grounds it was, therefore, decided that to safeguard provincial interests and rights, disclosures should be made only in court.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. members of this House that there is no desire to limit the powers of enquiry of the Public Accounts Committee, and the matter will be left entirely with that Committee, and I am quite sure it will be agreed that this course is the proper one to take. These matters can be considered by the Public Accounts Committee itself, a Committee constituted by this House, with very wide powers, and the matters to which I have referred in the interest of the province can be discussed by the Committee when it convenes.

The commission, which has been given to J. B. Woods and Gordon Limited, is a very far-reaching one. It extends not only to the investigation of alleged irregularities in the Fort William Division, but it includes applying every lesson to be learned to departmental methods, and providing for the greatest

efficiency. No lesson to be learned in this matter will be overlooked.

The Department of Highways will be faced with an immense task within the next few years—how great, the hon. members here can appraise themselves.

We are faced in the Department of Highways with meeting the tremendous traffic problem of today, and with facing up to the great growth in that Department, and in its expenditures, and if it should be that works are required in this province because of economic conditions, it may be that the Department will again have to be extended. That is the situation.

With such an extension of business and problems, the revision of methods and procedures should always be regarded as capable of betterment. Lessons which can be learned from any matter must never be disregarded if they will contribute to the efficiency of the conduct of business. That is the attitude of the government, and that is the purpose of the commission given to Messrs. J. B. Woods and Gordon Limited, which is a highly competent and experienced firm.

Our objective will be to ensure for the Department of Highways, the very best that can be devised in the way of organization, administration and procedures.

I, by no means, come to this House and say that the Departmental methods are the best. I do say if there are lessons to be learned in connection with the Fort William situation, the hon. members of this House can rest assured that we will see they are applied in the interest of better administration in this province. That is all I have to say, with reference to the Committee.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he is now saying to the House that all matters relating to the Fort William irregularities may be discussed by the Public Accounts Committee?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I stated the problem. I say that, for myself, I would very much have preferred to have said things more

specifically than I did. I was met with very considerable embarrassment in the by-election which was held recently, by reason of the fact that I could not refer to things specifically. In the interest of the province, I thought it better to say nothing.

Now, I say again that I have no desire to limit the powers of enquiry of the Public Accounts Committee in matters relating to this whole problem, which will be left with them to decide in their good judgment as to how to treat them, in view of the enquiries which are being made.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask one more question, if the hon. Prime Minister does not mind? To what extent are these matters sub judice by reason of the fact that they are before the courts?

HON. MR. FROST: I think perhaps the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) could perhaps better answer that question than I, but perhaps I may be allowed to answer it.

I think the situation is this: questions which are sub judice before the courts, I think by all the rules, bar references outside of this House. Matters which are before a court, if referred to in public, in an address or otherwise, such reference may be considered to be in contempt of court. Whether that extends to the House, where we are privileged, is another question. I would like to reserve the answer to that question.

I rather take the view that perhaps it might not be sub judice if referred to a Committee of the House. Then it comes down to a question of good sense and good judgment, as to whether any investigation would be prejudicial to the trial of any individual.

MR. OLIVER: May I just add this, Mr. Speaker; what will happen if the Public Accounts Committee is called, and we immediately start the investigation by questioning anything relating to the acts allegedly committed by those who are now before the courts? It would not be competent for the Committee, I suggest, to deal with those matters. So the hon. Prime Minister,

by referring this to the Public Accounts Committee has handicapped the Committee before it starts. There is no question about that.

HON. MR. FROST: I did not say that at all.

MR. OLIVER: I say it.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not want you to put words into my mouth.

MR. OLIVER: I may not be as good a lawyer as the hon. Prime Minister, but I think I can see what is coming, and the hon. Prime Minister knows it quite well.

I want to argue that point for a moment or two. Not only will the Committee be handicapped, but this was indeed an astute political move on the part of the government. I say "astute," and it comes rather badly from the hon. Prime Minister—and this is not used as a derogatory term at all. It is a smart political move.

We have a list of 17 Committees, which will be sitting simultaneously throughout the Session of the House, and we will not be able to give the attention that this whole matter deserves before the Public Accounts Committee.

More than that, there is a preponderance of government members on the Committee, who will be able at all times to overpower and to overrule whatever may be brought up in the Committee itself.

I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister—and I think even he should see wisdom in this—that it would be better to appoint a Select Committee of the House to sit in between Sessions.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the fact that the Public Accounts Committee has powers and rights does not subtract from the fact that we may take any action we want to.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) knows that, because when he suggested the desire to have the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) added to that Committee, he said it will be an interesting Committee.

MR. OLIVER: It can be interesting quite apart from the question under discussion. This is not the only thing which may be involved before the Public Accounts.

I remember a few years ago, when the Highways Department was under investigation, when the present hon. Minister of Highway (Mr. Doucett) and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) were asking questions on behalf of the Opposition, but in that particular case, Mr. Speaker, there was a very great difference. In that case, there was nobody charged before the courts; there was nothing sub judice before the Committee, and my hon. friends had every right to go into everything which pertained to the matter under discussion.

If we go before the Public Accounts Committee now, and these facts are before the courts, anything relating to the acts alleged to have been committed will be declared sub judice by the Committee. You cannot escape that. If it is true outside, it is true in this Legislature. We have certain rights in the Legislature, I will admit, but I doubt if they are rights which can transcend the rights of a person charged before a court.

I suggest if the hon. Prime Minister wants to do the job in a business-like way, he will agree to the appointment of a Select Committee of the Legislature, which can sit after the court actions are completed, when there will be tranquility, as far as the persons appearing before the courts are concerned, and there will be unlimited time as far as dealing with this matter is concerned.

I suggest he is pulling the wool over our eyes by his suggestion this afternoon, and he is putting through a smart political move by which he will successfully smother the work before the Committee, and will prevent the Committee from doing the job it is appointed to do.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition talks about a "smart political move." He suggests that after these cases have been tried in court, and disposed of, a Select Committee of the House be set up in

peace, quiet and tranquility, to consider the matters.

Mr. Speaker, these cases which we consider are very important cases, may go to the Supreme Court of Canada, and be heard a long time from now.

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition, for one moment, want to argue that as Prime Minister of this province, I desire to stand here and withhold information from the people of this province until these cases have gone through the courts? I certainly do not.

For myself and my colleagues, and the government members here, may I say that we want to meet this thing head on, and deal with it in a business-like way.

I am rather surprised at the hon. Leader of the Opposition. At a time when he is going around this country talking about "disclosures," and saying a number of things which I can assure him will bear a great deal of correction, I am surprised that he would come today and ask us to do nothing about this matter until the courts have passed on it. It might conceivably be several years from now, before it gets through the Supreme Court of Canada. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a very poor opinion of the representatives of the people and of the people they represent.

Our position has been this: this matter was brought to light by officials—very able and trusted officials—of the government itself. The investigation has been conducted without fear nor favour, and it will continue to be without fear nor favour.

It is our desire to clean up not only this matter, but if it is shown that there are other weaknesses in the practices which have grown up over many years, then let us correct them, and give our people and our province the very best there is. That is the situation.

In discussing this matter, I naturally mentioned the Fort William situation, because obviously, the hon. members opposite have been referring to it, but the Committee can deal with all sorts of public accounts. This Committee has broad powers of enquiry, and may

enquire into any expenditures which are contained in or referred to in the Public Accounts. Any hon. member, after this Committee has been appointed, may enquire into any item of expenditure, which an hon. member or members may particularly want to scrutinize. It is in no way limited to the Fort William matter, or any other matter. It is wide open for any hon. member of this House to enquire into any expenditure in the province, and that is the way we want it to remain.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when the argument first started on this point, but I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister that this House, including the hon. members of the Opposition, be assured without delay, just how far we can go in speaking to this matter in the House, or before the Public Accounts Committee. If you are going to declare this matter sub judice, then we are handicapped in the House.

Perhaps it may be that we will be able to speak about these matters to a certain extent inside the House, but when we go before the Public Accounts Committee, we will be told, "That is 'out'; you cannot talk any more about that subject."

What good would a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee be if we found that to be the fact? I think the government owes it to the House and to the Opposition particularly to let us know without delay just how far we can go in discussing these matters in the House and before the Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. OLIVER: On that very point, may I say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Prime Minister, that it is hardly fair for him to bring up the motion to refer these matters to the Public Accounts Committee, when in one breath, he is saying "You will have the widest possible opportunity to examine," and in the next breath, he says there is doubt as to whether we may examine at all or not. I do not think the hon. Prime Minister is on solid ground in that regard.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know whether the hon. Leader of the Opposi-

tion is even on the ground. I think he is still up in the air. This matter came up in a very proper way. The Committee has been constituted in the House, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition's interest is apparently in the Public Accounts. I made my statement in relation to the powers of the Committee, and I suggest he get *Hansard* and read carefully what I said. He will find that not only is there no attempt to restrict anything in any way, shape or form; but on the contrary, there is a desire to give the House the most complete information.

I never mentioned "sub judice" at all; that was mentioned by the hon. members opposite. But I do point out that there is a situation in which the Crown and the province could be prejudiced at the present time in connection with the disclosure of premature information.

That was the case when this matter was put before a jury of the people just a week ago today.

I went into East Simcoe, but I was most careful not to refer to these matters, because of the restrictions which had been placed upon me by very trusted officers, the Provincial Auditor and others.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister, and I want to preface the question with the statement that it seems to me to be necessary for the Leader of the Official Opposition to seek all the safeguards he is trying to obtain, there is something, at the same time, in what the hon. Prime Minister said about procedure. So it seems to me, as one who has no special interest except to get to the bottom of things, and have the facts revealed.

It does seem reasonable for the hon. Prime Minister to say that the suggestion about appointing a Select Committee, to act after the matter will have been cleared through the courts, is rather a poor suggestion. It may take years, and it may be, there will be no Conservative Government in the province by that time and perhaps even some people now in Opposition, will no longer

be in the House, and it would, therefore, I think, be a wrong procedure to follow.

Now, agreeing with the hon. Prime Minister, I want to ask whether his policy of referring the matter to the Public Accounts Committee will prevent this House from deciding on any other course during this Session, such as the appointment of a Royal Commission, or the appointment of a Select Committee, or any other step which the House may consider advisable in dealing with this matter?

That is the question, Mr. Speaker, which I will repeat. Does this action rule out any of the other methods I have suggested? If it does, then I would be strenuously opposed to the suggestion of the government that the Public Accounts Committee will be the only channel through which this matter may be cleared or processed.

If, on the other hand, the action of the government does not preclude the possibility of this House resorting to other means of dealing with the matter, such as a Royal Commission, or a Select Committee, or any other means, then, of course, it remains before the House, and we shall be able to return to it and refer to it, and make proposals, motions, or any other suggestions we may think necessary.

I think that is important when dealing with this matter now.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say that the hon. Leader of the Opposition on Thursday will probably argue for a Royal Commission. He has asked for it before, but I think the course I have suggested is the best course to take to protect the people of this province.

MR. OLIVER: It may be that I will argue for a Royal Commission, and it is a very smart move on the part of the government to take such action as will make that argument wholly useless.

What the hon. Prime Minister has done is to put this before the Public Accounts Committee, where he knows it cannot be properly argued; where he knows the facts cannot be properly

adduced, and where it will provide an umbrella under which the government can proceed in temporary immunity. That is all.

MR. GRUMMETT: I think the government owes it to the Opposition to let us know where we are going. The hon. Prime Minister was unnecessarily sharp with the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MR. FROST: He accused me of "pulling the wool over the eyes of the people," and that is perhaps why I was a bit sharp.

MR. OLIVER: You cannot be too sharp. Go right ahead.

MR. GRUMMETT: If a Select Committee cannot do anything, as suggested by the hon. Prime Minister, then what is the Public Accounts Committee going to do?

MR. OLIVER: Nothing.

MR. GRUMMETT: Absolutely nothing. It means that we in the Opposition are completely stymied, and during all this Session, we can only sit here and wait for a magistrate or other court to deal with the matter at the Head of the Lakes.

I understand a preliminary enquiry has not yet been held. This matter was brought to the attention of the officials some considerable time ago, and still no legal steps have been taken to expedite the matter in the courts.

HON. MR. FROST: You are wrong there.

MR. GRUMMETT: The matter is dragging in the courts, and it will be some time before the preliminary enquiry will be undertaken and the case proceeded with.

HON. MR. FROST: The government is very anxious to get ahead with these cases.

MR. GRUMMETT: I believe that the time lapse since the charges were first laid up to the preliminary hearing is too long, and it creates doubt in the minds of each hon. member of the

Opposition as to the reason for this delay. If this delay can be prolonged until this House adjourns, and we cannot discuss it in the Public Accounts Committee, nor in the House, what can we do? The whole matter can be washed out, and no one get to the bottom of it.

HON. MR. FROST: This matter, in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition, is so beset with doubt, that there is nothing I can do. However, I will do my best, and I think you will be satisfied.

MR. GRUMMETT: The Opposition is curious on many points.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister did not answer my question. Will the referring of this matter to the Public Accounts Committee be interpreted as meaning the exclusion of any other method of procedure.

HON. MR. FROST: No, it will not.

MR. SALSBERG: May I finish? Does that signify the government has closed its mind, such as it has, and is going to limit itself only to a procedure which we on this side of the House question very, very seriously? Does that mean the government has come to a conclusion?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member has asked a question. May I answer it? First of all, he refers to "such mind as the government has." We have sufficient mind, that at least we can make it up, and that is more than the hon. member can do.

Let me assure the hon. member that the fact that the Provincial Auditor, and his Department, and Messrs. J. D. Wood and Gordon Co. are engaged in this matter, does not preclude any other action whatever, nor does the consideration of this question, in whole or in part, by the Public Accounts Committee preclude any other action.

I have endeavoured to assure the hon. member that the only thing which will affect it, will be what is in the best interests of the people of this province,

and in the best interests of good government in the province.

MR. ALBERT WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, after the hon. Prime Minister's remarks, I would take it that as long as questions from the Opposition in the Public Accounts Committee do not concern the Fort William area, they will be quite proper, but insofar as the Department of Highways is concerned, they will be sub judice?

There is one more point I would like to have clarified. In my view, it would be within the function of this Committee to call witnesses. To what extent will the Opposition be squelched by the suggestion of the possible cost of bringing down from the north important witnesses, who may give valuable evidence to this Committee? Will we have a free hand in calling witnesses before this Committee?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the hon. member that he carefully read what I have said this afternoon to the House. It will be in *Hansard*. I think it is perfectly plain. I suggest he read it over.

I would also remind him that the government has not had since the commencement of this matter some months ago, the slightest intention of holding back anything.

MR. OLIVER: Until now.

HON. MR. FROST: Not now, either. I will say to the hon. member he will find this matter will be probed to the bottom in the fullest and most complete way.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister knows quite well that cannot be done.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid we have broken a good many of the rules of the House this afternoon, and I can assure you, you will not have the amount of liberty you have had today, for instance, in having spoken three or four times on one subject.

Motion agreed to.

HON. A. G. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

(1) The report of the Minister of Education for the calendar year, 1952.

(2) The Annual Report of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission for the year ended October 31st, 1953.

(3) The Annual Report of the Ontario College of Art, for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1953.

(4) The Report of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto, for the year ended June 30th, 1953.

(5) The Forty-fifth Annual Report of The Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, for the year ended December 31st, 1952.

(6) Seventh Annual Report of the Research Council of Ontario for the year ended March 31st, 1953.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

THE TELEPHONE ACT, 1954

Hon. George H. Challies (Minister Without Portfolio) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "The Telephone Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: This Bill establishes a Telephone Authority, along the lines recommended by the Commission dealing with this problem, together with certain rights which are now under the authority of the Ontario Municipal Board, which will be transferred to the new Telephone Authority.

The Bill, while it is a long one, is comparatively simple. The only right now under the Ontario Municipal Board which will not be transferred to the new Authority is the question of the approval of the issuance of bonds.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Ontario) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make reference to the passing of Miss Agnes Campbell MacPhail, for a number of years an hon. member of this House.

Before coming to this Chamber, I was advised by Your Honour that the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) might not be here, and he had asked that any reference to Miss MacPhail be postponed until tomorrow. In the meantime, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has advised that he is going to Priceville to attend her funeral tomorrow, and might not be here, so I think we might refer to this matter today, and pay our tribute of respect to her memory which is honoured by the flag flying at half mast over this building.

The funeral service is tomorrow at Priceville, and representatives from the government, the Opposition, and other hon. members, including those of her party, will be represented.

Miss MacPhail was well-known to a great many of us here, having sat in this House from 1943, for a time, and then following the election of 1948, she again sat in this House. She was the first to achieve the distinction of becoming a member of the Canadian House of Commons at Ottawa.

Miss MacPhail was elected, according to my recollection, in the election of 1921, as the federal member for one of the ridings taking in part of the County of Grey. I am not sure of the political designation of the riding, but I believe it was South East Grey.

Votes for women had just come into effect some four years before in a rather limited way, in the election of 1917, but it became fully effective in the election of 1921, and at that time Miss MacPhail was the first woman to be elected to Parliament in Canada, and, indeed, it may be in the Commonwealth, although I am not sure on that point. Certainly, she was the first woman to be elected in Canada.

Miss MacPhail remained a very distinguished member of the House of Commons for some nineteen years until

1940. Then she added to her great record by being one of the first women elected in the 1943 election. There were two women elected at that time, and Miss MacPhail was one of them. She certainly was the first woman to be elected both to the Parliament of Canada and to this Legislature. That is a very great record indeed.

In all those days she contributed, in her own colourful way, to the issues of the day both at Ottawa and here in Toronto. I would say of Miss MacPhail that she was militant; she was able, and she always had an abiding interest, as a woman, in the betterment of men, women and children. Indeed, in her great profession of school teaching that was exemplified long before she became a member of these Houses of Parliament.

I referred last Thursday to the passing of Doctor MacPhee, and I mentioned the fearless way in which he met the inevitable. Miss MacPhail was in the same position. She knew her grave condition, and she faced it bravely.

I remember reading in the press this morning that in 1938, nearly sixteen years ago, the doctors told Miss MacPhail she should take it easy, and she said, "So I will not live long? I will live what is left, and do what I want to do." She was indeed one of the fearless women who faced life bravely, and did not allow herself to be depressed by the fact that because of her ailment her time was limited.

That was in 1938. Since that time, to my knowledge, she has run in at least five elections. She was militant, and placed her views before the people, and advocated what she thought was right.

I think we are the poorer here in Ontario today, and in Canada, by the passing of this very great Canadian woman, for whom we all had such a very great regard.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I might say it is with a very deep sense of regret that we, here in this House, received the news of the passing of Miss Agnes MacPhail, a woman who accomplished

much for her own sex in Canada, and whose interest was the betterment of all mankind as ably stated by the hon. Prime Minister. I must say, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to follow the hon. Prime Minister in a matter of this kind. He is so expressive and covers the subject so very fully that it is difficult to add to what he has said.

As he stated, Agnes MacPhail devoted her life to a principle. Also, no matter where she went, her friends were not only those of her own party. I know, that she had a very deep regard and a very deep friendship for many of the hon. members sitting on the Treasury Benches. She regarded them as her friends. Party politics did not exclude her personal interest in the people she met in political life.

Agnes MacPhail served nineteen years in the Federal House, nineteen years pioneering ideals; ideals which bore fruit. We have seen many pieces of legislation go on the Statute books of the Federal House which Agnes MacPhail helped to formulate long before they were accepted, and there are many pieces of legislation which will be accepted and go on the books of this House in the future which she helped to formulate. Her influence will be felt for a long time. She was an outstanding woman, a woman who pioneered the cause of womanhood, and in this day and age we need many like her. In this day and age when many of our ideals are being torn down, we need women like Agnes MacPhail, with patriotism, integrity and respect, and I am sure that all of us here in the House regret the passing of this able and brilliant woman.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, not only as Leader of the Opposition, but as a firm political and personal friend of Miss MacPhail over a long period of time, I want to join with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and with the hon. member for South Cochrane (Mr. Grummett) in expressing a tribute to her memory here today.

I think one of the outstanding traits of Miss MacPhail was—and she was very proud of it—the fact that she was a pioneer, a pioneer not only in that she

was the first woman member of the Federal Parliament and the first woman, as the hon. Prime Minister quite aptly said, to sit in both Federal and Provincial Houses at subsequent times.

Miss MacPhail pioneered in ideals and in new things. She wanted to move forward. She was ever restless and she was ever moving forward from one accomplishment to a new field of endeavour, which served to protect and to enhance the interests of the ordinary person in this country of ours.

She was very fond of people. She was a humanitarian in every sense of the word. She was a firm friend and a mighty advocate in high places for people of humble means.

I think one of the things which can be said about Miss MacPhail at this time is that she was without doubt, in my mind at least, the ablest woman speaker in Canada of her time. She had a sound logic, a very quick wit, and she employed both to serve the people of this country.

I think we can say today, as we mourn her passing, that there will be thousands of people in this country who will mourn the passing of Agnes MacPhail, and this province and this country will be the richer because she passed this way.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, the occasion we mark at present is really unusual, in that we are paying respect to an unusual person. Everything which has been said, Mr. Speaker, about the late Miss MacPhail is unquestionably true, but what perhaps should also be added is that she symbolized in many ways the profound changes which have taken place in the country in the last half century, the passing from a predominately agricultural society to one which is predominately industrial.

Miss MacPhail expressed the up-surge among the farmers and the city workmen against the new conditions, the new difficulties and new hardships which were placed upon them.

She, perhaps more than any other person, will remain identified with that up-surge. It was not a revolutionary movement of which she was a

prophetess, it was in the main a middle-class reaction to the new conditions, but she remained identified with it. I say this with all respect and with the highest regard for all who were associated with her in earlier times but who for their own good reasons have gone in another direction to bring about the results which they set out to achieve originally with her. She remained identified with the farm movement, independent and apart from what we call "the old line parties."

She was a person who could have chosen a path which would have brought her a great deal of security and personal well-being, she could not obviously follow any course but the one in her mind, was necessary to be followed, to bring about the betterment of conditions for the common folk. She was one of the founders of the new movement with which I do not see eye to eye very often, but she perhaps, as I said before, more than anyone else remained steadfast to the new cause she embarked upon immediately after the First World War.

She recognized the need of farmers and city workers joining hands for their common protection and well-being. It is in that role that she will forever retain a unique position in the history of the political life of this province and this country. There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, but that there will be areas named after her, schools named to commemorate her name, and there will be clubs and organizations which will want to bear the name of Miss MacPhail.

Her life was rich and her activities and experiences, I think, will bear studying by all of us who are interested in the advancement of the well-being of the common folk.

In conclusion, I want to say that I, like everyone else, found her a very warm, friendly and encouraging person. Regardless of her differences with me as well as with others of other groups. I found Miss MacPhail always very sympathetic, very encouraging, very humane. We can say of her that she was not only a fighter for the good of the people and that she fought as she

saw the light, and as she understood that fight, but that she had also a great personality. A great person has passed from our midst in the death of Miss MacPhail and I join with all others in honouring her memory.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Bills on the Order Paper which I believe should go to the various Committees, and I would like to advance them with that end in view.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT, 1954

HON. MR. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 33, "The Department of Education Act, 1954."

He said: On first reading I explained in some detail the purpose of this Bill which is to consolidate three existing Acts known as "The Department of Education Act," "The Schools for the Deaf and the Blind Act," and "The Vocational Education Act, Part II." I suggest this Bill be referred to the Committee on Education.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: If there are any Orders here which hon. members desire held, we will not proceed with them.

MR. OLIVER: Are they all going to the various Committees?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, they are all going to various Committees.

MR. OLIVER: That is satisfactory.

HON. MR. FROST: This is only for the purpose of advancing Committee work.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister one question. It is customary in the House to debate a Bill on second reading; that is, any general remarks made on the Bill and any general debate takes place on the second reading. Can we be assured when the Bill comes before the House in Committee the same

procedure may be followed, that we will be given the greatest latitude in presenting any general remarks on the Bills?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. Mr. Speaker, if any hon. members of the House desire to ask the sponsor of the Bill any questions or feel an explanation is necessary today, I will be very glad to have it given. It was only for the purpose of getting these matters advanced so that the Bills could go to the Committee dealing with them. If any hon. member would like any Bill held for debate, we will hold it over and give the explanation at some other time.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE EXPENSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Expenses Act."

He said: This Bill and the Bills contained in Orders from Number 4 to Number 20, I propose to refer to the Legal Bills Committee.

I have explained each of these Bills in a general way on first reading and I will not make any further explanation unless some definite question arises.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act."

MR. SALSBERG: That Bill is not even before us. It is not printed.

HON. MR. PORTER: According to the Order Paper, it is.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not in my book in front of me. It is bad enough to allow Bills to go on before we have a chance of properly reading them. It is understandable if they are going to Committee, but they are not in the book.

HON. MR. PORTER: It will go back. Do you want me to explain it? I explained it on first reading.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not want to make a fuss about it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Do you want it held out, or do you want it to go on?

MR. SALSBERG: It is not printed, it should not go on.

HON. MR. PORTER: We will hold it out.

HON. MR. FROST: If it is not in the book, we will hold it back automatically. These are marked "Printed" here, but if they are not, we will hold them back.

THE CORONERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 36, "An Act to amend The Coroners Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 37, "An Act to amend The County Courts Act."

MR. SALSBERG: Is that going to the Legal Bills Committee?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act."

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): That is not printed.

MR. SPEAKER: We should consider those not printed as not moved.

HON. MR. PORTER: We will hold that.

THE CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves second reading of Bill No. 39, "An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves second reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves second reading of Bill No. 44, "An Act to amend The Jurors Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves second reading of Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend The Magistrates Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE MECHANICS' LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moves second reading of Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act."

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask whether the hon. Attorney-General would care to refer this Bill to the Labour Committee. It may sound odd at first glance, but I think it is quite properly a Bill which should be sent to the Labour Committee. It is for the protection of mechanics.

HON. MR. FROST: It will go to the Legal Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: I think that concludes our deliberations for this afternoon. In moving the adjournment of the House, I would remind the hon. members that tomorrow is the day for moving and seconding the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I move the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.35 o'clock p.m.





ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 16, 1954.

Reading and Receiving Reports by Committees	45
Act respecting The Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital, Mr. Nickle, first reading	46
Act respecting The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, Mr. Nixon, first reading	47
Act respecting Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited, Mr. Roberts, first reading	47
Act respecting The Town of Fergus, Mr. Root, first reading	47
Act respecting The Town of Palmerston, Mr. Edwards, first reading	47
Act respecting The Town of Mimico, Mr. Brandon, first reading	47
Act respecting The Frontenac High School District, Mr. Edwards, first reading ...	47
Statement regarding Trans-Canada Highway contracts	47
Discussion on Unemployment in the Province, Mr. Salsberg, Mr. Frost	48
Motion of Thanks for Speech from the Throne, Mr. Jolley, Mr. Noden	49
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	64

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1954

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

The Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving reports by Committees.

MR. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Dempsey from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders presents the Committee's First Report as follows:

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the Notices as published in each case sufficient.

Petition of the Corporation of the County of Frontenac praying that an Act may pass authorizing The Frontenac High School Board to present its annual estimates to the Council of the County of Frontenac only; and for other purposes.

Petition of The Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital praying that an Act may pass authorizing an increase in the number of elected governors from 12 to 30.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Fergus praying that an Act may pass changing the name of "Groves

Memorial Hospital" to "The Groves Memorial Community Hospital" and establishing "The Groves Memorial Community Hospital Commission."

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Mimico praying that an Act may pass authorizing payment of pensions to employees of the Corporation; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the transfer of the Company to the City of Sao Paulo in the State of Sao Paulo, United States of Brazil; and for other purposes.

Petition of Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec praying that an Act may pass respecting the power of the Boards of the Convention to hold real and personal property.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Palmerston praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership in The Palmerston Hospital Commission.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. MR. FROST: (Prime Minister): Moves that the names of the hon. members for Kenora (Mr. Wren) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) be added to the list of names composing the Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

He said: I think there are some others. I will look into the matter in

the course of the next day or two, but the names I have mentioned should be added at this time. I promised I would enter their names but I have not had time to look at any other requests.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I have, as a result of the suggestion of yesterday, communicated with the hon. Prime Minister and provided him with the names of some of the Committees upon which I feel I could make a contribution, if I were to become a member. One of them is the Committee on Public Accounts. I note the hon. Prime Minister's statement that he has other names which he has not yet had a chance to consider and give the necessary attention.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I will be quite content to add the hon. member's (Mr. Salsberg) name to the Committee on Public Accounts right now. If the motion can be changed and the name of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) can be added, I will do it right now.

MR. SALSBERG: That will be very much appreciated. I wanted to keep the records straight.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Bills.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. MR. FROST moves that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof it will stand adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon and for the remainder of the week and that the provisions of rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they may apply to this motion.

He said: That is somewhat unusual. I gave notice, I think, on Friday, that tomorrow at four o'clock there have been arrangements made for a visit of the hon. members of this House, the hon. members of Parliament, and the gentlemen of the Senate, to the new subway construction here in Toronto.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), who is absent today attending the funeral of Miss MacPhail,

has a very important meeting, I believe, in Ottawa on Thursday, and he asked me if it would be possible to adjourn the debate to enable him to attend. We arrived at this arrangement: that we would meet Thursday at two o'clock to enable the hon. Leader of the Opposition to take myself and my colleagues to task for many things, and by so doing it would enable him, I think, to have pretty well concluded his address by the time he has to catch his plane for Ottawa.

On Friday, Mr. Speaker, ordinarily we meet at two o'clock in order that the hon. members may catch their trains, so I am making the arrangement for those three days. If there are any objections from any of the hon. members opposite, I will be very glad to consider them.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. WELSH: (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House the following:

(1) The Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Niagara Parks Commission for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1953;

(2) The Report Relating to the Registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths for the Province of Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1951;

(3) The Report of the Commission on Agriculture Loans for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1953;

(4) The Financial Statement of the Settlers' Loan Commission for the year ending March 31, 1953, and copies of Orders in Council under the Northern Development Act.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

THE TORONTO EAST GENERAL AND ORTHOPAEDIC HOSPITAL ACT

Mr. Nickle (Kingston) in the absence of Mr. Macaulay, moves first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE BAPTIST CONVENTION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC ACT

Mr. Nixon (Brant) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

SÃO PAULO LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY, LIMITED

Mr. Roberts (St. Patrick) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting São Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TOWN OF FERGUS

Mr. Root (Wellington North) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Fergus."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TOWN OF PALMERSTON

Mr. Edwards (Perth) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TOWN OF MIMICO

Mr. Brandon (York West) moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Mimico."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE FRONTENAC HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. Edwards in the absence of Mr. Pringle, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Frontenac High School District."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. MR. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Before the Orders of

the Day I would like to make a statement regarding the investigation relating to the Trans-Canada Highway contracts. In the Huntsville Division Number 11 of the Ontario Department of Highways, certain irregularities appear to be indicated. The circumstances are such that we feel that the Division Engineer, Mr. D. S. Patterson should be suspended pending a full investigation of the contract.

I wish to make it very clear that we are not pre-judging this case, but the circumstances indicate that in the interests of the Department of Highways this suspension should take place. May I say the investigation will be full, fair and impartial.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the government on a matter of great importance.

As is generally known there are tens of thousands of citizens around Toronto who are unemployed, due to no fault of their own, and they are suffering extreme hardship as a result of that enforced unemployment.

As is unquestionably known to the government, there are in the City of Toronto alone, hundreds of single men, who are sleeping on floors of various missions and in other less protected places, such as around steam pipes leading to big buildings, and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: May I advise the hon. member there is a question which I allowed him to ask, but I am not going to allow a speech to be made in asking the question. May I suggest the hon. member state his question clearly and specifically.

MR. SALSBERG: I need your guidance. I am just trying to make clear what the government should do.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a great deal of business to do this afternoon. May we have the question?

MR. SALSBERG: The question concerns perhaps one of the most important items of business at this time. The question is: Is the government of

this province fully aware—as I am sure it is—of these horrible circumstances afflicting so many citizens and their families in this province? Is the government prepared to take some immediate action to remedy these circumstances by either providing cash relief for those who are not in receipt of any form of unemployment insurance, or assistance or calling a special conference between the Federal, Provincial and Municipal levels of government to find a way to help the municipalities to meet the obligation which they cannot obviously escape since they are closest to the people?

My question is as outlined and I think that not only the hon. members of the House, but scores of municipal councils are anxiously awaiting a reply from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very sorry to interrupt. I endeavour to be fair, and I expect fairness on the part of those who are allowed the privilege of the House. We are not having a debate, but a question, and the hon. member knows that as well as anybody else. The question has been asked, and it is entirely in the hands of the government to reply.

MR. SALSBERG: Just for the sake of the record, I thought I was only asking a question. If I was not, in your opinion, I am sorry.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised by the hon. member, and I think the answer or answers are really well-known to himself.

First of all, may I point out the situation which exists. Back in the early 1940's there were certain arrangements made with the Federal Government. One was in relation to Unemployment Insurance. At that time some of us who are here today were in the House, including the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

The provision concerning Unemployment Insurance carried with it the right of the Federal Government to institute a plan which they did, and an obligation

was placed upon the Legislature at that time, and indeed the attitude of the government of that day, the Hepburn administration, of which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was a member, was that the problem of unemployment, as such, was really a problem for the Federal Government.

To that extent the provision for unemployed relief for unemployed employables was removed from the Statute.

That left the province with their segment of the problem, of providing for relief assistance for the unemployed. That plan was followed then, and it has been followed ever since.

Concerning the unemployment situation; may I point out that not only myself, but my colleagues, and I am sure the hon. members of this House, recognize there is unemployment in this country. As to whether it is seasonal unemployment or unemployment found in certain industries, of course, is the question. I read in the newspapers—as I presume most of the hon. members here did also—a comment by Rt. hon. Mr. Howe, relative to the implement industry, in which he stated, in his opinion, that industry would not be able to support the degree of employment which it formerly did, and there would have to be adjustments. I think I am quoting correctly what Rt. hon. Mr. Howe said.

There was something relating to the textile industry, which was hitting some of the communities rather badly. Because of this condition matters relating to tariffs, to agreements with other nations, and other things which the Government of Canada in its wisdom feels should be carried on for the good of Canada, are completely beyond the capacity of this House to deal with.

The best indication we get from Ottawa is their expressed opinion 1954 is going to be a year of high employment. According to the Ottawa authorities, as they assess the problem, there will be cases of spotty unemployment, which seems to be the feeling of the Federal Government and its experts. However, after all, we are a province and a part of Canada, and we have to

take the assessment made by the government at Ottawa in relation to these things, and their expectation is that 1954 is going to be a year of high employment, despite the fact that there are some points at which there will be some unemployment, which will require adjustments.

Of course, these things always have their pressures and their impacts. I am sure everybody here must be sympathetic to those who are affected by these trends. Nevertheless, due to action taken by the government many years ago, there is unemployment insurance which is designed to make somewhat easier those particular problems.

That, I think, is the situation, as I would give it to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg).

Mr. Speaker, concerning this province, and what this province would do; may I point out we have in Ontario today—not designed because of conditions of recession or levelling off—a tremendous works programme, so tremendous that it taxes some of our Departments to take care of it. That is something to which I referred yesterday. I referred to the fact that it is our aim and design to strengthen our Departments in every way possible to provide, if the necessity should arise, for increased public works to be conducted on a plane of the highest efficiency, in order to provide employment, if that should be so indicated by the Ottawa government.

I do not say our works programme should be indicated nor dictated by any other government, but again I say we are Canadians and we try to follow the trends which are indicated by the Federal Government, which has control of these matters.

It was only four years ago at this time that I stood in this House in connection with a similar problem. In 1950—at this time of the year—we had some recession, and some levelling off. At that time, there was a demand from the hon. members opposite that there should be the issuance of cash relief, and for us to go into various things for which our province is neither constitutionally

responsible, nor are the municipalities in this province fiscally capable of doing. At that time, the same answer was given by this government, and by the Ottawa government. As a matter of fact, we have continued from that time up to the present with perhaps the highest level of employment the country has ever seen. I am not a prophet, and I do not fore-cast anything, but I do say that the indications from the same people who made the fore-cast at that time, are that 1954 will be a period of very high employment.

Concerning our capacity to carry on public works; already, in this province, we have the greatest public-works programme ever engaged in by any government, in Hydro, roads and public buildings. It has been fore-cast there will be between 40,000 and 50,000 houses started in this province this coming year—an all-time high.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has indicated they are not going to engage in any additional public work at the present time—and again I think I am quoting them correctly—but if it is necessary, the credit of this province and our fiscal position are such that if the Federal Government indicates it is necessary for the provinces to enter into a public-works programme, we are prepared to do so.

That is the line we have followed for years and that is why we have established on a sound basis the credit position of the province, to enable us to meet this situation.

I think that answers the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: First order, consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Jolley moves that we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your

Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

He said: I am sure that I voice the sentiments of this House when I suggest that our deep sympathy goes out to the members of the Royal Family in the death of our late Queen Mary. She personified all the attributes which we like to associate with royalty. She was a well beloved member of a close-knit and affectionate family circle. To the end of her long and eventful life she maintained the love and respect of the family circle and the people of the Commonwealth. The Empire is the poorer because of her departure from the scene wherein she had been such an impressive figure for so long a time.

It is fitting that I should make a brief reference to the magnificent ceremonies of the year just past which culminated in the Coronation of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. It was my very great privilege to be in London on that occasion and to mingle with the scores of thousands who had gathered in that mighty and historic city to glimpse something of one of the greatest pageants of history. When on a former occasion as Princess Elizabeth, Her Majesty with her distinguished husband visited our nation, I had the honour, in common with other thousands of her subjects, of meeting the Royal couple. I am sure that every member of this House joins me in congratulations to Her Majesty on the occasion of her formal Coronation. We wish for her and for her distinguished and valiant husband, the Duke of Edinburgh, long life and all happiness. We trust that Her Majesty may enjoy a long and peaceful and prosperous reign. Our thoughts go with the Royal couple as they visit at this time the other Dominions of the Commonwealth. We wish them a safe and pleasant journey and a safe return to their home-land.

I am sure it was a source of satisfaction to all of us that the Hon. the Prime Minister was able to attend the Coronation ceremonies as an honoured guest; also that a number of his colleagues in this House enjoyed a similar privilege. I am sure they all returned to this province with a new

love and respect for the Monarchy and an added faith in the future of Britain and the Commonwealth.

As a new member of this hon. House I appreciate most deeply the honour bestowed upon me by being permitted to move the adoption of the address presented by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. I know my constituents also will appreciate the nature of this occasion which is, shall I say, a compliment to my riding rather than in the direction of my own humble efforts.

NIAGARA FALLS BY-ELECTION

I am grateful to the people of Niagara Falls Riding for their vote of confidence of October last which now permits me to participate in the work of this Assembly. My predecessor (Mr. Houck) I believe represented the riding in this House for nineteen years, or thereabouts, with the exception of one term. He decided last year to seek promotion to the House of Commons, an ambition which he achieved in August of last year. Our political views are along divergent lines but this does not affect a long and valued personal friendship. I know also that he enjoys many friendships among all parties in this Assembly. I am sure we all hope that he may be happy in his new field of public service.

I am fortunate indeed in having very many good friends in my home community. I am grateful not only for their support, but for their overwhelming support in the by-election of October last. But in supporting me I feel that they were showing their appreciation of the good government we are getting under this Administration. In the campaign I was anxious to have our people extend a vote of thanks and approval to the hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues. This ambition was realized and on October 26th, last, the people of Niagara Falls Riding confirmed the all-Ontario verdict of a couple of years ago. It was a great honour to me to be elected to this House by my own people. It is an added pleasure to be able to render some small public service under the leadership of

a Prime Minister who enjoys the respect and confidence of this whole great province.

It is an added pleasure to be able to congratulate the hon. the Prime Minister and his Administration on the outstanding victory attained in the Riding of Simcoe East on Monday, February 8th. It will shortly be our privilege to welcome the member-elect from this historic riding as he takes his seat in this House.

Since the people of Ontario entrusted the management of their affairs to a Progressive Conservative Government, it has been necessary to call seven by-elections. In each and every instance the by-election has been called without delay, which formerly was not always the case. In each and every instance a supporter of this Administration has been elected. May I say that we on this side of the House deeply appreciate these repeated evidences of the confidence of our people. If indeed the average by-election constitutes a reflection of democratic sentiment—and usually it is so interpreted—then I suggest that the hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues of the Cabinet are justifiably heartened in the performance of their tasks by these repeated evidences of the esteem of our people.

THE MEMBERS

Every member of this House will join me, I am sure, in expressing regret at the recent passing of the hon. the member for Simcoe East (Mr. McPhee). It was not my privilege to know the late member who represented Simcoe East but I have heard him spoken of on all sides as a kindly, diligent and efficient member of this Assembly. Our sympathies go out to his family and to his very large circle of friends. Our province has lost an experienced and faithful public servant.

It is regretted by all of us that the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests, (Mr. Gemmell) has suffered severe illness in recent months. His department is a large and important one and his post is charged with heavy responsibilities. We all rejoice that in degree he has been able to resume his duties, and

I sincerely trust that he will be able to make his always worthy contribution to our debates in this Assembly.

Likewise, we all regret the prolonged illness of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas). His long and specialized training and his many estimable qualities of mind and heart fit him for the very heavy duties of his department. His absence, though temporary, is a great loss to this House and to Ontario Agriculture. May I express the sincere hope that he will soon be with us again.

The membership of this hon. House includes representatives from very many walks of life. Most of the hon. members, I think, have enjoyed experience in our municipal councils—a valuable experience in relation to their later duties in this Assembly.

I think the hon. the Prime Minister is to be congratulated on taking advantage of the energy and experience of the private members of this House by the organization of select committees to study and to report upon numerous matters related to the public welfare.

Among other committees I might mention that appointed to review the status of Indians, the committee to study lake levels, the Cemeteries Committee, and the committee on Reform Institutions. These committees have all approached their respective tasks in a non-partisan spirit. Their members have endeavoured to find workable solutions for the many problems which they have reviewed. I am certain that this House and our people generally, await the tabling of their reports with great interest. As a private member myself—a very new private member—it is a good feeling to realize that we of the back benches have work to do which may result in a contribution of some real worth.

NIAGARA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

I am glad to be able to report that the community I have the honour to represent is keeping pace with the rest of Ontario in the industrial development

which is a heartening, indeed amazing factor in our economic life. I scarcely need say that Hydro developments are on a mammoth scale. Of this, I shall speak in some detail a little later on.

We have in the Niagara area five sizeable projects relating to new industrial establishments. Noranda Mines, Ltd., for example, is constructing a four-million-dollar processing plant, a huge affair of major importance. Four or five other major concerns are expanding their existing establishments. Three of our leading banks have constructed new branch offices and a number of other bank premises have been remodelled and generally improved.

For 1954 the erection of five hundred new houses is anticipated and this will involve additional school accommodation. Summing up the current programme in the Niagara area, may I say it involves about Six Million Dollars in new capital investment. It means about seven hundred and fifty new jobs—which in turn means new livelihoods for three thousand to four thousand people. The increase in industrial wages, not including construction payrolls, is estimated at two million dollars a year. At Niagara Falls we are especially well located as to power and transportation facilities, but, in greater or less degree, we see the same type of development over almost all Ontario. It is a healthy sign. It shows that our best financial and industrial brains are not selling Ontario short. The long view seems to indicate that Ontario is certain to be one of the world's very greatest industrial areas, and indeed, we have already moved a long way in that direction.

NIAGARA PARKS COMMISSION

I should like to say a word about the job being done by the Niagara Parks Commission under the chairmanship of my hon. friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). The work of the Commission was commenced many years ago; it has taken many forms; essentially, it has guaranteed the continuing existence of a beautiful setting for one of the world's great scenic wonders. Its domain embraces the whole Niagara

frontier from Fort Erie to Queenston and beyond.

The park authority maintains many miles of roads and drives. It operates, and operates well, many facilities to attract and to serve the enormous influx of tourists. The late Mr. Mather contributed generously toward the striking memorial and park at the Peace Bridge. The late Sir Harry Oakes contributed the beautiful gardens which bear his name. The Ontario Department of Highways made a notable contribution as to the Queen Elizabeth Highway entrance and the related structures around the Rainbow Bridge. The horticultural school is performing a notable work in training boys and young men in landscape work, horticulture and so on.

As most of you know, plans are already in operation to ensure the continued beauty of the waterfall. The Canadian Falls, in particular, tends toward rapid erosion. Here, Hydro, in co-operation with the American authorities, is undertaking remedial works which will, I think I may say, guarantee in perpetuity the continued existence of the Falls in all their natural beauty. This is but one of many engineering triumphs added to the long record of Hydro successes.

It is many years since the first power development took form at the Falls, and it was not so long afterward that alarm began to be expressed as to the ultimate fate of the cataract. Naturally, the more water there is drawn off for power development in the section of river above the Falls, the less there is to go over the crest. The destruction of the waterfall as a scenic spectacle is something which would never be tolerated.

It was left to engineers of the Canadian Government, the Ontario Hydro and the United States Army Corps of Engineers to develop a remedial scheme, approved by all interested parties on July 22nd, last. This scheme saw actual start of construction in December, 1953. The United States and Canada participate in the plan according to recommendations of the International Joint Commission. In brief, the remedial works will create a more uniform flow in the

Niagara River, especially over the twenty-six hundred foot crest line of the Horseshoe Falls which are eroding at the centre. A fifteen hundred and fifty-foot dam is to be installed at Grass Island Pool to control certain water levels. Channels on the Goat Island flank and the Canadian flank of the Horseshoe Falls will aid in producing an unbroken crest line and effect a pre-determined distribution of flow. Earth and rock fill will be used at the ends of the Horseshoe Falls to eliminate what is known as incidental flow at the extremities.

Here I should mention that Hydro's scale model of the Niagara River played an important part in working out details of the remedial scheme. This model, ninety-five feet long and thirty-seven feet wide, depicts five miles of river, from the tip of Grand Island to the Rainbow Bridge. This model was of the greatest assistance to the engineers who worked out the details of the important remedial project.

HYDRO

During the ensuing session of this House, I have no doubt the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) Vice-Chairman of the Hydro enterprise, will review for us the mammoth developments which have marked the Hydro field. Let me point out a few facts rather briefly. Hydro's big post-war expansion programme began in 1945. At this time there were 21,569 miles of rural line with 156,560 rural customers. Eight years later rural lines totalled 41,376 miles, serving 366,091 rural customers.

The big Hydro expansion programme, launched just eight days after V-J Day, has raised its dependable peak capacity to 4,807,100 horse-power, an 85.1 per cent. increase over the 1945 figure. By December 31, 1956, the increase will be 144 per cent. and it will have involved 15 new power sources, hydraulic and steam.

The developments at Niagara at this time are among the most impressive in the whole history of Hydro. With the installation of the pumped storage

reservoir, the Sir Adam Beck No. 2 project will have an ultimate installed capacity of 1,828,000 horse-power. For purposes of comparison, I might add that Ontario's share of the St. Lawrence Development will be 1,100,000 horse-power.

The pumped-storage plan is of itself a remarkable, indeed an outstanding project. The reservoir will cover about 700 acres and will contain 650 million cubic feet of water. During off-peak hours, that is to say when demand for current is relatively low, pumps will lift water into the reservoir. Then, when demand is high, the pumps will operate in reverse, driven by the accumulated storage water. They will then be acting as turbo-generators, developing 228,000 horse-power.

I shall not attempt to review the enormous scope of Hydro expansion—the immense developments on the Ottawa River—in Eastern Ontario at Stewartville—the huge steam plants in Toronto and at Windsor. The fact remains that the danger of a power shortage is by no means over. Also the fact remains that this is the result of Ontario's astonishing growth. The next big development is the St. Lawrence project.

Here, the St. Lawrence project has finally been approved by the United States Senate. What the House of Representatives—Congress—will do, remains to be seen. There are evidences that the U.S.A. is becoming fairly well seized with the necessity for immediate action. The New York State Power Authority has been named by President Eisenhower as the official U.S. Agency to work with Hydro and there is real hope that actual construction will commence in the spring of this year. My information in short is that in the meantime Hydro is taking every preliminary step which can be taken so that there will be no delay in making a start once international and legal obstacles are cleared away.

I think the Hydro Commission deserves warm commendation for another recent measure of great importance. Arrangements have been made

between the Ontario Hydro and the Detroit-Edison Company for an interchange of power through lines between Windsor and Detroit and again across the St. Clair River between Sarnia and Marysville, Mich. This arrangement makes for free interchange of electric energy up to 400,000 horse-power.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

We shall certainly have a more complete picture of the power situation as our debates proceed. It is, of course, a very live subject with us at Niagara. An abundance of cheap and dependable power, an ample and skilled labour force, excellent transportation systems, and huge, nearby markets, guarantee for Niagara Falls and indeed the whole peninsula a great and still greater industrial future. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that our community appreciates to the full the vision, the courage and the enterprise of this Administration and of the Hydro Commission in expanding the Hydro establishment. The evidence is every day before their eyes and more and more is the vital importance of all these Hydro projects being appreciated by all our people.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

I have dwelt perhaps longer than I intended on the subject of Hydro. It is of itself a huge subject. But there are many other fields wherein the Administration has shown a very real awareness of current problems.

It is an elementary principle today that the state in an increasing degree assumes more and more responsibility for those permanently or temporarily unable to care for themselves. We do not expect the state to do everything for us. Far from it. We are not that kind of people. The Canadian people find little to attract them in the serfdom of Socialism or the slavery of Communism. But Ontario shows, I think, the most commendable progress in the quantity and quality of assistance rendered to the young, the old, the ill and the indigent.

We have, I believe, about the lowest tubercular death rate in Canada. The use of mass X-ray fostered by the

Health Department is an aid in wiping out this scourge. In 1942, there were 60,000 cases examined in this way. By 1953, the figure had risen to more than 300,000.

Maintenance grants to Sanatoria had risen from \$2,200,000 in 1943, to \$5,500,000 in 1953. There are 15 sanatoria located in Ontario with a nominal capacity of 4,375 patients. Then there are 600 beds for the tuberculous mentally ill at the Ontario Hospital at Woodstock. In 1947, the average waiting list related to Sanatoria contained about 400 names, in 1949, about 200; today waiting lists are about eliminated.

Or turn to our general hospitals. Here, maintenance grants were just over a Million Dollars a year in 1942 while today they total more than Nine and a Half Millions, to say nothing of capital grants for new construction and also very large rehabilitation grants. Capital grants are aiding in adding more than 16,000 new beds to Ontario's hospital establishment.

As to mental hospitals, nearly 19,000 patients are treated in these huge institutions. They are cared for by a staff of more than 5,300 people, a staff which has doubled in the past ten years.

This year there will be completed at Smiths Falls a completely new hospital of 2,400 beds—new—modern—up to the minute in every respect. Here we have it—the former government, 60 beds—just 60—this Administration 3,000 beds—to meet an urgent problem. Believe me, actions speak louder than words.

An addition at Brockville is adding about 600 beds; another addition is being made at Kingston; still another is being added at Toronto.

I should add that psychiatric units are being added at 12 general hospitals. These involve in the present programme 317 beds and the provincial grant here is \$8,500 per bed. Grants already approved total nearly \$2,700,000.

For 1953, all provincial grants to our general hospitals will total about Twenty-two Million Dollars. They were less than a Million ten years ago. In 1943 our hospital at Niagara Falls

received a provincial grant of \$2,500; in 1951 it was \$49,000; in 1953 it was \$131,000. The Douglas Memorial Hospital at Fort Erie received \$500 in 1943; \$7,000 in 1951 and \$83,000 in 1953. Generous capital grants have helped or are available to help in expansion and rehabilitation programmes here and elsewhere in our whole hospital establishment.

As time proceeds I hope to hear the detail of his stewardship from the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips). I congratulate him most sincerely on the energy, ability and vision he has shown in administering the affairs of a most important department.

WELFARE

The Department of Public Welfare is in a measure a partner of the Department of Health in assisting with the care of those unable in greater or less degree to care for themselves. Until recent years the care of the aged, unable to maintain themselves with their own resources or with the help of the family circle, devolved largely on the municipalities. To the present Administration goes the credit for a bold, a helpful and a forthright step. I think the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) is to be congratulated on the assumption, provincially, through his department, of one half of the cost of constructing, extending and maintaining Homes for the Aged. Many of our municipalities have built new homes on very modern lines wherein aged citizens are maintained in care and comfort throughout their declining years. Generally, the standards relating to these homes have been raised.

It should also be noted that through the same department the province has accepted responsibility for 25 per cent. of costs related to Children's Aid Societies. These societies are essentially local organizations. Like the general hospitals they maintain a very large measure of local autonomy, which is as it should be. I think it is a desirable principle to observe, namely that institutions serving in the main local interests should retain a maximum degree of local management. Generally speaking,

I think it is a truism that governments, and I might add, managements, do the best job when living rather closely to the people they serve.

Inauguration of pensions for totally disabled persons is another sound measure. It was this government which introduced this plan, and I am sure that we are glad to see that the Federal Government appears to be about ready to emulate our good example in a national way. Our participation in the old age pension scheme for the 65-69 age group where need is shown is another achievement in the welfare field. It also evidences the ability of our governments here to co-operate with the Federal Government where such co-operation is indicated in the field of both those policies and administration.

I think the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) is to be congratulated as to his most effective efforts in the fields of both policy and administration.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

In saying a word about municipal affairs I think first I should say something about taxation in general. The Federal Government has—and uses—almost unlimited taxation powers. Enormous sums are flowing into the Federal Treasury—from income tax—from corporation taxes—from succession duties—from customs and excise taxes. As to corporation taxes, any corporation making any real money hands over about 50 cents of its profit for each 50 cents it keeps for itself and its shareholder. The amount of money collected by the national government just about staggers the imagination.

The municipalities have access to real estate taxation. There is where they get their revenues. This government has led the way in a new departure by making provincially owned properties subject to local taxation. Real estate taxation is a big field, but the demands on municipal treasuries are very heavy indeed.

The province has relatively limited taxation fields, unless indeed new taxes

are to be imposed. We have gasoline tax, succession duties, tax field rentals, lands and forests revenue, something from the race tracks, and the liquor revenue. Now without imposing new types of taxes this government has been able to increase its grant to the municipalities from less than Twenty Million Dollars a year to more than One Hundred and Twenty-five Millions a year. In other words about one-third of provincial revenues are paid out to the municipalities.

This does not mean that the municipal problem is at the point of solution. Far from it. But it does mean that provincially, municipally and federally where taxation is concerned we need a new deck and a new deal. Review the enormous demands made on municipal and provincial governments—hospitals—health—education—streets, roads and highways—water supply and sewage disposal—police and fire protection—parks—welfare activities and so on. Then consider this. Out of every Canadian tax dollar more than 78 cents goes to Ottawa and the provinces and the municipalities have to struggle along on less than 22 cents. Things are out of balance. I wonder if we can justify spending three-quarters of a million dollars a year for entertainment in Canadian embassies abroad when we have thousands of level railway crossings which should be eliminated. Municipal taxes on some modest farms around Toronto run to \$900 a year—\$1,000 a year. Sometimes I wonder if we actually own our homes and farms or whether we just rent them. Sometimes I think we are actually paying a substantial annual rent for occupancy. This is not the fault of the provinces. It is not the fault of the municipalities. It is the fault of the unbalanced division of the tax dollar.

This government has co-operated with Ottawa on every possible occasion for the national and the provincial good. We need, we sorely need, a readjustment of governmental revenues all along the line. I do not mean to be unduly critical of the federal authority and if the provinces tackle the problem, I think they can get some much needed and

long overdue adjustments. I do, however, sincerely congratulate the hon. the Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) on his very realistic assistance to our municipal governments. I also hope that he, along with the other provincial leaders may presently succeed in bringing about some of the readjustments I have mentioned.

I cannot leave the subject of municipal affairs without saying a word of congratulation to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). He received a sound schooling in municipal affairs when he lived and worked almost under the shadow of the House of Commons in our national capital. He has given long years of faithful and useful service in this House and in various departments of government. I hope to know him better as time goes on. In years he is perhaps senior to all of us; however, his energy of mind and spirit are as youthful as ever. I hope he will be with us for many more years of vigorous and effective public service.

Before leaving the subject of municipal affairs, I should like to say a word about rent control. Our housing shortage was in large measure a by-product of the war. Federal rent control was introduced and retained as an emergency measure. In the fullness of time it was dumped in the laps of the provinces. The scarcity of rental housing remains acute in certain metropolitan areas. In other areas the housing problem has diminished. As I understand it, the matter of further rent control now passes into municipal hands. The general principle is that it will be retained in those centres where it still appears to be necessary. The danger most feared is the possibility of gouging on the part of certain landlords. I would suggest, therefore that at this session careful consideration should be given the subject, including provision for local tribunals which will be in a position to see that even-handed justice applies to landlord and tenant alike.

It is not my intention to weary the House in trying to detail something of the activities of every department. There

are, however, one or two matters I should like to mention briefly before concluding.

We have an excellent body of men serving with the Ontario Provincial Police. I am sure we are gratified to know that substantial progress has been and is being made toward the provision of adequate local headquarters, along with housing for members of the staff. These men are moved from time to time; housing often poses a difficult problem. I should like to look forward, therefore, to the time when ample modern housing will constitute an integral part of the whole police establishment. Again, while salaries in the Civil Service are being considered, I think there should be something of a general upward revision in the schedules as related to the police. This will help in securing and maintaining a high standard of personnel. I also venture to suggest that the hon. the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) might give some thought to a revision of the system as related to highway traffic patrol. I must congratulate the hon. the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in his unflagging efforts along the line of traffic safety education. This is a valuable effort. It naturally is a continuing task. But I venture to suggest that thorough policing is the only method of appealing to a certain type of motorist, and I think the accident toll indicates the need of added facilities in this direction.

LAND USE—FIRE PROTECTION

There is a considerable and growing quantity of literature in relation to the world food supply. It is hard to realize the fact here in Ontario, but actually there are hundreds of millions of people in the world today subsisting on a sub-standard diet. Faulty distribution has something to do with it, as witness our huge supply of unmarketed wheat. Faulty land use plays its part. Overpopulation in many countries aggravates the problem. But this I should like to point out. Right here in Ontario, indeed all across Canada, thousands of acres of our best farm land are sacrificed for housing, for the expansion of industry, for airports, for public institutions of

one kind or another. Down at Ajax 2,500 acres of very rich land went out of production as a site for a shell filling plant. An establishment like Malton Airport consumes hundreds of acres of good farm land. I suggest that governments in general, federal, provincial and municipal, should go easy in taking over good farm land for various projects. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Planning and Development could give us some enlightenment on the subject a little later on. I do sincerely think this—that as to government projects necessary for a given area, there should be a bit of shopping around to see whether marginal or sub-marginal land might not be available, rather than to put out of use one or two or half a dozen good farms. The subject is worth much more than passing thought.

Speaking of farms and farm land brings up another subject. One of the greatest disasters which can overtake a farmer is loss of his buildings by fire. I think I may say that the average farmer has little or no fire protection. Fire is difficult enough to handle where a well equipped fire brigade is available. But in the country a fire burns itself out. There is little to be done except to save what can be saved. I wonder if the Ontario Research Foundation, co-operating perhaps with Hydro, with the Fire Marshal and with the Department of Lands and Forests, could not devise some inexpensive, efficient and workable devices for installation in farm buildings so that the farmer might have some reasonable chance of nipping a blaze in its early stages. It might involve installation of a farm pond as a water supply. It might be some sort of chemical installation. There are many good chemical extinguishers on the market but they are fairly expensive and are not generally in evidence except around public buildings. I sincerely believe that if some such equipment could be devised and merchandised to the point where it became as commonplace as a rural telephone or a rural Hydro installation, it would be a great asset to all our rural dwellers.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, it is a great honour to me to move the adoption

of the address of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. While I am a new member of this hon. House, I know something of the fairness and dignity which has always marked your incumbency of the high office which you hold. It is a great privilege to me to participate in this debate, and to lend my humble support to a leader who enjoys the affection and respect of the people of Ontario.

MR. W. G. NODEN (Rainy River) : Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to second the motion of the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) for the adoption of the address presented to this House by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. I am deeply appreciative of the honour thus extended to me and to the constituency which it is my privilege to represent in this House.

It is scarcely necessary for me or for any other hon. member of this Assembly to reiterate our continued loyalty to the Crown and our respect for the Monarchy. Our regard for the Monarchy and our devotion to Her Majesty are accepted and enduring factors in our provincial and indeed, our national fabric. During the past year our Royal Family have experienced deep sorrow and abounding joy. In the death of our late Queen Mary they suffered the loss of one near and dear to them. The coronation of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II was the highlight of a pageant on which were focused the eyes of the Commonwealth and indeed of the whole democratic world. It is gratifying to us that the hon. the Prime Minister and his charming wife along with a number of his colleagues were among the honoured guests at one of the great ceremonial occasions of British history. The good wishes of this Assembly accompany Her Gracious Majesty and her distinguished husband as they visit Commonwealth nations on the other side of the world. We wish them good health, a happy journey and a safe return. Long may they reign!

It is, a matter of the most profound regret that one of the able and popular members of this House who had given freely of his time and talents over

many years has been taken from among us. The late member from Simcoe East (Dr. McPhee) was a kindly and capable old school gentleman. His death is a loss to this House and to his constituents. We all extend our sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

I should extend my best wishes to two of my colleagues who have been overtaken in recent months by serious and prolonged illness. As you doubtless know, I refer to the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) who I am happy to see in his place today and the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas). We all join in our wishes for their speedy and complete recovery. Both the hon. ministers I have mentioned are charged with the direction of very important departments. Their return to their respective posts will be a matter of gratification to the hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues.

Here, I should like to extend a word of hearty congratulation to my friend, the hon. member for Niagara Falls. In the by-election of October 26th, last, the hon. member turned an adverse majority of more than 3,000 into a victory in which he himself attained a similar majority. The voters of Niagara Falls Riding have insured themselves of able representation for the duration of the life of this Assembly. More than this, they have given the Administration a well deserved vote of approval. I am sure that members of all parties will extend a hearty welcome to our friend from Niagara Falls, and I am equally sure that he will give a good account of himself.

In due course it will be an added pleasure to welcome to our ranks the member-elect for Simcoe East whose decisive victory of a few days ago undoubtedly constitutes a further whole-hearted endorsement of the Administration.

I would like to say a brief word of appreciation on behalf of the hon. the Prime Minister. His devotion to the heavy duties of his office, his sterling character and his broad experience are

appreciated by the people of Ontario. Without his fine qualities of leadership there could not have been the enormous expansion of government services that we witness all around us. His ability to co-operate with other governments is a most valuable factor—for Ontario—for the Dominion—and for the municipalities. My thoughts in this matter are well expressed in an editorial appearing in the *Toronto Daily Star* for January 21st last, and I quote:

Mr. Frost has submerged divergent political views in order to foster the good understanding that should prevail between his administration and the federal government. The friendly relations that have resulted between the two governments and their ministers are paying off handsomely in terms of progress for Ontario and Canada. (End of quotation.)

I am mindful of the many kindnesses and courtesies extended to me by the hon. the Prime Minister on many occasions, and I am sure that my own feelings of warm appreciation will be echoed by every member of this House.

The constituency which I have the honour to represent (Rainy River) some 1,100 miles away is one of the two most Westerly Districts, and is a large segment of that great empire which we know as Northern Ontario. It contains many elements of pioneer progress. Our people are students in the school of hard work on the farm, in the forests, in the mining industry, in the lumber, pulp and paper mills, the ever-expanding tourist industry, and generally in all those phases of activity which feature a community of the North which is and which will be for many years in the development stage. If in the North, more especially in the Northwestern part of Ontario where our lot is cast — I say that if in that part of Ontario we lack the sky-scrapers, the huge and diverse industries, the television stations, and indeed many of the features which in the South are commonplaces, we have our compensations. We have great resources of rich land, of mineral and of forest and most important, of water. Some of these resources are well

developed. Others are in process of development. Still others constitute our great natural storehouses against the future.

As to Northern Ontario we have passed well out of the period of exploitation of our natural resources. We are well into the period of ordered development, and in addition we have entered definitely into the period of conservation and replacement. These latter terms mean much more than planting trees. They involve the construction, repair and replacement of dams to conserve our water supply for the future. They include supervised cutting of timber. They mean efficient fire protection. Indeed they include education and leadership with our governments and our people becoming conservation-minded.

It would be fair to state that our forests are our greatest natural asset. Modern methods of harvesting timber are such, that coupled with demand, natural propagation is not sufficient to provide replacement. Cutting, also, is not the only means of depletion; fire, disease and over-maturity all take their toll.

Good forest administration is a necessity to preserve the beauty and utility of our forests, but neither governments nor individuals can do all that is required. Industry must do its part, and indeed is doing a commendable job today. For instance, the establishment of a new pulp and paper mill involves an investment running into many millions. The investment is today so extremely large that a permanent supply of raw material must be maintained. Hence we find our large forest industries not only using improved cutting methods but also planting millions of seedlings to grow into trees for future use.

During a tour of Northeastern Ontario many members of this House visited a nursery farm at Kapuskasing. This farm is owned and operated by the large forest industry which has its mills in that thriving town. From here, seedlings are transplanted into cut-over areas where they will eventually grow into merchantable spruce. Policies

such as these show an awareness of future needs, and they are followed in one way or another by many of our big operators.

I should like to commend the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests with respect to his very large and extremely efficient fire protection service. The use of planes, of fire-towers, of numerous types of special vehicles, of gasoline-operated fire pumps and many other special items of equipment is a huge story in itself. It is to the credit of the Department that its officials are credited with the design of one of the most useful types of aircraft ever evolved for special work. I believe that the use of the Beaver airplane became more or less general in the Korean war, which says a lot for its utility and performance under abnormal conditions.

I must commend most warmly the staff of the Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department for their work. Here again man is taking more of natural resources of fish and game than nature is able to propagate. The Division of Fish and Wildlife is planning and finding ways to help nature in meeting the demands of the public for better fishing and hunting. They are helping the tourist industry. They are aiding the commercial fisherman. Their educational campaign is an excellent one. They are one and all keenly interested in the maintenance of our fish and wild life for this and for coming generations.

Just here, I should like to mention the importance of water supply. We saw in recent years, and even now, a water famine on the Ottawa River which threatened to curtail the power output of the great Hydro developments in that area. In some places wells are failing; out here in Scarboro Township many suburbanites are forced to have water delivered in tank wagons because their wells have gone dry. There is talk of supplying towns in Southwestern Ontario with water from Lake Huron, this involving large and expensive pumping and piping operations. We hear a good many stories of falling water tables. This is a common experience in many areas. Down around Los Angeles, for

example, even the artesian wells have failed or are failing.

I mention this matter for more than one reason. Up in the North we have an abundant forest cover in most areas so that we do not experience a quick runoff. In past years many lumber operators, many now out of existence, built dams, establishing new levels in many lakes and streams. Latterly, it has fallen on the provincial government to repair or rebuild many of these structures. Were it not for water our Ontario Hydro generating plants could not turn a wheel, thereby causing the complete breakdown not alone of our industrial factories but also our present way of life. Again, I know of one paper mill which requires 90 million gallons of water every 24 hours in order to maintain a 60 million dollar investment. Thus water conservation is a work of importance which I hope will be a permanent part of government policy and administration.

Again, here in the South are numerous conservation authorities. They are fine examples of governmental co-operation and partnership. They involve endless negotiation, patience, planning, time and a big investment. But they will pay off. They already are doing so. The great dams on the Grand River and the Thames; the reforestation plans and accomplishments; the development of modern measures of land use — all these things will pay big dividends for the future. They will lessen or prevent floods; they will restore forest wealth for future generations; they will help restore local forest industry. As I said, they require time, patience, money, planning and co-operation, but we cannot repair in a year the depletion of decades. In a young country — I should say in pioneer days — the bitter struggle for survival meant the loss of much that should best have been preserved. This, however, is a part of the price of progress.

Just here, I should like to mention the new northern towns of Terrace Bay and Marathon. These, among others are bright, thriving and self-contained communities. They are based on brains, capital, enterprise, forest wealth and

finally the sound policies of this government.

It will be recalled that in the final months of 1937 a former government—by secret agreement—without competition—disposed of huge areas of virgin pulpwood forest. No mills were built, notwithstanding conditions in the agreements—but a huge export programme was announced. More than this, it was put into operation. Now it was one of the first acts of the incoming government to call a halt to this most improvident programme. As a result of this halt we now have two new and flourishing towns founded upon and built around big industries which will be a permanent feature of Northern Ontario.

For more than fifty years our statutes have stressed home manufacture of our forest wealth. It was left to this government to translate these statutes into action. The transition from wholesale export to a maximum of home manufacture is still being affected with a minimum of upset. Perhaps it involves some measure of local hardship, but generally, the programme is in the interests of our province. I am sure the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests will amplify my brief remarks.

Our mines rank alongside our timber as one of our greatest northern assets. It is often said, perhaps truly said, that we have only scratched the surface of our mineral wealth. Here is a rather startling instance of what has happened in recent years.

Ten years ago or thereabouts Ontario produced no iron ore at all. Yet in 1953, Steep Rock Iron Ore Mines which is in the Rainy River District alone produced more than One-and-a-half Million Tons of ore and the Algoma Ore properties produced nearly One Million Tons—that is nearly Two and one-half Million Tons in one year. Then stripping is going forward on proven deposits down at Marmora. What this third proven deposit may produce remains to be seen, but there is commercial ore and in huge quantity.

Up at Steep Rock my information indicates that the Caland Ore Company

is spending \$25,000,000 to remove silt from the lake bed. When a strong and capable company spends—yes, it will represent near \$50 Million before one ton of ore is mined on preparatory work, then the possible production simply staggers the imagination.

Now we hear a lot from some of the hon. members opposite about home manufacture of this ore. Naturally, all of us are anxious for just as much home manufacture of our natural resources as we can manage. But there are other factors. First, it is necessary to mix other ores with our Ontario product to get the various qualities of iron and steel which the trade demands. Second, as almost anyone knows, the standard practice in the interests of economy is to haul iron ore to the coal supply rather than to haul coal to the iron ore supply. So it follows if we do not export ore we would have an uneconomic operation, and you may be sure our American friends might not be too willing to ship us too much of their coal. I am not in a position to argue all the economic factors. That I leave to the experts, but I do say this.

America is the greatest single arsenal of democracy. In the United States the Mesabi deposits in the Minnesota area are wearing fairly thin. We—and I include the United States—must have steel and plenty of it to survive. Therefore, I say that our iron developments in this province are nothing less than a modern miracle that may well be a big factor in the survival of our democratic way of life. We maintain our British heritage. We value our Commonwealth connection. None the less we must be realists, and as such we must be alive to our relations, and especially our economic relations, with the United States.

I am glad indeed that industrial peace is in a fair way to be restored in our gold mining industry. It is not my intention to discuss the turmoil which over a prolonged period caused so much loss and so much distress. I shall content myself with extending my congratulations to the hon. the Minister of Labour, who, in this, as in many other industrial disputes has given of his energy, understanding and ability to

help bring about a reasonable settlement. I suggest that the hard and conscientious work of the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and his staff represent a most valuable contribution to labour, to management, and indeed to Ontario.

In the North the development of local and provincial highway or road systems presents special problems—much rough country—great distances—a sparse population. We have some settlements which are isolated islands so far as highway transportation is concerned. This particular situation arose at Atikokan, site of the Steep Rock Iron Ore enterprise. Here, there are some 4,500 people, but with the advent of the Inland Steel Corporation and other powerful industrial concerns we look forward to a population of 25,000. I think the government under the guidance of the hon. the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) deserves credit for building the Atikokan Highway from Shebandewan on the Trans-Canada to Atikokan, giving the citizens of that area the opportunity of using Ontario's modern highways. This highway traverses 72 miles of forest, rock, swamp, muskeg and crosses innumerable lakes and streams. This same highway, I suggest, should be extended in the near future on to Fort Frances completing another important link in our provincial highway system. At the extreme westerly boundary of Ontario there should be given consideration to building another International bridge at Rainy River to eliminate the present congestion of motor traffic during the summer season into Northwestern Ontario from the United States. This highway will make more fully available to our people the beauties and the facilities of Quetico Provincial Park. May I say here that this great, unspoiled playground with its magnificent forests and its wealth of fish and wild life is the envy of our American friends across the line. They wish indeed, as so many of them have expressed to me, that this 1,700 square miles of unspoiled nature could be a part of their country.

I should mention that our Northwestern Associated Chamber of Commerce has set up a committee to study

ideas related to the future development of this great Quetico area. Their views have been transmitted to the government and I know they will receive the earnest consideration of the various departments involved.

I do not like to single out various departments, but I must say that the demands of today on such departments as Health, Highways, Public Welfare, Education and the Treasury constitute a vast challenge. The Health Department today in relation to the maintenance grants to general hospitals is paying out \$12 a year where ten years ago it paid out \$1. The Education Department pays out about \$60 today as against \$12 ten years ago. The Highways Department pays out more than \$30 millions a year in municipal road grants as against \$3,600,000 a year a few years ago. The Department of Public Welfare under the capable guidance of the hon. the Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) has brought in good welfare legislation, coupled with sound and humane administrative practices. The assumption by the Department of fifty per cent. of all costs related to homes for the aged affords a welcome measure of relief to the municipalities. Up in our district we now have an excellent home for the aged. It is filled to capacity, which affords ample proof of the need. Our people recognize this home as filling a long-felt want.

Throughout the province the story is the same. Here, as elsewhere, the Treasury Department finds the necessary funds. The same Department guarantees the huge and necessary borrowings of Hydro. At the same time Ontario's credit never stood higher in the great money markets of this continent.

Here let me say just a word about the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop). He was kind enough during the latter part of May to visit my riding. We called at eleven different schools in the Rainy River District. We saw pupils at work in 43 different classrooms as I recall it. I know that my home folks deeply appreciated the honour done them by a busy and an able public servant. I think it speaks well for this

government when a senior minister in such a practical manner displays such an interest in those of us who live in that remote part of Ontario which I am proud to call my home.

I sincerely hope that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture may soon be in his accustomed place. His long experience—as a practical farmer—as an Agricultural Representative—as a member of this House—as a member of the government in another department—this experience gained by few of us, seemed to fit him exactly for his present portfolio. I should like to say this about agriculture in the Rainy River area.

We have some of the best farm land in Ontario. Settlers are coming in, and I should especially mention the influx of Dutch settlers. These fine people fit into our Ontario way of life very easily and I hope we shall see more and more of them enter our province. Our farm markets are good and they will be better still. The growth of such communities as Atikokan is of immense benefit to our farm community.

I should like to say a word of appreciation on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Warrender). Under his direction and with the co-operation of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the people of Atikokan are receiving the benefits of a new deal in housing.

Up to date the governmental partnership has acquired about 200 building lots which have been serviced, that is with streets, sewers and water supply. About 400 more such lots are included in a further subdivision. The subdivisions, one is called Dunbar Heights after the hon. Minister, are surveyed and laid out along lines indicated by modern community planning. The costs involved are charged partly against the individual lots and partly against the municipality. The purchaser gets his building site at cost—as a matter of fact he gets a serviced lot for \$200 or \$250—and he doesn't have any worry about digging a well, installing a septic tank or getting a path to his door. This programme breaks new ground for a mining town. It is something which

commends itself to me as being practical, sensible and worthy of wide general application.

The expansion of Hydro is of great importance to us in the North. Hydro marches apace with the development of our forest and mining industries. The St. Lawrence development is not only of vital importance to Hydro. It will have a very great bearing on the development of our iron deposits, for the completion of the waterway will widen greatly our markets for our ores. I think we all echo the recent demand of the hon. the Prime Minister that the United States after all these years should get out of the way and let us get on with the job alone. No doubt we shall hear much more of these matters as our debates proceed. There are many other subjects which I should like to interject into my remarks but I must content myself with dealing with one in particular. I refer to the Ontario Civil Service.

Like all other hon. members of this House, I find it necessary to come to the Parliament Buildings from time to time to iron out the various problems of my constituents. The care, efficiency and the courtesy which I receive at the hands of the members of the Civil Service always evoke in me the warmest feelings of gratitude.

In recent days I have noted the announcement of the hon. the Prime Minister to the effect that a modest general salary increase has been afforded the members of the service. This latest measure will be of real assistance to our efficient and conscientious civil service, a body of men and women whose daily task is to keep turning the wheels of the immense machinery of government. I feel sure that all members of this House will join me in expressing the warmest approval of the consideration extended to the employees of our government.

Commerce and industry today are competing for men and women of ability and training. They offer good salaries, opportunity for advancement, paid holidays, and all sorts of fringe benefits as they are freely termed. Men and

women who have achieved reasonable skill and experience are today drawing salaries which would have seemed fabulous a few years ago. A boss machine tender in a pulp mill, a skilled man of course, will draw perhaps \$6,900 a year and the next in line, if my information is correct, will draw perhaps \$6,500.

Speaking very frankly, I think the government, always in the light of its resources, should scrutinize its salary schedules. I think it would be found that salaries of senior executives are often out of line in many instances with their responsibilities.

What I am getting at is this. There is real competition today for brains, industry and technical skill. I think the Administration must maintain working conditions, including salaries, which will enable it to attract the best available people into the ranks of the public service. We have a good service today but we must not falter in the job of meeting modern employment conditions as they exist.

I am sure the government will agree with me when I suggest we must have good salaries and good working conditions for our public servants. They need not be overpaid. They must be well paid. And they must have available to them the security and the opportunity for advancement which is generally available in the better fields of private employment.

I am grateful for the opportunity of making these comments on the conduct of our affairs as I see them. I believe that the hon. the Prime Minister and hon. members of his Administration hold the confidence of our people. I believe their constant endeavour is as the hon. the Prime Minister has so often said, to

continue the job of giving good government to the great Province of Ontario.

There is one other thought I would like to leave with the hon. members of this Legislature. We who represent the Northern part of Ontario, hope that when you look towards the North and the Northwest you do not allow your attention to dwell on the bush only. By this I mean do not allow your vision to be fogged by daily happenings — look at what lies beyond — the vast timber resources, the mineral wealth, the fish and wild life and the abundance of water. The natural resources of Northern Ontario will play an increasingly important part in the future greatness of this grand old Province of Ontario.

The confidence of our people was given in full measure on November 22nd, 1951, just a little more than two years ago. I believe the verdict will be repeated when next our electors rally to the polls to exercise their democratic rights.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow we will go ahead with second readings. I should like to call first of all Order No. 12 on the present Order Paper, "The Telephone Act, 1954," so that it may be considered, debated, and sent forward to committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.51 p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Wednesday, February 17, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 17, 1954.

Reading and Receiving Petitions	67
Reports of Committees	67
Motion to Convene at 3 o'clock on Thursday, February 18	67
Discussion of Salary, Expenses and Allowances of Opposition Leader	67
Discussion of Flood Damage, Mr. Frost	71
The Telephone Act of 1954, Mr. Challies, second reading	72
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	89

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1954

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: The following petition has been received:

Of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement between the Corporation, Canadian National Railway Company and The International Bridge Company.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Education and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Brandon from the Standing Committee on Education presents the committee's first report, as follows:

"Your Committee begs to report the following bill without amendment.

Bill No. 33, The Department of Education Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I moved that due to certain circumstances the House would meet today, tomorrow, and on Friday at 2

o'clock. The reason for meeting at 2 o'clock tomorrow was to meet the convenience of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) who had, at that time, an important engagement, and would be very much inconvenienced if the House met at 2 o'clock.

Since that reason has abated somewhat, I understand, and he has since advised me, it will not be necessary, so far as he is concerned, to meet at 2 o'clock, I should like, therefore, to revert to the former time and convene tomorrow at 3 o'clock instead of 2 o'clock.

I present that motion now, which I have not committed to writing, although I believe it will be in a moment; but I should like to move now that the motion I made yesterday relative to the times of meeting should be altered, and revert to the ordinary time of 3 o'clock for tomorrow afternoon, and that the motion passed by this House should be amended accordingly.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, there is a matter which I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of the hon. members of this House.

I have here a clipping from one of the metropolitan newspapers of this area purporting to contain some remarks made by the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren).

In these remarks, the hon. member charged that the government was refusing to pay a staff that any Opposition should have. He pointed out that Mr. Drew at Ottawa has the status and receives the salary of a Cabinet Minister, but at Queen's Park, he pointed out, assistants had to be hired in the Opposition office and paid for out of the hon. members' indemnity.

As you know, that statement is very far indeed from the facts. For the seven members who constitute the Official Opposition, the government allows a regular staff of one man and one girl, full-time for twelve months. In addition to that, two extra stenographers who are hired for the session, are allocated to the office of the Leader of the Opposition. We have in all sixty-five members. The proportion is as follows: Two stenographers for the Official Liberal Opposition, which means that there is one girl for every seven members of the Opposition and one girl serving half-time.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): His arithmetic is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. WELSH: May I finish please? There is one girl in addition who assists the Secretary of the Opposition. One girl serves the Labour Progressive Party, half-time, and one girl is allotted full-time to the CCF.

In proportion, therefore, the Opposition is much better served than the government members. If you want to reduce it to dollars and cents, for every dollar that is paid for stenographic help for the government members, \$2.00 is paid for the Liberal, \$4.50 for the CCF, and \$4.50 for the Labour Progressive Party.

The reason I bring this matter up is that I do not think a statement of that kind should be allowed to stand without correction.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, according to the remarks of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh), may I point out that the com-

parisons he has made are just a bit ridiculous. It is certainly not comparable to use the comparison of the number of stenographers and office help, and of dollars and cents per member, because one must admit, if we are going to be fair about these things, that the government benches have unlimited staff and an unlimited amount of money at their disposal to present their particular case, or to develop any research on any particular subject.

It is the duty of the Opposition in the House—and a duty we fully expect to perform—to examine the activities of each and every department of government, and it is absolutely impossible to do a proper and thorough job of examining each department with the limited staff we have.

I repeat that the ordinary hon. members on the government side of the House, do not have to do the research we have the responsibility of doing, because the cabinet ministers and the many members of staff who support those members, provide them with the facilities for the research which is consistent with the job they have to do. I submit, as I submitted in my remarks in an address I made the other day, that the Opposition offices are inadequately staffed. The hon. Prime Minister was made aware of our attitude on that subject last session, and I re-submit that we cannot, for the good of Ontario, properly examine the work of all the departments of this government with the staff which we have at our disposal. I repeat, and I reiterate, that the salary and status of the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be proportionately equal to that enjoyed by the Federal Leader of the National Progressive Conservative Party at Ottawa.

HON. MR. FROST: In reply, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have always been most sympathetic to the problems facing any Opposition, large or small, in relation to their staff, stenographic and otherwise.

I say that for this reason: I was an Opposition member myself for many years. When I was in Opposition,

the government of that day—which was not very far removed from the front benches of the Opposition—gave us one stenographer during the session, and that was little Miss Drew, who died some two or three years ago. They allowed her the sum of \$1,000, and we put up the balance ourselves.

I do not complain about that because with that slight help we turned a government out of office. I may say I am most anxious to see that the Opposition receives every help—not to turn us out of office, but to make us stronger in office—because I am anxious that people who wish to criticize us should have the opportunity to do so.

I assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that it has never been my desire to do anything but get the full views of all the people.

As regards his salary; while the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not bring this up himself, I would like to give the House this picture. It used to be that the allowances, both for salary and expenses for the Leader of the Opposition were much less than they are today. As a matter of fact, the official revision came, I think, about 1945.

MR. OLIVER: In company with a general revision.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. The Leader of the Opposition was treated no differently than anyone else. There was one revision during the time Mr. Jolliffe was Leader of the Opposition, which was recommended by a Select Committee on which, I think, the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) sat. Later on that was reviewed again by a Select Committee which met in 1950. The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) sat on that committee also. At that time, the Select Committee, after a most thorough consideration, recommended adjustments in the indemnity or salary of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, indemnities of the hon. members of the House, salaries of cabinet ministers, and so on.

That report was accepted by this

House without any objection whatsoever. I may have sympathized with the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) but I think the objection he took at that time was that it should have been implemented at once, whereas I took the position I did not want to implement it until after a general election. That is what we did. However, the position taken by the hon. member for Cochrane South was a most honourable position and indeed he had very many arguments on his side for making that suggestion.

The salary, expenses and allowances of the hon. Leader of the Opposition were agreed to by the Select Committee of the House and were accepted without any amendment whatever. I am most anxious the hon. Leader of the Opposition should receive the emoluments, and the expenses to which he is entitled.

These are different days than those of many years ago. It is quite correct to say the hon. Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa was allowed the salary of a minister, the recent salary adjustment. Although I am not familiar with the amounts, but I understand that is the case.

I am perfectly prepared to appoint a Select Committee of the House to review the salary and allowances of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I will agree to that at once, and I will arrange for such a Select Committee to deal with that problem forthwith. If my friend feels that should be done, I will be delighted to do it.

May I say, in all fairness to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that I recognize the burdens on the hon. Leader of the Opposition in this House, and I would not want it to be said or felt that we would do anything which would restrict, nor hinder the functioning of the Opposition.

I have the greatest respect for what was done at Ottawa, in connection with the treatment of the hon. Leader of the Opposition there as regards salary and expenses, and I would say that what we have done was based on the recommendation of a Select Committee of the House which was representative of all

parties. I am perfectly prepared to have that matter reviewed.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, any remarks on the subject under discussion have been rather thrust upon me. I had no idea this was coming up today.

I just want to say with reference to the salary of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was quite accurate in his analysis of the situation up to a point. I think he will recall, and agree with me, that when the last revision of salaries was made there was no change in the salary allowed the Leader of the Opposition. I think that is a statement of fact. I am not complaining of it, at the moment, but what I do complain about—and I think the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) has a point there that perhaps the hon. Prime Minister has missed—the salary of the Leader of the Opposition would be perhaps ample, Mr. Speaker, if he were allowed to retain all of it. However, I have found in my experience that in order to get the type and number of personnel which we feel we require in the office, that the Leader of the Opposition has had in the past, is doing now, and perhaps will in the future, have to “dig down” into his own pocket to pay for this additional help.

That is the crux of the whole matter. I agree with the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) that in this day and age, when the revenue of this province is such as it is, and with the wide variety of subjects with which we deal, and the complex character of those subjects, that if the Opposition is to do the job, it is its to do, it should have in the office, an outstanding man in the research field.

It is not a question of stenographic help, as my hon. friend says, but it is a question of experienced help of a character which can get to the bottom of these things, search them out, and come to decision, for our perusal. That is the difficulty in the office now, as the hon. Prime Minister well knows.

We made representations to him last year, in his capacity as Provincial

Treasurer, in the hope that he would allot the Opposition office sufficient funds with which we could hire an outstanding man to do such research work as is needed.

I have no idea at the present time—indeed, it is farthest from my mind—of pressing for additional salary for the Leader of the Opposition, but I do think there is great need for additional high-calibred help in that office.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) that in his remarks, I think he was a little unfair. He took the number of Opposition assistants, and then those of the government, and worked out a sort of arithmetical table about them.

We are the Opposition, irrespective of the numbers in that office, and the smaller the number in the Opposition office, the more imperative it is we have outstanding people to advise us and help us; I think the hon. Prime Minister will see that.

HON. MR. FROST: Without attempting to prolong this any further, may I just make reference to the latter point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

He spoke in reference to a sum which could be used by the Opposition for research work. The difficulties are two-fold, and I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as well as the hon. members of this House, will recognize that fact.

First of all, to pay a man for research work would require that he be treated as a civil servant. I think most of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's assistants are treated as civil servants, and are paid as such, and are eligible for superannuation. This would mean bringing in a person, and putting him on the Civil Service list, as a research man, and would really, in many ways, be tantamount to paying for a political organization. I think the hon. members can see that.

I have considered that matter. I have had investigations made of the various practices in Canada, in all parliaments—Ottawa and the provinces—and I could find nothing parallel with this.

The other point, of course, is could an amount be voted—say a sum of \$5,000 or \$10,000—which would be at the discretion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition? I am sure the hon. members can recognize that difficulty. That matter would come under the Department of Mr. Speaker. Would there be any responsibility there from the standpoint of Mr. Speaker administering that section of the Department, in connection with the uses to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition would put these sums? In other words, would it not be tantamount to voting a large sum of money which might be regarded as a political fund, because, as a matter of fact, any Leader of the Opposition would be using the fund for purposes which he felt would provide him with the political facts and figures, he might desire to use.

MR. OLIVER: What is the matter with that?

HON. MR. FROST: I do not say there is anything the matter with it—except this; I was unable to find any place where that practice had been indulged in.

However, I am perfectly prepared to look that matter over again. I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that in the matter of stenographic and secretarial assistance, he can count on it that I will do everything I can. But his problem is somewhat different; it is to set up an organization paid for out of public funds, which would have to do with the briefing of the Opposition members in relation to matters of government. That question is quite unique, and, as I say, I have not been able to find any parallel practice of that sort.

I am most willing and anxious to discuss the matter further with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I will make available to him the investigations which have been made and the facts as I have them, and I will give them consideration, on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day: I know the hon. members of this House were very greatly disturbed last night, as was I, when reading of the effect of the flash floods in this province, due to the facts that the uplands of Ontario are quite heavily covered with snow, and, to the remarkable changes in the weather, ranging to as high as 60 degrees, and the recent amount of rain which has been experienced, and I went to bed last night feeling very greatly disturbed over the possibility of damage, as I am sure many of the hon. members did.

I am very glad to say that the reports we have today are encouraging. There have been some bad cases in the province. Fortunately, they are in comparatively small areas, and from the reports received, it would appear the floods are subsiding with the coming of colder weather.

Perhaps the situation where the greatest damage might have occurred was in the city of London. I do not want the hon. members of this House to feel that my affections are confined to Orillia and Lindsay. My mother was born in the city of London, 89 years ago, so I have always had a warm feeling in my heart for that city.

In my childhood, I was very often told stories by my mother of her early days in that city, when floods used to cause heavy damage at certain times. I received a communication from His Worship, Mayor Rush, of the city of London, this morning, in which he said that all was clear on the north and south branches, and the gauges showed the water was falling, and in the opinion of experts, the critical stage has passed. He stated that sand bags on the south branch of the river had helped to meet the situation, and he spoke in the highest terms of the Civil Defence organization in the city of London, and of the very good job they did in that situation.

There is something in which we are all interested, and that is the Fanshaw Dam which was opened within the past year. From reports I have noticed in

the *London Free Press*, and also word from His Worship, the Mayor, the Dam assisted greatly in saving the situation, and that the areas which had been considered critical ones in past years, had suffered no damage from flood on this occasion, and the Dam could have taken care of the storage water for a further fifteen hours, without being opened. I think that is something about which we can all feel very gratified.

I remember at the time we made the arrangement with the Federal Government for the erection of that Dam, in conjunction with the River Authority there, one of the points discussed by the people of the city of London as well as by ourselves, was that it would help in such a situation with which we have been confronted at the present time, and I am very glad to say that such has been the case.

MR. OLIVER: Have we received any requests from municipalities for financial aid?

HON. MR. FROST: Not that I know of. We are keeping in touch with the situation.

THE TELEPHONE ACT OF 1954

Hon. Mr. Challies moved second reading of Bill No. 51, "The Telephone Act, 1954."

He said: Mr. Speaker, at this point, it may be rather interesting if I were to review, rather hurriedly, the highlights of events leading up to the bringing down in this House of Bill No. 51, "The Telephone Act, 1954."

I think the initiation of the movement started with our hon. Prime Minister when Minister of Mines and Provincial Treasurer in 1947. He called together in his office, a small group representing a few of the branches of government interested, and a few from other organizations which should be, and are, interested in the question of the telephone.

At that meeting, there was present, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and some of the representatives of

Hydro, and Mr. MacDonald, who was, and still is, the Superintendent of Telephones, and is still with the Department of Municipal Affairs.

There was also present Brigadier General Smythe, who is a consulting engineer, and who, over a number of years, has been very interested in the telephone systems in the rural areas of the province of Ontario. This meeting was held December 2nd, 1947.

At that time, it was understood that a great deal of the work in connection with the telephone situation in the province of Ontario was handled by the Department of Municipal Affairs, such problems as requests from various companies relating to changes of rates, the question of sales or amalgamations, the extension of franchises, and approval of agreements, but great difficulty was experienced through this channel, because, after all, the Department of Municipal Affairs, did not have the technical staff, outside of Mr. MacDonald, to go into all the ramifications of the problems, and the difficulties of the small and large independent telephone companies. It was agreed that the province required adequate service, but that very few of the independent systems—excepting perhaps some of the larger ones—were giving adequate service.

It was also mentioned there were different departments of government interested, such as the Department of Lands and Forests, The Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission and The Ontario Northland Railway, all of whom, to some extent, have telephone systems in their Departments, and it was considered desirable that rural areas should have a reasonably high standard of telephones, and something should be done in order to assist in bringing this about.

Mr. MacDonald reported that the agreements, changes of rates, by-laws, and certain other features, came under the Department of the Ontario Municipal Board.

At that time, there were some 125 independent telephone companies,

ranging from 5 subscribers up to probably 200 or 300.

As the result of the discussion at this meeting, it was decided that Mr. MacDonald and Brigadier General Smythe should review the whole situation, and bring in a report. A report was brought in, which was dated February 12th, 1948. It covered the whole field of rural telephones, and independent telephone organizations in the province, in very large detail, because it was understood it was an interim report, and an interim report only, but it gave the government sufficient information to indicate that the whole problem of independent rural telephones should be enquired into.

Then, for a period of a couple of years, much research was done in connection with this problem. The Rural Telephone Act was introduced in 1951, which gave The Hydro-Electric Power Commission the responsibility of investigating and bringing in a report on this whole problem.

The commission gathered together a small body of men who knew the problem, and were interested in its solution, and the following composed the personnel of that committee.

Mr. B. W. Smith, representing the more successful independent telephones in the province; Mr. H. A. Rogers, O.B.E., the Executive Secretary of the Canadian Independent Telephone Association, and Mr. R. E. Smythe—Brigadier General Smythe—who was a consulting engineer in the province.

They secured the loan from the Bell Telephone of two of their experts, a Mr. Howard B. Blecker, and Mr. Warren G. Lloyd.

This man brought to the committee technical information it was very difficult to get from any other source and also maps and details of the lines, and all that sort of thing. In the report, it was felt proper to express our thanks and appreciation to the Bell Telephone Company for its generosity in making these men available to the committee.

That report is a very excellent one, and I may say, just in passing, that the

recommendations in that report have been carried out in this present bill.

The report is dated March, 1953, and a copy was sent to each hon. member of the House.

In order that the House may have a hurried glance at what this committee has been doing since it was organized in 1953, may I just give you rapidly, some examples of their activities.

They arranged for the amalgamation or sales of three large companies, some to other companies, and one or two to the Bell Telephone Company.

In others, amalgamation or sales are pending. Naturally, I cannot give the names at the present time, because it might prejudice some of the activities, but in most of them you will find that engineering studies have been made in order to assist the different companies as regards their value, and their assets, and what is the best way for them to proceed, either by amalgamation, or by sale.

Four of the systems, totalling 1,139 telephones are presently under study, and it is possible that amalgamation may be arranged.

These studies were undertaken upon the request of these four companies. Similar studies are anticipated in two other sections of western Ontario.

A serious problem is in the northeast section of northern Ontario, where there is a very large lumber industry, and in the summer, a large tourist trade. That was to ascertain the best method of getting telephone communication out to the larger centres. To do that at present, they have to pass seven different independent systems. Some of them are indifferent, and it takes hours to get a telephone message through.

This is probably one of the most difficult problems they have tackled, but the committee's engineering reports will be brought in, and we hope they will be able to solve the problem, and to help the people in that area.

One of the outcomes of this particular case is that the authority is taking over

wide power, in order to make it compulsory for some of these smaller indifferent companies to co-operate with the other companies, and give a better and more adequate service. There are areas in one or two townships where there are five small independent telephone systems, and it is the feeling they should be encouraged to amalgamate, and in so doing, be able to reduce the number of their centrals, and give a much better service to their subscribers.

There are many consultations being held and studies being made in different parts of the province. They are studying the rural areas surrounding one of the largest cities in the north. In that particular case, there is a municipal system, and there are about 240 farmers in that very excellent farming area. They nearly all require Hydro, but the municipalities themselves, because of the financial difficulties, are rather indifferent about attacking the extensions into the rural areas. We feel that by our officials visiting the authorities in the municipalities, they will see their way clear to extend their lines to take in these farms surrounding that quite large centre.

There are many other sections of the province where the feeling is the present committee can give assistance and help, but, so far, the committee feels the primary duty, and the matter of most concern, is to assist those independent companies to help themselves, and to enable them to get together with other independent companies in the same area, and amalgamate.

In most cases, it is not a lack of a desire to do so, but it is a question of somebody who knows the problems meeting with these different companies, and giving them leadership, whether that leadership be in engineering or organization, or whatever the case may be.

The committee, through this authority, and its officials, are making a large number of contacts. There is one case where the committee has met with five different telephone companies in an area, and it is not in that one only, but all over the province, where they are

making a large number of visits and contacts. It may be interesting to remember that although the committee has only been in operation since November, it is doing a very excellent job.

I think we should express, on behalf of this House, our appreciation and thanks to the committee which, in the initial stages, has brought this movement as far forward as it has.

Their work has been done at considerable sacrifice on the part of those engaged in it, but these men are keenly interested in solving the problem for the benefit of the people of the province.

Perhaps I should give you the personnel of the present authority.

Mr. H. A. Rogers, O.B.E., who is on the original committee, is the chairman. Mr. R. E. Smythe, is vice-chairman; Mr. V. B. W. Flynn, is a member of the committee.

They also have a Director of Engineering, in the person of Mr. Smith; Mr. James MacDonald, who is now the Superintendent of Telephones in the Ontario Municipal Board, if this bill goes through, and the new authority is set up, will be transferred to this new authority. He is doing an excellent job, and the province is very fortunate in having available the long years of experience of this public servant in telephone problems, and it is to be congratulated on his being able to give his services to the new organization.

Then they have Mr. Thomas Grindley, associate director of the commercial department. The authority is very fortunate in being able to obtain a man trained in this field of telephone.

They have two field men, who will visit the districts, answer enquiries, and give all the municipalities any information which the authority has in connection with this work.

Under the new Act, the authority is given very wide powers of governing, and will administer the whole questions of rural telephones, under this Act.

Their duties, which were primarily—and are now—those now under the Ontario Municipal Board will be transferred to the new Telephone Authority,

except those matters which have to do with the issuing of bonds or financing by municipalities of new systems, or the extension of systems, and that sort of thing.

You will find, in going through the Act, that most of the powers are just a transferral from the Municipal Board, with some changes in phraseology, which had been mostly for clarification purposes.

So the Act is the compilation of the duties and authority under the Municipal Board, which will be transferred to the new authority.

The duties, obligations and rights, under the authority are well outlined, and perhaps I should take but a moment to refer to them.

The authority, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations, to regulate and control the business practices and accounting practices of telephone systems. That will be of immeasurable value to a great many telephone companies, because one of the weaknesses in their systems is the fact that their system of accounting and rates and so forth, is not on a proper business basis. It will be able to give considerable help to them in that regard.

They will prescribe the forms, books, accounts, and records, to be kept by the telephone systems, and regulate and control the type of construction, and the plans of the different systems, and give them all technical assistance in regard to the type of plan they should use, and to regulate the maintenance of the operating practices of the telephone systems.

Perhaps the greatest contribution this authority can make after amalgamation is to see that they can set up a proper maintenance crew to look after the systems and keep them in excellent working order.

- (e) Prescribing rules of practice and procedure applicable to proceedings before the authority;
- (f) Prescribing fees applicable to proceedings before the authority and for certified copies of orders

and other documents made or issued by the authority;

- (g) Prescribing the form of and the particulars to be contained in tariffs of rates and tolls and the manner and form in which tariffs of rates and tolls shall be published and kept open for public inspection;
- (h) Prescribing the form and the particulars to be contained in the annual returns to be made by telephone systems to the authority;

In other words, to get a uniform system of bookkeeping so that the authority will be able to know what is going on in the different independent municipal telephone systems in the province.

- (i) Respecting any other matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the intent and purpose of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, this Act which I recommend to the hon. members of the House is, in principle, in order to give the people of the Province of Ontario the best telephone system of any province or any state in any jurisdiction.

As with rural Hydro, rural telephones are playing a most important part in helping not only the people in the rural areas, but our young people, in order to keep them there by giving them the comforts which a few years ago were only enjoyed by people who lived in the urban centres.

Upon behalf of the government, I want to thank, with a sense of keen appreciation, those who now constitute the Telephone Authority, for their splendid effort, as they have been responsible from the beginning for clarifying what the problems were, and now providing by this new Act, the machinery for solving them.

MR. OLIVER: Did the hon. Minister say this was going to committee?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: That is understood, is it?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: It is going to committee.

MR. CHARLES E. JANES (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in rural-telephone work for about twenty-five years, and I would like to take some part in this discussion on the new Act. As it is going to the Municipal Law Committee, I will not discuss the Act in detail, but I have two or three suggestions or remarks to make, and certain thoughts I wish to express. I want first to congratulate the government on their action in appointing this rural telephone authority. It is something which has long been needed. Up until that date, we were the only province in Canada which had not taken some action to assist in rural telephone service.

I also want to congratulate them on the fact that they have used such good judgment in going to the governors of the independent rural telephone associations for advice and help, and have chosen from amongst the Governors of the Independent Telephone Association, one to be chairman of the committee investigating the rural telephone situation.

That was a very wise action in more ways than one. They chose a man who has spent years and years as Secretary of the Independent Telephone Association and knows their difficulties and troubles, and knows the different members of the association, and has their confidence, which is very important in any new committee of this kind. The result is that from the first the independent companies will be behind this authority, and without that, it would have been almost impossible to carry it through and have the success it has today.

The government made a very thorough investigation a number of years ago, as the hon. Minister has stated and actually brought in the bill in 1951, but they were still not satisfied, and investigated for two more years before they brought in the amendment, and brought in the authority with power to act in many important issues.

It means now that they have consulted with these companies, and they really know what they can do for them. I have great hope in what they are going to do.

The hon. Minister made some remarks regarding the personnel of that committee and gave you their names. The chairman, Mr. H. A. Rogers, as I stated, has been secretary of that independent association for ten or eleven years. He did a wonderful job there. He was able to show leadership to that group, and it has been my pleasure to have been at the conventions every year for quite a number of years. As a matter of fact, I am quite proud of the fact I was once invited to become a governor of that association, but declined because I had so many other duties.

I have watched them over the years and have been very much pleased with the fact that their understanding of the situation over the province is improving every year, and we find men who know the telephone business coming forward and assisting in the discussions. Mr. Rogers and his board of governors were picking out these men as they came along and doing an excellent job, so I look for a great future for this new authority.

The vice-chairman will be Mr. Smythe. That is a very interesting situation. During the last war, Mr. Rogers was a buck private and Mr. Smythe was a brigadier. The situation is changed now, the brigadier is a "buck private" and Mr. Rogers is commander-in-chief, but they are greatly interested in telephone work and I know they are going to turn in a good report.

I have known Mr. Flynn for years. He has been a very successful manager of the Noisy River Telephone Company. I was interested in the name, "The Noisy River Telephone Company." None of us want noisy telephones. However, Mr. Flynn is showing wonderful ability meeting in these independent companies over the province and working with them, discussing their troubles. He is a chap who came up from the bottom and took over a company which

was in difficulty and made a very great success of it, and is showing a very active interest and a very fertile mind, I am told, in working out schemes to keep the companies together. After all, in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of this authority, the very great need is to try to amalgamate these companies and get them together.

The great difficulty right now is that we have 497 independent telephone companies, 168 of which have 50 phones or less, and 38 have 100 phones or less. No company with that small number of phones can give adequate service. After all, our rural people require the same type of telephone service as the urban people require. Never forget this situation, that they are all connected with the Bell Telephone Company, and the Bell Telephone Company cannot complete a message to any rural subscriber unless the rural telephone system is in a condition so that the message can get through. For that reason, the Bell Telephone Company is aware of, and rightly interested in the situation.

I think I might clarify the telephone situation a bit if I went over the different types of companies. If you look in the Act, you will see about four or five different sections referring to different types of companies. One type of telephone system is where we have the smallest number of public utilities. There are about ten of these in the province. Only in the urban municipalities like Port Arthur, Fort William, Kenora and similar places do we have public-utility telephones.

Then we have the private company which really must be considered a co-operative company. That is the type of company which I have worked with for a long time. In this company where practically all the phone holders are shareholders, it makes a very secure type of company, because in times of depression you do not lose telephones. The people are all shareholders; they have bought their shares and they have their telephone, and the result is they stay with the company. It has been necessary for our company to secure permission to use that type of phone

because of a certain transient population who do not have shares.

In describing that type of company, I will tell you something about my own—at least the company of which I have been a director for a number of years, and go back into the history of the company to show where and when it was organized.

In 1900, the need for telephone service arose. Up until that time the only service we had throughout the country had been a private line run through some of the local towns by a doctor or where there was a post office. That situation continued for two or three years until the people realized they should have telephone service.

In about 1903 or 1904, twenty men got together in the town of Forest to try to interest the people in organizing a telephone company. They did not know where they would get the money, but finally conceived the idea of putting up notes at the bank for \$50 each. The bank agreed to loan them \$1,000, if they got twenty notes of \$50 each. They scoured around the country and got nineteen men to sign a note, but they could not get any more, so the bank manager signed the other note to give them twenty notes of \$50 each.

They started doing business and had not gone very far until one of the twenty wanted his note back and said, there was too much politics in the business and he would not stay in it. He got his note back, leaving nineteen.

It is very interesting to note that two of the original men are still alive and voted at the last annual meeting this year. They had their ups and downs and had just got started, and had the trunk line up, when there was a terrific storm which blew it all down and they had to rebuild it.

The present difficulty of so many companies with less than 50 phones dates back to those days. They organized a central in the town, bought a switchboard, and every person who wanted a phone had to build their own line out.

At that time my father and one other man built a line eighteen miles long, and put a phone in. This happened in every direction from central.

In a few years they decided that was not a very good way to do business, and they turned the line over to the company. That is the way they did business. In other companies they kept them and did not turn them over, and as a result we have some telephone companies with only 8 or 9 phones on them.

The great hazard with the rural telephone people is the weather. This year, our company had a \$10,000 loss through storms, wind and ice, but fortunately we had sufficient money to pay for it, but this is a hazardous business with rural telephone companies. I will say more about that later.

I have a few figures here which I thought might be interesting to the hon. members, and which certainly will be to the general Telephone Authority regarding the prices of telephones fifty years ago. One item here shown a contract for 250 tamarack poles, 25 feet in length and 6 inch tops, fifteen cents. Another shows where they hired a lineman for \$1 a day. They got a coin box for a pay phone which cost them \$4. Today, the same phone costs \$120. The price for tools and everything else all the way through are on the same ratio.

However, through it all, we have managed to have good telephone service. We have served our locality and have given them excellent service, so much so that each year the Bell Telephone Company has been sending an inspector, a public relations man around the province, and in every instance he has given us a clean sheet, stating that our company was in excellent condition and our service was good, which we are very proud of.

Among the private companies, we have another company which has organized one line and built it. They are still trying to operate, with the result that in no instance do they have enough revenue to hire a lineman to operate it. The most regrettable part is they became a service station company connected

with central, owned by another company, and it is impossible in that situation to give good service.

We have another type of company that has given excellent service, our municipal company. These municipal companies are organized in a municipality. Where ten people are on the assessment roll, they can file a petition with council asking them to organize a company. That company is to a great extent co-operative. It is handled in this way. They go down the road and people sign to take a telephone. In each case, they must sign what amounts to a mortgage on their farm for 20 years, that they will pay so much each year to cover the cost of installing that phone. Also, they give them permission to put this money on the tax roll, and in that way that telephone company is the best situated of any company. Their tolls are all included on their tax roll.

There is one great weakness. In most instances these municipal companies are service station companies, and as I said before, it is impossible to give the best of service by a service station company, because of the fact someone else owns central, generally the Bell Telephone Company, and no purely rural telephone company can operate, because there is not enough revenue unless their rates are abnormally high. After all, it is the toll lines which pay the way and make it possible for a company to operate at reasonable rates and give good service.

I have some interesting figures here. In our western provinces where they believe very greatly in socialism, they went into the telephone business a number of years ago. In Alberta, in 1922, legislation was passed and they went into the rural telephone business. They sold it out in 1936, by organizing municipal telephone companies. Up to that time, the government had lost \$10 million besides many hundreds of thousands of dollars they could not collect.

Saskatchewan had about the same experience. They started in the telephone business to supply telephone service to the rural people. They built these

lines and put a tax on each farm whether they had a telephone or not. It did not matter whether they had a telephone or not, they paid taxes. They also paid rent if they had a telephone. They did that for a while and lost so much money they got out of it.

Then they built toll lines and by using the toll lines they were able to subsidize the rural lines in Saskatchewan and keep them going.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: What about Manitoba?

MR. JANES: Manitoba subsidizes the rural lines all the time to keep them going.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): What about British Columbia?

MR. JANES: In British Columbia they own the whole thing and they subsidize their own lines. Do not get the idea that I am going to suggest that we should subsidize rural lines. I do not support that course at all. I am convinced that when our committee gets to working and these companies amalgamate into larger groups of up to 800 or 1,000 telephones, and establishes rates, by creating goodwill and good public relations and working with the Bell Telephone Company, either try to arrange with the Bell Telephone Company to buy the line out and operate it, or that the rural company buy out the central from the Bell Telephone Company and operate it. Either way should be satisfactory. Indeed it is the only way it can be possible to operate with its own finances.

Any telephone company which has 800 to 1,000 subscribers and has the proper rate set can borrow all the money it wants anywhere. Our company have never had any trouble borrowing money, the bank will supply us with all the money we want any time we want it, and I know that is the case with any independent telephone company in Ontario.

In a few years after this authority has been working and has these companies organized and amalgamated, there might

be a reason to assist one of the companies to extend a line into an area where they have no telephone service, but that is several years ahead, in my view, and I certainly would not be happy at all to have the government do any financing of any telephone company at the present time.

Another point in which I am interested is, there is only one reason for giving a charter to a company to operate a telephone company and that is to give service to the people. I am not interested in any company which has a charter; I am only interested in the people who want the service, and I hope that when the authority begins operating if at any time they find a company that is not giving service, they will cancel its charter and give it some other company which will give service.

People who live in the rural areas do face some difficulties and have to do without certain things. Probably they get a considerable number of other things to compensate them for the things they miss, but the fact remains that they have a perfect right to a telephone service and that must be given without making the rates too high in the rural section; as where a local town is hooked in with it and they have reasonable toll rates, it can be operated, and will operate and carry itself quite easily.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) gave a fairly good report of what our committee has been doing. As he said, we do not want to mention the names of telephone companies with which we are working, because it might prejudice the situation, but they have been doing a very fine job. We hear criticism every once in a while about the Bell Telephone Company. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my experience over the last 25 years with the telephone companies and the years I have spent coming to conventions of the Independent Telephone Association in Toronto, the Bell Telephone Company is not interested in any rural telephone company. It is not interested in any small company except for one reason, that is to complete their contract, as I said before, with their subscribers. If they get a long distance

call in Toronto and they want to deliver that message some place in Lambton County, they want the rural company to be in a position to deliver that message. That is the only interest the Bell Telephone has in the local company, and they have gone out of their way to advise and assist those smaller companies. I feel there is a certain jealousy which dates away back 40 or 50 years ago. We had trouble in our area where at one time the Bell refused to accept any calls from our company, which had to go to the Railway Board in Toronto to compel them to accept those calls. But those days are gone, Mr. Speaker, and now the Bell is co-operating in a very efficient manner.

I would like to mention the Ontario Hydro. As hon. members know, this committee has been working under the Ontario Hydro this last few years. They have been very co-operative and it is really amazing what they have done. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that since this bill came in, in 1951—and this committee has been working only the last few months—the Hydro people have had 700 requests to put telephone lines on their poles in joint use. These requests have all been taken care of but two. I think that does show co-operation.

There are many instances of Hydro poles where it is not economical to run telephone lines, it is far better to keep away from them. The cost of equipping a high tension line to carry a telephone line is almost prohibitive, it is much cheaper to build a telephone line by itself and to keep away from the Hydro line; but where any of these Hydro lines are running through the country supplying power to the farmers, if it is only 2 horse-power or 3 horse-power, it makes a perfect connection to run lines on the same pole.

You will probably hear complaints along the line of the Hydro costs. One of the governors of the telephone company was telling me the other day that he inquired what it would cost to put his telephone line on the Hydro line and they figured out that it was going to cost him \$700, a perfectly just charge because they had to take their line down

and put in new higher poles in order to get the transformers higher up and do away with interference on the line. He estimated he could build his own line for \$300, and that is what he did. We must face that situation.

Another point that may be of interest is that since conversion from 25 to 60 cycle in Hydro, interference is much greater and the telephone line must be kept further away and must be more protected in order to have a quiet service. We were the "guinea pigs" in our company when conversion came along. At the time conversion was completed in our district, we could not hear over our phones at all. Nobody knew what was wrong. I came down to the Hydro people and told them the situation, they said they did not know what was wrong but they would send engineers. By the time I got home there were four engineers there and they were in there every week for a long time trying to figure out what was wrong. They finally came to the conclusion that 60-cycle current moved faster and went out further from the wires and was causing interference, and by putting certain protection on our telephone wires they were able to get over the difficulty. I want to commend the Hydro for the very fine assistance they gave us all the way through.

There are several situations in Ontario where the committee have been called in to insist on better service. The hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) suggested that he did not think we should mention any names, but in one case I have asked the chairman of the Telephone Authority to bring the map to the municipal committee when they are going over the Act and just show them the situation that is developing in this particular place where they have seven telephone companies for the message to pass through, a few miles on one company's wire, which is not very well protected; then a few miles on the next company's wire, also not very well protected, then it comes to a central where they close up about 8 o'clock at night and go home, and any long distance message definitely has to pass through that central.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I hope that is not in Eastern Ontario.

MR. JANES: That is where it is. I am not going to mention the name. Mr. Speaker. However, he tells me he is getting quite promising co-operation from them and that he hopes in a very short time to have one company operating all those exchanges. There is one good company among them, but all those messages must go through some of these poor companies whose lines are falling down and who will not take proper precautions.

I do not want to take any more time, Mr. Speaker. I have a few figures here which I thought might be interesting.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the hon. member (Mr. Janes) should not restrict his remarks. There is lots of time yet and he is making a very interesting speech.

MR. JANES: I have a few figures here which were taken from the U.S. Telephone Blue Book. There are 85,000,000 telephones in the world. The average calls per home for 1953 over the world were 153; there were 382 in the United States and there were 389 in Canada, so we do more talking than anyone else in the world.

In the United States there are 53,000 independent telephone companies. In Canada there are 950. This is interesting when you look at our new Act. Michigan is the only state where there is a penalty for listening on the telephone. Our new Act recommends a penalty for so listening.

HON. MR. FROST: Not for listening, for repeating. Mr. Speaker, that is in the old Act. I do not think it is a new provision, is it?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: No, it is in the present Act.

MR. JANES: I was over at our new rural Telephone Authority at No. 7 Queen's Park this morning. It is a very nice office. We are going to be very well

situated and if any hon. members have any complaints from any of their constituents about the telephone service, go over and "unload the whole thing" onto the shoulders of "Hal" Rogers. He is looking for work.

I do not think I should take too much time, Mr. Speaker. It is very necessary that engineering service be supplied to our rural telephone companies. Practically all the telephone engineers in Ontario are employees of the Bell Telephone Company, and as I remarked before, there is a certain jealousy, particularly among the smaller companies. The larger, successful companies are not being bothered by that jealousy, but the smaller companies are what one might call afraid of the Bell. In most cases the Bell would not touch them with a ten-foot pole because they are money losers no matter who has them. However, there can be a very great service given to those companies by supplying engineering service to them, by discussing their troubles with the manufacturing companies and by giving them a proper accounting system, because no company of any kind can operate without a proper accounting and auditing system. An auditor who understands the telephone business, in going over the books of the telephone company can tell them exactly the rates they should have to operate that company. Any company must be set up on rates that will pay their current expenses and any bonds they may have.

To my mind, to amalgamate these companies is probably the most important and most immediate thing this authority can do, and it is really surprising to me the response they are getting from these companies. The sad thing, though, is that the companies so far which need the assistance most are not coming forward for it, but when this Act is passed, authority will be given to go to these people and tell them they must do something.

I think I will not take any more time. I want once more to say that I am very happy in the fact that we have established this authority. We should have had it long ago. Quebec long ago gave

assistance to their independent companies and I see a great future for this Telephone Authority.

MR. J. ROOT (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the very interesting and enlightening remarks by the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) and the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Janes) it is not my intention to speak at great length on Bill 51, "The Telephone Act, 1954," but I would like to support the principle of this bill and to congratulate the government on the leadership it has given in this, as in other matters.

It is known to informed people that the problem of municipal and independent telephone systems was under study by the government for a number of years. In 1947 a conference was called in the hon. Prime Minister's office, to discuss this problem. This conference asked Mr. R. E. Smythe, consulting engineer, to prepare a report. Mr. Smythe presented an interim report in 1948. In 1951 legislation was introduced and passed, "The Rural Systems Telephone Act, 1951," which gave the Hydro Commission power to make a further study and give assistance to municipal and independent telephone companies. This Act was amended in 1952 and again in 1953, and today we are debating "The Telephone Act, 1954."

Mr. Speaker, what I have said and am pointing out, is that this government has given advanced leadership in the study of this problem. They have developed legislation and now present this bill which has benefited and will benefit and assist many of our people living in the smaller centres.

I mention particularly clause 66 of the present bill, which provides:

Every telephone system shall furnish continuous telephone service that adequately and efficiently meets the needs of the public in the territory in which it operates.

I draw attention also to clause 89 of the bill that provides:

Every person who, when using a telephone instrument or conversing over a telephone line, whether the tele-

phone instrument or line is owned by a telephone system under the jurisdiction of the Legislature or not, refuses to give up or permit the use of the line when requested to do by the operator or any other person in case of a fire, accident, sickness or similar emergency, is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a penalty of not more than \$50 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than 30 days or to both.

Clause 101 of the new Act sets out as some of the duties of the authority, among which are:

to study the communication needs of Ontario, both immediate and future, and plan adequate communication facilities;

to supply telephone systems, municipalities and persons with engineering, accounting, legal and other technical advice and assistance pertaining to telephone problems;

to encourage and assist in the formation of larger and more efficient telephone systems by rendering engineering, legal and other assistance in the amalgamation, purchase, sale or other disposition of telephone systems or parts of systems;

to encourage and assist telephone systems to improve telephone service and to extend such service to unserved areas;

to establish and conduct schools for the training of construction, installation and maintenance employees and the operating staffs of telephone systems.

These and many other clauses in the bill will make it possible to provide an improved communications' system for many parts of Ontario and, in particular, the rural parts.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone interested in the welfare of the people and in particular, the rural people, will give their support to this bill, as I intend to give mine.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to add

my congratulations to the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) and hon. members who have preceded me, in extolling the virtues of this new telephone bill.

My great interest in it is more or less personal. I have a phone in my house in the Township of Macintyre, 2 miles outside of the city of Port Arthur, which has not rung once in the last two years. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is because nobody wants to talk to me, it is just a case of one of these systems which went into bankruptcy two years ago and has never worked since.

This bill is designed chiefly to help situations such as that. As the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) explained, some year and a half ago he figured that a good telephone service should be given to all the people of Ontario and, with that forward-looking idea of his, he immediately asked the Hydro-Electric Power Commission to form this committee and investigate and bring in a report on what the possibilities were for giving good telephone service to all the citizens of Ontario. I understand they sent out questionnaires to different areas and visited telephone companies throughout the province, and they have now brought in this bill for our consideration and passage.

The hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) who preceded me, mentioned several things in the bill which strike me as the most significant items in it.

Page 26, part VI, provides that there shall be a body known as the "Ontario Telephone Authority" and the members shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor;

the staff of the authority shall consist of a secretary, a commercial director, an engineering director and such other officers as employees as may be deemed necessary.

That really constitutes an authority which is worthwhile in connection with our rural telephone situation.

The sittings of the authority may be either private or open to the public, but any complaint made to the

authority shall, on the application of any party thereto, be heard publicly.

That is another excellent point. Then the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root) mentioned the duty of the authority

to study the communication needs of Ontario both immediate and future and plan adequate communication facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware that for the past 32 years Mr. MacDonald has been struggling, many times greatly frustrated in his efforts, to keep rural telephone systems going throughout this province. This Act is going to be of great assistance to him and I know he will be of inestimable value to the committee. In my own municipality, Mr. Speaker, we have a great many railroad workers who have found it most difficult to carry on their vocations and who live outside the city, and due to lack of telephone service, very often they have to go so far as to hire taxi cabs at \$2.50 a journey, to notify them when they are needed for railroad duties.

These are some of the things we are up against.

Now, we have managed to get the city of Port Arthur Commission to extend their lines into our municipality, at a cost of \$4.75 per month, and a down-payment of \$15.00 at the time they take their 'phone. The charge is high, but at the same time, we feel it is a great service, and we also feel that this bill will help not only the small communities, but the larger ones, to get the service we have been so long denied.

There are a couple of other points, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention, which I think are important. One is on page 28, section "f" which reads:

to encourage and assist in the co-ordination and joint use of power and telephone plant, including the improvement of the appearance, efficiency and safety of such plants, and to assist telephone systems to reach agreement with power systems for such purpose.

In our own locality, the Hydro-Electric have made available to us, the use of the poles, which was a very great saving to our municipality in the telephone use, and I think that section of the Act is most important.

I also like this item on page 28, subparagraph (b),

to encourage the telephone systems to establish pensions and other benefit plans for employees.

That will mean a continuity of staff, which will ensure better telephone service for the users, which are available at all times, and they will be people who have been trained in their work. This will benefit the rural municipalities, Mr. Speaker, instead of as previously, where the board came to their assistance only in case of emergency, or for any adjudication to be heard by the board. Under this authority, they will have this trained staff to render constant assistance to telephone companies and help them improve their systems. They will be able to render engineering advice, and supply telephone systems with detailed maps, showing what should be possible to be done, and then be able to send in field men to give actual instructions. I understand that schools will be set up to train men in the different municipalities in proper telephone operation. This will be of benefit to the whole telephone situation in Ontario.

There are so many unserved areas, and some which are poorly served, and this authority will assist in improving these conditions.

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, something which I have always believed, that this is but another price of forward-looking legislation which has always been emblematical of the Frost administration.

MR. S. J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, representing a different part of rural Ontario than the other hon. members who have spoken, that is, Renfrew County in eastern Ontario, I think perhaps there the telephone problem is more acute than in the western

part of the province, and I would like to commend the government for bringing in Bill No. 51. I think it is a sincere attempt to render assistance and direction to some of our small companies, to help themselves to provide better telephone service in rural Ontario, in their attempt to provide rural telephone service, where we have no service at the present time, and we have a great many people in that category in Renfrew County.

In our county, we have four distinct types of telephone service at the present time; we have the Bell Telephone, which has taken over certain small companies during the last few years and is at present providing a very good telephone service, but, I must say, at a considerably higher rate than was paid to those prior to their being taken over.

We have one large system operating in our county, which provides a very passable telephone service to its subscribers.

Then we have dozens of small, independent companies, or mutual companies. These companies have anywhere from 40 subscribers upward, and in each case the subscribers are shareholders in the company.

These companies date back 30 or 40 years, when they were granted a charter, when the municipality gave them the right to build a line along concession lines, and they have provided services for the people in these townships. There are a great many who are perhaps a quarter or a half-mile off the telephone lines, who were never able to get service, because in many instances we have telephone lines on one side of the road, and Hydro lines on the other, and it was impossible to build a third line, so nothing has been done to provide service for these people.

Then we have several government lines, such as the Department of Lands and Forests, and the Hydro, which provide telephone service for themselves, and in some cases, for private parties.

We have, as the vice-chairman of the

Hydro remarked earlier, a great many summer resorts which are in the backward parts of our county, where no telephone service is provided. These people live in the most remote parts of the county, and it is those of whom I speak at the present time.

I think the direction which can be given by the Telephone Authority, through its engineers, to our smaller companies, can be of very great value, and perhaps bring about a solution of the problem of the many people who are unable to secure telephone service at the present time.

These small companies, to which I made reference a short time ago, built their lines 30 or 40 years ago, and provided a reasonably adequate telephone service at that time. In fact, in many of our rural sections today, the telephone service is not as satisfactory nor as adequate as it was 25 or 30 years ago, when the lines were comparatively new.

These lines have fallen into disrepair, and the poles have rotted, and in many cases, have almost fallen down. The metallic surfaces have been corroded, and are not giving as good a service as they did when the lines were new. Because of the limited cash invested by these companies, they cannot provide such amounts needed to provide services to which these people are, I think, entitled.

I think the Telephone Authority to be set up can render very valuable assistance in getting these small companies together and to amalgamate, and co-operate, to provide better service for a great many people who are doing without it at the present time.

I do not know that Bill 51 is a "cure-all" for all our difficulties. I have been looking over some of the sections, and can visualize running into some difficulties, particularly in the section where it says:

In a case where the revenue derived from the operations of a telephone system is insufficient to carry the cost, a special rate may be imposed by the municipality upon all rateable property in the municipality.

In our county, where some are already under the Bell system, for which we think we are paying a sufficiently high rate, there will be objection if a rate is levied on them, to help provide telephone service for other rate payers in the municipality.

I understand this bill is to go to the committee, and some of these little difficulties may be ironed out there.

I am sure this is an attempt to correct a situation which is bad at the present time, and is a measure which is long overdue.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, although the riding of Essex South is serviced, in the most part, by the Bell Telephone Company, the residents of Pelee Island are operating a municipal telephone system. This has worked very well in the past, but from time to time, there have been interruptions in communications to the main land on account of the cables being disturbed by ice, or by dragging anchors of ships in the ship channel of Lake Erie.

However, a few years ago, connection was made by radio, and it has been used very effectively ever since.

However, the point I wish to make is this—which may not be properly in order—but the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission has rendered good, co-operative service to the rural systems throughout the province, and this has been done through legislation introduced by this government.

On Pelee Island, we have a well-maintained telephone system, and on behalf of the residents of the island, I wish to state that they would like to reciprocate with the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, and will be very glad to offer all their telephone poles at any time the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission is ready to supply them with Hydro service.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate on this bill, but I do wish to make one or two observations.

In the first place, I think the government has taken the proper step in setting up the authority, and that this authority will take over many duties from the Ontario Municipal Board.

The work which has been done by the board heretofore was simply the control, taking the telephones as a whole, and I am very pleased indeed to see that Mr. James MacDonald, a very faithful employee of the board, has been retained and his services are going to be used by the authority. I think that was an excellent move, as Mr. MacDonald is one of the finest telephone officials in the province of Ontario.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hunt) that I think he is unduly apprehensive when he made his remark about the assessment. The special assessment is only made as against subscribers in a municipal telephone system, where the subscribers have subscribed to the establishment of a municipal organization. Then the special assessment may be placed on their property. The hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hunt) evidently thought that such companies as the Bell Telephone might ask for his assessment.

I have gone over the sections of the bill rather hurriedly, but I believe it is an excellent bill, and will fulfill a much-needed want. There are, however, one or two things of which I am fearful. I see there is one section which says "continuous service" must be given. Now, "continuous service" is undoubtedly necessary, but it will mean the limitation of the operations of many of the smaller companies. In the smaller areas, many of the smaller companies have closed down their operations at a certain hour of the night, or evening, and have not re-opened again until the early hours of the following morning. If these companies have to give continuous service, it will mean increasing their overhead expenditures, but I think they can get around that by amalgamating small groups together. I am sure all hon. members of this House want to see these small companies survive, and not

be "gobbled up" by such a large, monopolistic system as the Bell. I would hate to see the Bell take over the telephone services of the province completely. I want to see the smaller companies continue, if they can give proper service, and I would like to see an extension of the municipal systems. I think therein lies the answer; let the municipalities take over these systems, and operate them.

For nearly thirty years, I was a director in a stock company which owned and operated a telephone system in the north. About three years ago, the municipality gave notice they were going to take it over and they did so. They took over our system. At the time our company lost control, we had 185 telephone services in the settlement of Ansonville; today, they have somewhere between 600 and 700, which shows what a municipal system can do, when they take over the operations of the telephone systems.

All in all, I think the bill is a very good one. There may be one or two questions which will have to be ironed out, but that may be done in the Committee on Municipal Law, or in Committee of the Whole House, which will be the proper place to bring up these problems.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I was hoping the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) would make it unnecessary for me to make even the few brief remarks I had not intended making, but now I am compelled to make them because he has not created the condition which would have made them unnecessary. This has been what you might call a government field day. I do not suggest the government organized this extensive debate. I think it was very interesting, and the subject matter of the bill does deserve the discussion given to it. I have learned quite a bit from the discussion but inevitably it was almost a symphony of praise of the government. It will, I am sure, find its way into the columns of the weekly papers of this province and they in turn

will spread far and wide that this government is always on guard for the telephone users.

I do not want to create dissonance at this late hour but I am obligated to say that while I agree with the principle of the bill I still feel that the bill does not go far enough, and that should be stated. The bill, Mr. Speaker, points up a few very important things that should be noted on this occasion. First that the Bell Telephone Company, which has a monopoly in a very decisive field of human communications, is falling down on the job and steps in usually when it is profitable for them to step in, but leaves the pioneering work to the rural person, to the farmer and to those who open mines. Is not that true?

It is a truth of which we should take note that here is a monopoly which boasts of the fact that it has paid dividends uninterruptedly since it came into being—and so it has. It tops the list of big corporations which have never failed their bondholders. Yet this company lets the farmer and the bush man struggle it out and create the local telephone systems, and then comes in much later.

Indeed I think Mr. Speaker, that while the bill will help the small companies—and to that extent should be supported, as I am sure it will be supported from all sides of the House—what would be necessary in my humble opinion would be that we utilize this occasion for embarking on a new policy, a policy that would ultimately lead to a provincially-operated public utility of all telephones in the province. That is what we need. There are some local telephone companies which have done pretty well. At the Head of the Lakes I understand there is a publicly-owned telephone system which has done so well that I hear its treasury was raided on a couple of occasions by the municipal treasurer in order to keep the tax rate down.

Here is a telephone system operated by the municipality and they find it very profitable, and I am sure we would find it profitable to operate the Ontario telephone system and we could perhaps

now begin to regroup and amalgamate all these companies into an Ontario system which ultimately would blanket the whole province.

One of the greatest accomplishments of Hydro is its ability to come here year after year and boast of the extension of services in the rural areas, which until now, did not have the benefits of electricity. I, like everyone else, am happy Hydro is doing that. If we had the telephone system operating as a publicly-owned utility we could extend it into the remotest areas of this province, open up new areas and relieve the burden on struggling farm communities or communities which open up virgin forest land. I think we would really "go to town." I think we would give service cheaper than is now given by the Bell or the struggling small local systems because we could borrow money at interest far below what the Bell is paying its bondholders. I have not looked up their bond interest rates but I think they are paying now between 5 and 6 per cent.

MR. A. K. ROBERTS (St. Patrick) :
5 per cent.

MR. SALSBERG: All right, I accept the information of the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts), not entirely because he comes from a neighbouring constituency but because he is around Bay Street and knows what is doing in those parts. The hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) tells us the interest rate is around 5 per cent. We can borrow money as we do for 4 per cent. or less, I think, and we have operated Hydro—despite all the things we may complain about and despite things we would like to know—as efficiently as any private company would and we are able to borrow cheaper money. It is possible to operate a publicly owned telephone system in Ontario on money borrowed at anything between 3 and 4 per cent. Hydro bonds recently were sold at less than 4. Why should not we do that? I think we should. I think it would help the extension of this very necessary system of communication. The people would profit thereby

and would be relieved of the load they now carry on their shoulders. The hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Janes) has done a very excellent job and I am sure he will now qualify for a seat on the new authority. If agreement has not yet been reached that he should be a member of the authority, I would suggest his name to the government for consideration. As for the hon. Prime Minister, I am sure he privately, in his own heart, agrees with my proposals. I can see it in his eyes. His heart is in the right place, but he has no control over his heart. I hope on this occasion he will remember to implement at least some of the suggestions I have made.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say before this bill goes to its next stage in the committee, that I hope it will receive there the most full consideration. I know it will receive it there. There are clauses in this bill which I think require very thorough consideration. I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Grenville (Hon. Mr. Challies) and those to whom he referred, and I would also like to thank a large number of hon. members of this House on both sides who have taken an interest in this matter for some years past. This is another step, and I think it is one which will add to the betterment of rural communications.

I do not speak without interest. I am a rural telephone subscriber myself. I have been for some time now a subscriber to the Dunsford Rural Telephone Company, and I would point out to my hon. friend from Lambton East (Mr. Janes) that this is a good company. It gives good service. I have phoned to places a good distance away, and it is a good line.

I believe this will be a means of giving to our people improved communications. I was in the Kenora Riding some time ago, and there I saw an interesting experiment—I presume it was an experiment—in wireless communication, and I had an opportunity of talking over that wireless communication to outfitters' camps and other places. This is a very interesting thing,

and it may be that development of the idea will solve many of the problems of rural people in connection with sleet storms and weather disturbances. Science may meet them.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure this bill will be given the utmost consideration in committee as one more step in providing for better rural communication.

MR. OLIVER: Will there be ample opportunity for interested telephone companies to present their views before the committee?

MR. FROST: Of course.

MR. OLIVER: I would think it elementary that we should not push it through committee too fast and that these companies and their representatives will have every opportunity to state their views in respect to the different clauses.

MR. FROST: Perhaps the best thing that could be done would be to refer it to the committee now and then let the matter stand—people will get notice through the Press—and do not hurry it; let it be there perhaps a month and then let it come back here after everybody has had the fullest opportunity.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House may I say the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne will proceed tomorrow. On Friday I hope we will consider other bills and also consider the report of the Election Committee, of which the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings) is chairman. In considering these reports I think it should be remembered that these reports are the reports of the thinking of committees which are bipartisan. I was rather interested in a comment made during a recent by-election in which one of the members opposite—I cannot say whether it was from the C.C.F. group or not, or somebody connected with them—likened me to a person they dislike very much, because there was a

provision in it for putting down a deposit. Perhaps some of the hon. members here saw that. At least—it is so said—there was provision in the report for the payment of a deposit, and therefore I was likened to a person whom the speaker did not like very much.

However, any report to be presented is a matter for this House when it comes from the committee and I can assure you that views put forward by committees are decisions at which they arrived entirely untrammelled.

I have never been consulted about any of these matters and I would not expect

to be. I would look for the committees to bring forward their views to this House to be debated in the ordinary course.

On Friday I hope we may consider that report. We have a number of these reports and I want to give ample opportunity to all the hon. members to consider everything contained in them.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The house adjourned at 4.17 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, February 18, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 18, 1954.

Reading and Receiving Petitions	93
Motion to add Mr. Oliver's Name to Committee on Government Commissions, Mr. Frost, agreed to	93
Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. Kelly, first reading	93
Operating Engineers Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, first reading	93
Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	93
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	94
Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading ...	94
Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Porter, first reading	95
Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Frost	95
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	115

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1954

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

The Acting Speaker in the Chair.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: The following petition has been received:

Of the Corporation of the Township of Scarborough praying that an Act may pass providing that the Council of the township shall be composed of a Reeve, a Deputy Reeve, and six Councillors and providing for the method of its election.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the name of Mr. Oliver, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, be added to the Committee on Government Commissions.

Motion agreed to.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

THE MINING ACT

HON. P. T. KELLY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Mining Act."

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): With your permission, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister. He is introducing a bill

amending certain sections of the Mining Act, and I think he is fully aware that there are many people who do have day-to-day dealings with this Act, who feel it would be in the interests of the Province of Ontario if a more general revision of the Act was made in committee. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether, in presenting this bill, he contemplates referring it to the committee and permitting much wider recommendations to be made.

HON. MR. KELLY: The bill in toto will be referred to the committee, and we would welcome suggestions from hon. members and particularly the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) which might enable the committee to bring in recommendations which would be of benefit in the administration of mining by way of amendments to the Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE OPERATING ENGINEERS ACT, 1953

HON. CHARLES DALEY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Operating Engineers Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This is just a matter of having the municipalities placed on the tax notice with rents to be received from the Provincial Government during the year. Although we listen to broadcasts about how mean we are with municipalities, we want the taxpayer to know what he is getting. We are not ashamed of it.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an explanation. This is quite a lengthy bill and will go before the committee, of course, as all our bills do.

Section 1. This is a revision of Part I of The Municipal Act, which is the part dealing with the formation of new municipalities, changes in status of municipalities, changes in municipal boundaries and dissolutions of municipalities, and matters consequent thereon. The fundamental principle that has been followed in the revision is that all such matters should be settled before the Ontario Municipal Board.

That is to say, we have been dealing with conditions in places which have been changing. We have in the Atikokan district, the "Improved District of Atikokan." They were desirous of changing their status to a town. We found, according to our Act, it was impossible. If it had been formed into a township first, they would have been put to the expense of a Private Bill. They asked for permission to be placed as a town or village.

I might as well explain here—because you will be asking me if I do not—that this will affect Malton, which is "a police village" and now desires its status to be changed to a village. It will go to the Municipal Board and not to the county. Times have changed in the past ninety or one hundred years since this was

placed on the Statute Books, and conditions have changed. Manufacturing interests in or near surrounding villages have affected the sale of bonds in the township. I have had several letters during the past week from bond dealers, saying they sold bonds for the Township of Toronto, and that Malton Village was considered at that time, and the industry there is a great asset to that township, and would, perhaps, affect the price of the bonds.

Therefore, we feel all these factors in changing the status of a municipality should go to the Municipal Board, where people will have the opportunity of a public hearing and both sides will be heard before a decision was made.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): May I interject and ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) if he has given any consideration to having a general revision of The Municipal Act?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We have been revising it pretty well each year, bringing it up-to-date, and suggestions have been made by The Mayors and Reeves Organizations, The Ontario Municipal Association, The Rural Municipal Association, and different associations of that sort. It is a difficult thing to change a complete Act, because the foundation is sound on which it was built and amendments are made from year to year. When you consider there are nine hundred and sixty-two municipalities in the Province of Ontario, it is difficult to change the Act to fit it in with the machinery of all the different municipalities. That is why we must have so many Private Bills.

This amendment will pretty well revise the first part, and we will have further amendments to offer regarding the balance of the Act.

THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with employee pension and retirement plans operated by an employer or by a trustee.

Some little time ago The Insurance Act was amended to deal with plans of this kind when they were operated by insurance companies, but there are a number of these plans which are operated by trustees and by employers direct, and it is intended by this amendment to bring them into line with the provisions of The Insurance Act.

Also, this bill will provide that these pension trusts will be excepted from the law respecting perpetuities and accumulations as it is inappropriate that these laws should apply to such trusts, and there is some doubt whether it may apply.

THE PARENTS' MAINTENANCE ACT, 1954

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This bill provides for a general revision of this Act, which was originally passed in 1921. It does contain two new principles.

In the first place, in line with the policy which appears in some other bills which I have already introduced at this session, the jurisdiction in these cases will be given to the Juvenile and Family Courts rather than to the magistrates, except in those cases where there is no Juvenile Court, and in those cases it will be before the magistrate.

In the second place, cases in which the information is laid without the consent of the Crown Attorney are extended and it is now provided in addition to these other cases under the present Act, that informations may be laid by a representative of a municipality, because the municipalities have some interest where the children of parents who are able to support them, have become public charges.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Before the Orders of the day, I want to extend to the teachers and pupils of Stayner Public School a very warm welcome to our Legislature.

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

- (1) 1952 Statement of the Return under Sections 235 and 241 of The Municipal Act.
- (2) Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission for Ontario for the year ending March 31st, 1953.
- (3) Thirty-third Annual Report of the Public Service Superannuation Board.
- (4) Report of the Provincial Auditor on the Public Service Superannuation Fund for the year ending March 31, 1953.
- (5) Report of the Provincial Auditor on the Public Service Retirement Fund for the year ended March 31, 1953.
- (6) Eighth Annual Report of the Department of Travel and Publicity, Ontario, for the fiscal year 1953-54.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 1st Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the session.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would want my first words this afternoon to be in appreciation of your acceptance of the chair on this occasion, and I can assure you that, as far as I am concerned, this afternoon, you will have a quiet tenure in office. I am personally a man of peace, and I have no desire to stir up controversy, and if you have any difficulties, they will come

as a result of provocation from across the way.

I thought I might as well place the responsibility at this time, because in the heat of argument we might lose sight of the relative aspects of the proper basis for the responsibility for any flare-up. But I do want to emphasize—and seriously, Mr. Acting Speaker—how glad I am to see you occupying this high place in our Legislative Assembly, and to express the hope we will have the opportunity, as the session progresses, to see you in action, and to benefit from your fairness, as we proceed forward.

It was my loss, Mr. Acting Speaker, not to be in the House the other day when the mover and seconder of the address in reply made their contributions to this debate. I would have liked to have been here, but I think the House will grant this, that I have always been here in times past, but sometimes circumstances arise which seem to prohibit a person being in the House, and one of those circumstances arose, hence I was unable to be here when the mover and seconder gave their addresses.

I have no doubt they were speeches which were well prepared and well delivered. I have no doubt, further, that in the course of these speeches, at the start, and at the conclusion, there was a bit of praise tendered to the government for what they saw as achievements on the part of the government.

Indeed, I am told that at one stage of the proceedings, the congratulations were so profuse and so unexpected—and so undeserved—that the hon. Attorney-General actually fell from his chair in consternation. That should be taken as a warning by other hon. members of the government. Personally, I would like to see many indulge in that practice if it has similar consequences, and similar results, but it just may be that carrying that to a very great degree in regard to this profuse praise, might end in some casualties on the government benches, and, of course, we would not want to see that.

I would also imagine in the speeches, the mover and seconder made little or no mention of any omissions or com-

missions by the administration, for which this government is responsible. I think they would rather have sought to lead the legislators to believe that all the government did was correct, and all they did not do should not have been done anyway. I do not imagine that anywhere in their remarks, could be found anything which savoured of criticism; anything which could be classed as a rebuke to the present administration, and I do not imagine anywhere in their speeches there was an element of discord, so far as the government was concerned.

I am sorry there was not, because I think in this House, even the government benefits from criticism, if that criticism is constructive, and it benefits whether it comes from the Opposition benches or from amongst its own members.

So I would suggest to the members of the government that they be not so reticent in their criticism of the government and governmental policy.

After all, you cannot be so foolish as to think you can live in a house of dreams, in which there are no troubles, and in which everything is right, and nothing could be made better. There is always room for advancement; there is always room for progress; there is always room for improvement in governmental policies, and their application to the people of this province.

And those policies will benefit, I suggest, Mr. Acting Speaker, by constructive criticism, aimed, in the first place, toward extending the policies which have not been wide enough in their application, and, in the second place, at formulating new policies, which may be just in the offing, but which need concentrated attack, if you will, by hon. members who are interested in these problems, to bring them to the fore, and to get behind these problems sufficiently to attract public attention, and to have them rectified in this Legislative Assembly.

I would have thought that the hon. members who moved and seconded the address, would have had something to say, for instance, about municipal affairs.

We have had some bills brought down this afternoon by this department, and I hope when you put the amount the government pays to the municipalities on each individual tax bill, you will add the schedule you have drawn up, so much for the city of Toronto, so much for this, and so much for that locality, so that the people in the various municipalities will know just where they stand in relation to governmental appreciation of their problems, in respect to financial contributions from the Province of Ontario. I think that might well be added as a foot-note, advising what you are prepared to do.

I suggest there is criticism due to this government, because of their flagrant behaviour in respect to municipal financing. Over the years, we, on this side of the House, have tried to impress upon the government, the urgency of getting down to grass roots in connection with the problem of municipal financing.

We have said, Mr. Acting Speaker, over and over again, that the municipalities are in this peculiar position; that they have a tax base which is more or less static, and that most of their taxes are levied against real estate, and there is a limit, and a very definite limit, beyond which the municipalities cannot go in levying additional taxes against real estate. They have not really any other source of income, and if they want to increase their taxes and thus increase their revenue, it can only come about by an increased mill rate against real estate in that particular locality. So I suggest it is fair when one says that, generally speaking, the municipal tax base structure is a static institution; it is something which does not move very much from year to year.

We know that assessments increase somewhat because of good times, and because of the buoyancy of conditions generally, but, speaking broadly, the tax basis upon which a municipality must levy its taxes, and fix its rates, is more static, and is not given as much to widening and broadening as in the provincial field. I think that is accepted by the public generally.

Over the years, the municipalities

have tried to pay increased costs with that static tax base; they have had increased costs for education; increased costs for welfare services; increased costs for the administration of justice, and every municipality has had increased costs all along the line, and their continuing problem has been to try and meet these increased costs from a tax base which is more or less static. That just cannot be done, and at the same time, give the people of the municipalities that to which they are entitled.

I have suggested this many times, and I do so again today, that the provincial administration, whose responsibility is very great, should come to the aid of the municipalities of this province, and either increase the grants presently given the municipalities, or take over some of the tax fields toward which the municipalities presently contribute.

I was interested the other day when reading an editorial in the *Globe and Mail*—and when I find myself in agreement with the *Globe and Mail*, I know I must be on the right track.

The burden of the editorial in the *Globe and Mail* was to suggest what I have suggested many times in this rather than increasing the grants presently paid to the municipalities, the government should divide the tax fields, and divide the sources of taxation, and that it should give to the municipalities some fields in which they would be masters in their own house, and the province, on the other hand, should take over from the municipalities completely some fields in which the municipalities presently attempt to share the financial responsibility.

One might ask, "What fields would you take over?" I think it is proper to suggest welfare costs, because they are costs which should not be borne by the municipal taxpayers of the province. I think that is a tax which should very properly be borne by the people generally, and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this province.

I am convinced, moreover, Mr. Acting Speaker, that the cost of the administration of justice in this province should not be a tax against the local taxpayers.

All of us, I am sure, can recall to mind instances where just by chance, a certain county or a certain municipality has been burdened with the court costs, and one thing and another, which they should not have had to bear at all.

There is one case I have in mind which occurred just a few months ago, where a murder was apparently committed, and the body was thrown out in a certain county, and because it was in that county, the county had to assume all of the charges in connection with the case. They had to harbour the one who was alleged to be the slayer, and they had to pay costs of keeping him, and all the court costs, and the matter really had nothing to do with that county at all. It just so happened that the body was there, and it having been found there constituted the reason for the costs being charged against the county.

I think the administration of justice in this province could well be taken over in its entirety by the provincial government.

I suggest to the government that now is the time to do something in connection with what I think is their responsibility, in helping out these municipalities with more financial aid.

Just last week, we learned from the report of the Provincial Auditor, that the Provincial Treasurer had charged the people of this province, some \$58 million more than he said he was going to charge them in the forecast he made in the budget speech.

That \$58 million came from the same municipal taxpayers who are finding the burden increasingly heavy in this province. Not only did the hon. Prime Minister fail to recognize his responsibility under the provincial set-up, but he taxed them to the extent of \$58 million, which makes the situation just that much worse.

I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister and the government as well that the day has come in Ontario when we should take the problems of our municipalities very seriously and we should move to improve the conditions by assuming, at least in part, some of the tax fields,

presently being the property of the municipalities of this province.

I want to refer another thing which the hon. members who moved and seconded the address probably did not suggest the other day. This has to do with health insurance and hospitalization.

I do not want to deal extensively with that matter this afternoon, but I do want to say to the House that, in my opinion, there is room in this province for a health insurance scheme, which will take care of the needs of the people of this province.

I am one of those who believe that the province, as a whole, has a responsibility for looking after these people, who have excessive hospital bills, and excessive illnesses in this province of Ontario.

I have in mind, as I speak, a man who has spent at least \$10,000 trying to restore the health of his child, and has had to pay that out of his own pocket. There should be some way in this province, under the umbrella of a health insurance scheme, whereby people could buy the insurance to protect themselves against illnesses of long duration, or against excessive hospital bills.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips), when it was announced that the Blue Cross rates were going up 25 per cent., burst into print, and made a statement to the *Toronto Telegram* which I must say was just the sort of statement I would expect the hon. Minister to make, because I happen to know him well, and I know the humanitarian traits which he possesses, and I was not surprised when the announcement of the rise in rates was made, that the hon. Minister of Health would say to the *Toronto Telegram*.

Certainly within five years—more or less—there should be a form of health insurance covering everyone in this province.

My feeling is that this should be similar to a deductible plan used in connection with car-collision coverage.

A person could buy hospital insurance with, say, \$25.00 or \$50.00 or

\$100.00 deductible, and should a bill from a hospital be \$36.00, if he had a \$25.00 deductible policy, he would pay only \$11.00.

He went on to elaborate the system which he had in mind, and he wound up by saying that Ontario had been working on such a plan, and while it had not gone very far, he said, "We have given it a great deal of consideration."

I imagine those words on the part of the hon. Minister of Health were an expression of his innermost feelings in connection with this problem.

But then, two or three days later, the hon. Minister was speaking in Trenton, and he made this rather significant announcement, he said, "the Ontario Government is definitely opposed to a state health insurance plan." Speaking at the branch annual meeting of the Victorian Order of Nurses, the hon. Minister said,

Such plans have been tried in the western provinces, and, in the main proved more costly and less efficient than privately-sponsored schemes, like the Blue Cross.

I will not argue this afternoon as to what form health insurance or hospitalization we should have in Ontario, but I do believe in this province, the province in which the hon. Prime Minister says we have taken so many "first steps" that we could well take another "first step" and establish in Ontario, a health insurance and hospitalization scheme which would look after the needs of our people.

I know what will be said from the other side. They will say that the Federal Government should institute such a scheme, and if it does, the province will be willing to contribute and co-operate.

We must, at all times, remember, it seems to me, when discussing the Federal Government, and its responsibility in these matters, that the Federal Government has to deal with ten provinces of Canada. These ten provinces have ten varying conditions, extending from ocean to ocean. The needs of each province vary, and the desire for legislation varies in each province.

But that does not—and need not—stop the people of the Province of Ontario with its great potential wealth, and its vast possibilities, from becoming the pioneers in this great, humanitarian movement, and just as in the Disabled Persons Act, in which as we shall hear, the Federal Government is going to participate, if we start a pilot scheme of health insurance and hospitalization in this province, there is no doubt in my mind—and there should be very little doubt in the minds of the government—that after the agreement is established and we get underway with it, the Federal Government will step in and help us, as they are prepared to do in connection with disabled persons.

So I suggest to the hon. members of this House that we should give every attention to the matter of health insurance and hospitalization, before it is too late, to meet the very great need in respect of health and hospitalization in this province.

There is another matter I wanted to discuss for a moment, which has to do with housing. I do not want to deal extensively with that matter, but it seems to me that practically the same thing can be said with respect to housing as with respect to health insurance.

We, in this province, say that we have a National Housing Act, and if it does not meet the needs of the people in regard to housing, that is "just too bad." We have a National Housing Act, and we are prepared to co-operate with the Federal Government in extending the provisions of this Act, and making it applicable to all who desire houses in this province.

I say the same as I said a moment ago, that the National Housing Act, as everybody knows, has been an instrument to meet a great need in the Dominion of Canada. It has built a large number of houses, and it has met a very great degree of need which exists for housing in this Dominion.

But, just as I said a moment ago, the Federal Government has to deal, in their housing legislation, with ten provinces all with varying conditions, and each province may have a different need in

respect to housing. Some may have a great need for housing, and some may not have a need which is so great.

These conditions prevail all across Canada, and the aim of the Federal Government has always been to meet, in a general way, the broad needs of the population of this country, from one end to the other.

I think they have done that admirably in respect to the National Housing Act. It has been in force for some years, and has been amended from time to time, and it has done, is doing, and will continue to do a good job for the people of Canada in respect to housing.

May I add this further suggestion, Mr. Acting Speaker, that if we find in this Province of Ontario that the National Housing Act, and the provisions thereof, do not adequately meet our needs and our requirements, then it is not only our opportunity, but our duty, to supplement the National Housing Act by legislation of our own and get on with the building of houses for the people of this province.

There is no doubt in the minds of any of us here that in the Province of Ontario, there is great need for additional housing, perhaps greater than in any other province of Canada. The last report of the National Housing Board, issued just a few days ago, emphasized that point, and set it out clearly that the Toronto Metropolitan Area was in no better condition now than it was in 1946. That is a condition, Mr. Acting Speaker, which it seems to me is one which we should do something to rectify.

We should try on our own, to be pioneers in this matter and get into the field of housing legislation and devise ways and means of helping our people to secure houses for which they can pay. I do not think there is anything that will lend itself to a deterioration of mankind, generally, more than poor housing and slum conditions, by people being crowded into one or two rooms and lacking the facilities of good housing. There is nothing that will sap a person's morale more definitely, nor more quickly than the fact that we have not houses for our people. I suggest to

the government they make another "first" out of this, that they go into the field of housing and do something to help our people into places in which to live.

Might I add this further suggestion, that a few years ago we had in this province what was known as the "Second Mortgage Plan." That was one way in which the government tried to help people to own their own homes. We have not that plan now, it was felt that because of some changes in the National Housing Act the need for the plan was not as great as it had been heretofore. However, there are other ways in which people could be helped to secure and maintain a home in this province. And I am not thinking, as I speak, only of new houses. It seems to me this province could render a very great service to young couples, when getting married and starting out in this province, and particularly in this Metropolitan area, if we could say to those young people:

You go and buy a good house in the old section of Toronto proper and we will help you with the first mortgage, or we will help you with the interest payment.

I do not know why we should not go that far. It seems to me that one of the greatest assets we can possess is young people owning their own homes.

Now what chance has a young couple today to buy an existing house, when they ask from \$4,000 to \$6,000 down and from 6 to 7 per cent. interest? What opportunity is there there for a young couple to buy such a house? But if there was someone to come along and say: "We will take care of the first mortgage on the house," then the earnings of that couple might very well be expected to and in most cases would, keep up the principal payments on the house. But to make the down payment and then be expected to pay 5, 6 or 7 per cent. interest is just too much to ask, and these houses are not being sold to the proper people. We should get our young people into good existing houses; we should start them on the way to

becoming good citizens, and there is no better way of doing that than to give them the opportunity to own their own home in this province.

There are many ways the government could move to alleviate the distress which exists with respect to housing accommodation in this province. I have not very much hope they will move in the right direction, but the opportunity and the challenge are there, to make available to those who need and want houses and are prepared to keep up the payments on them, and to meet the carrying charges and for this government and this House to do something really worthwhile in respect to housing.

Now for a little while this afternoon I want to talk about another matter which seems to have some interest at the present time, and that has to do with the Department of Highways. I think it would be expected that I would say something about that department in my remarks this afternoon and I would not for anything disappoint those who are looking forward to it. I do not think any analysis of the present highway problem, shall I say, would be satisfactory if there were not included in that analysis a knowledge of what has transpired in the process of building highways in this Province of Ontario.

We started building highways many years ago, perhaps 30 or 35 years ago and in this province in those days it was a pretty small department. The money expended on highways 30 or 35 years ago was but a shadow of what we spend today for building and maintaining provincial, county and municipal roads. In those days, back in the twenties and the thirties, the Province of Ontario paid only 80 per cent. of the cost of provincial highways. The other 20 per cent. was assessed back to the municipalities. The same story is true in connection with county roads, the province paid much less a proportion of the cost of county roads than they do today. The same is true in respect to township roads, the relationship between what the province paid 25 or 30 years ago toward township roads, and what they pay today is one which should be examined as we approach the problem that we have at

the present time in connection with highways.

Highway construction 25 and 30 years ago was very, very small indeed in comparison to what it is today, and I think any discussion of this whole problem would not be complete nor too informative if we did not take into consideration and keep in mind the past picture relating to highway construction and highway costs in the Province of Ontario.

We are bearing, as I say, a much larger share of the three levels of road construction than we did 25 or 30 years ago. And not only are we bearing more of the municipal share of highway construction but we are at the same time spending four and five and ten times as much as we did 30 years ago, so that the two of them coupled together have brought us to the place in this province where we are spending now some \$150,000,000 annually for road construction and maintenance.

That is a tremendous figure. It is a lot of money, it is much more than the total budget of this province was just a few short years ago. And in this great acceleration of expenditure there is bound to be a degree of trouble, shall I say. There is bound to be somebody in that vast organization who will "step out of line." The human frailties are with us today just as they were years ago and while they remain with us—and I suppose they always will—we will always have the odd person who will seek to take advantage of what looks to him to be a promising situation, an opportunity to get rich quick. We will always have the penny chiseler, the man who sees an opportunity to get a little of something for nothing. We will always have in a vast organization like this men who will take advantage of their position.

I think as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to acknowledge and to admit that we have had these things to a degree in the past and that we might as well prepare for them in the future, and the public generally, I suggest, is ready to accept the odd stepping out of line. They are ready to accept and almost condone the odd

person who steals from the government, who takes something from the government which does not belong to him, who wants to make it sooner. We will have those people with us for some time to come, I am afraid. The public in the past has been prone to accept that state of affairs, and that they would have to go on with it and make the best of it.

But the difficulty that we are in at the present time is that it does not appear to be just the odd chap who has slipped out of line nor it does not appear to be just the "penny chiseler." Apparently they have grown wiser as the years have gone on and now they do not bother with small amounts and small things, they are getting to the place where they are grafting on what appears to be a very large scale. If there is grafting and corruption in the Department of Highways on a large scale, we in this House have the responsibility to ferret it out. We have a responsibility to get to the bottom of the problem and to clean it up and to present to the people of this province a solution for the difficulty which has arisen, and to promise that it will not happen again.

In this matter of highway work we are presently discussing, there have been indications that the sums involved are large and that the area covered is somewhat extensive. Those two things in my opinion make this problem one which should have the searching attention of the people of this province and particularly the legislators of the Province of Ontario.

I am not going to quote all the various things that have been written in respect of this highway probe, but I do want to quote, just to show that there is some indication of the size of the problem, some of the records and some of the stories which have been written in the paper. That of course is all we have to go on at the moment, but I notice a headline in the *Toronto Star*—I think that is a paper published in the city of Toronto—and the heading of this article is:

Hills, Swamps and Pits Grow A
\$7,000,000 Drawing Board Swindle.
Probe Has Been Ordered.

I would think if it was \$7,000,000, the least we could do would be to order a probe. The paper goes on to say that:

The firm and management consultants retained by the Ontario Government to investigate the road building scandal at the lakehead will report that at least eight contracting firms and dozens of Highway Department employees worked hand in glove in a drawing board swindle that has cost Ontario taxpayers at least \$5,000,000.

I suggest to the House that I am not aware of the authenticity of that story, but there is contained in that article by a recognized writer of the *Toronto Star* a story which should focus attention on that particular matter until it has been cleared up to the satisfaction of the legislators and of the people generally.

I want to quote one more thing and then let it go at that so far as quotations are concerned. The other one is from the *Windsor Daily Star*, and I want to read this carefully. What I am trying to suggest at the moment is that this problem we are discussing is a problem of some magnitude, I mean it is not petty chiseling, it is not a few dollars here and there, it is dealing in big sums and dealing with big people. This article in the *Windsor Star* dated January 22nd had this to say:

The Ontario Highways scandal probe has spread to still another jurisdiction. This was confirmed here today unofficially by a top highway official. On top of the already announced investigations in Fort William, Blind River and Kenora, this makes the fourth division of the Ontario Highways to come under scrutiny. The official wouldn't say where the latest probe was taking place, except it was in the north and in the east.

How big is this thing going to be? That is what a stunned Queen's Park is asking itself today, as day after day what started out to be a more or less routine investigation of the suspected irregularities grows into what seems to be the greatest mass swindle or series of swindles in the province's history.

And then further down it says that:

Newspaper reports have said the swindle in Fort William will amount to \$7,000,000.

And this writer in the *Windsor Star* suggests that may be a little big, he says it is doubtful on the facts if it could be this big—

But one thing is certain, he goes on to say—

it is huge and the government knows it is and admits that it is huge.

He says further:

Premier Frost called reporters in late on Wednesday afternoon for his first comment on the probe and he admitted the potential swindle was huge. It was apparently a big effort intricately planned involving a large number of people, he said.

Then the writer goes on to say that:

The original investigation which started in Fort William has spread to Kenora, Blind River and an unnamed division.

I suggest to the House until those suggestions—if that is what you want to call them—are proven erroneous, we in this parliament have a duty to perform, and that duty is to find out just what is behind all this smoke and to see if there is really a fire of some magnitude. Quite frankly I say to the House that I think there is a scandal in the Highways Department of some magnitude. I believe, Mr. Speaker—and I say this seriously to the House this afternoon—that in the workings of the department from the day it was started, with the huge increase in expenditures that there has been in the Department of Highways, the administrative practices in the Department of Highways have not kept pace with the increased costs and the money expended in the Department of Highways. I believe that to be true, I believe that the administrative practices have fallen down before the impact of the increased spending that there has been in the Department of Highways.

I said a moment ago that I would want to know whether this was an

isolated case or not. Does it concern Fort William alone? Is it that one division and no other? Before it was discovered there were other divisions. I was bold enough to make the suggestion that I thought there were other divisions involved. Since that time auditors have been into Kenora, I understand, and into the Blind River district and the other day the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) said he had suspended a foreman in Rockland near Ottawa for stealing lumber from the Department of Highways to build himself a couple of houses. After all he was greedy, he should have been satisfied at least with one house. I was interested in what the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) said. He said: "I am going to lessen the inventory that these fellows have." Well, I thought that was rather an odd explanation, in other words he knows they are going to steal, so he is going to place less in their hands.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) never made any such statement.

MR. OLIVER: He is going to make the temptation less, because the amount is less. Then the other day it was made known by the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that still another division, that of Huntsville, has come under scrutiny and they have suspended the divisional engineer.

This has gone on long enough, far enough, and its implications are wide enough to suggest that there should be a thorough and an impartial probe into the whole situation. That is the point I want to discuss next, and I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree that in the face of what has happened and what is happening—because we do not know from day to day when another district engineer may be suspended, it breaks on us before the Orders of the day, something like "An apple a day keeps the doctor away," sort of parallel—I would suggest that in its present scope of seriousness, the government has a grave responsibility to search

the thing out right to the bottom. It has a responsibility not only to itself and to this House but to the people of the Province of Ontario. After all the people of the province "Pay the shot," through the avenues of the gasoline taxes and the license fee and so on, they are contributing very huge amounts to the Department of Highways and they have a right to expect, Mr. Speaker, that their money is honestly expended, they have a right to expect from this government that it can look the people in the face and say: "We got a dollar's worth of service for every dollar expended." Now while this present suspicion lasts, no hon. member of the government can look the people of this province in the face and say that and be truthful about it, because there isn't any doubt even in the government's mind that there has not been only isolated cases of irregularity, but it has been spread over a very wide front, and the sooner we tackle this thing in a realistic way, and the sooner we have it cleaned up, the sooner will be public confidence be restored in this government and in the legislators of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest there are three or four ways this matter can be dealt with. One of them is by the avenue presently employed by this administration, that is by sending a group of consultants to go into the whole matter and report. There are one or two things I do not like about this group of consultants. One of them is that they are appointed by the government, they report back to the government and the hon. members of this House are dependent upon the government to divulge to the full the extent of that report. I have some confidence in the government but I do not know whether it goes that far or not at the moment. However, I want to say in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that as I understand it these consultants are to probe the irregularities at the Fort William office, they have not been commissioned so far as I know to probe the irregularities at the Huntsville office, they have not been commissioned to probe the other irregularities that have come to the fore in recent days. There-

fore they are only doing a part job, they are dealing with an isolated case, they are dealing with one number where there are many numbers and they cannot do a full job when their commission is as it is.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition—he will not mind if I do so for half a moment. May I say this firm of consultants is employed to investigate every part of this Province of Ontario and anything they wish in connection with the Department of Highways, regardless of where it is or what it is. We have given them full authority and that I hope they will do.

MR. OLIVER: Did not the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) say—and I will be corrected if I am wrong—in his letter appointing these consultants, that their duty was to investigate the irregularities of the Fort William division and then to make general recommendations as to the policy of the department? I think if the hon. Minister re-reads the letter, he will find that is exactly what is contained therein. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the government will consider extending the scope of operations of this group of consultants. I do not know what is in the government's mind in that connection but I do hold the view, Mr. Speaker, that is not the proper approach to dealing with this matter. I have said before and I say again here in the House that the group of consultants are restricted in their operations because of their inability to call witnesses and to take evidence under oath. What if a contractor or somebody involved refused to come before them and give evidence? Where would you be? They have not any powers at all; all they can do and all they can say is: "Come now, boys, let us reason together" and if they are not pliable to that extent, then their whole effort is stymied and I suggest to this House that that one avenue of probing into this matter will not be sufficient.

Another way it can be done is by the appointment of a Royal Commission. I want to say quite definitely to the

House this afternoon that I am very cognizant of my attitude in the past in respect to Royal Commissions. I looked up what I have said on various occasions and, thank goodness, I always fortified myself to this extent, that while I did not close the door entirely as I said that I believed there were some places and some uses to which Royal Commissions could be put, but I also remember an occasion when the hon. Mr. Drew was Prime Minister, when I said that "the prolific use of Royal Commissions by this administration is to be deplored."

Now if there ever was a set of conditions which lends itself to a probe by a Royal Commission, this is it. A Royal Commission would be fully equipped to take evidence under oath, to have hearings held in public. The public would be acquainted with the progress of the investigation and they in that way could be more helpful than they could be, if you are going to carry on the investigation in camera, but that is just about what you are doing at the present time.

I say seriously to the government even at this date I doubt if you can restore public confidence in the Department of Highways and in the government as a whole unless you do appoint a Royal Commission with the widest possible powers to go into this matter and sift the wheat from the chaff and find out exactly where we are.

Another way of course in which this matter can be handled is along the line of approach suggested by another editorial of recent date in the *Globe and Mail*. The *Globe and Mail* suggested—and I think the suggestion had some merit—that after the session was over and hon. members had more leisure time, a committee of the Legislature could start to work on this problem, a small committee, the *Globe and Mail* said, of five or seven men. I think there is merit in that suggestion and I wish to say to the government that if it will not accede to what I think is a very proper demand to appoint a Royal Commission, then surely they can go so far as to entrust the examination of these matters to a committee of this Legislature.

The other way, of course, by which

the matter can be dealt with is the one suggested by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the other day. Mr. Speaker, I have known the hon. Prime Minister for a long time and I never thought I would listen to him make such a suggestion to meet a very serious problem. My hon. friend suggested the other day that this whole matter could be discussed by the Public Accounts Committee, and in the next breath he as much as said that the statements and the evidence which the government has would not be available to the Public Accounts Committee, so that he did, as I suggested the other day, just put the handcuffs on the committee, locked them good and tight and then told them to go to work and do a good job.

After all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, that committee is only one of seventeen which are functioning in the short time this House sits. I want to ask the hon. Prime Minister in all seriousness, how can he expect hon. members of the House to give the attention they should to the deliberations, when we have all these committees? And, moreover, as the hon. Prime Minister knows, a standing committee of the House lives only as long as the House itself, when the House dies it dies also. In the five or six weeks that remain for the hon. members to do their work in committees, the hon. Prime Minister makes the facetious suggestion that this important work should be done by the Public Accounts Committee.

I suggest to the House and to the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon that he give very serious consideration to this matter, and I suggest seriously to him that I do not think the people of this province are going to be pleased with that sort of dealing with what they consider a very serious matter. And to that end, Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by the hon. member for Brant,

That the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words: But this House regrets that the Speech from the Throne contained no assurance

from the government that the serious and widespread irregularities in the Department of Highways would be thoroughly investigated by a judicial commission.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on this day when the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and the Leader of the Government take issue on all sorts of matters, I was prepared, frankly, to be taken back to the days when I used to practise law and prepare statements of defense, and to agree with what my hon. friend would say about yourself and the mover and seconder, but then to say: "Well, I disagree with everything else except wherein I specifically admit it." After listening to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), I do not take that attitude. The hon. Leader of the Opposition made a very reasoned speech this afternoon and I shall endeavour to do likewise.

I would like first of all, to join in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has to say about yourself, and to re-state some of the words I spoke the other day when I had the pleasure of moving your appointment to this position this year. I should observe that I am not altogether in agreement with what he has said about the addresses by the mover and the seconder, of the reply. I listened to them very carefully the day before yesterday, and I can say, what I have said in other years with all sincerity, that there have been very great addresses delivered in this House by movers and seconders and certainly the addresses of Tuesday were on a par with that very high standard and were on a high plane indeed.

One might wonder what there might be for me to say in this month of February, 1954. We have completed another year of the term of office to which the people elected us two years and some three or four months ago, and, Mr. Speaker, in less than six months, we have had two very emphatic endorsements from the jury of the people.

One might come here this afternoon and be boastful about these endorsements, one just ten days ago, one a little

over three months ago, but I do not do that. I come here, as I came in the month of February two years ago, in all humility, to acknowledge that these endorsements are a trust to us to give good government, and that will be the effort of everyone on the government's side of the House.

First of all, I should like to start at the part of the address by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his references in relation to the Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, in these past two or three months for reasons which, I think, are apparent and have been accepted by the people, I have not engaged in comments in relation to that matter, and I think this gives me the opportunity today to say something very specifically.

This trouble at Fort William, and what appears to be trouble in another division, the Huntsville Division, was discovered by our own very fine Provincial Auditor and his staff which, I assure you, are second to none in Canada in this regard. These matters are not totally confined to Trans-Canada Highway contracts, but there are the indications that perhaps this is the major place in which they exist.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, in effect, says that the government is on trial. Of course, governments are always on trial before the people. Nevertheless, I want to just accept that position and I want to explain to you and to the House, how this matter is being discharged and how it is being handled. This matter arose specifically some time last September, or in the late summer in any event. At that time, our auditor, and indeed the department and the government, might have levelled the charges at little people. That is where the matter first became manifest, and they might have there hushed things up. That was not done. As a matter of fact against the little people perhaps little may have been done to date. The matter was proceeded with the other way, without fear or favour. I do not know whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition made use of that expression, "without fear or favour," but right down the

line this matter has been so proceeded with. Payments have been stopped. Senior officials have been suspended. Remember, this was not a matter of prodding the government, or of prodding the auditor into investigating matters. This was done long before that, as I will point out to you.

At the present time—and as I shall have to deal with this sometime, I might perhaps make mention of it at this point—this matter has been under the direction of the Provincial Auditor, an auditor who has served several governments, including the government in which the hon. Leader of the Opposition served, a man of the highest integrity and ability, as are his assistants and his staff.

Secondly, without any restriction, in an attempt to get the very best, Mr. G. W. Mason, Q.C., one of the great and leading lawyers of this province, was engaged, along with Mr. C. W. Dubin, Q.C., one of the rising stars in the legal firmament.

In addition to that as the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, we have retained one of the outstanding firms of consultants in Canada, one not only engaged by this government—Messrs. J. D. Woods and Gordon Limited—but widely used by the Federal Government, the people who conducted the probe into the Post Office, people with the widest experience, and to them we have given the widest type of commission, not only to recommend and assist in connection with the irregularities, but the betterment of practices to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred. I would ask him to note these things so far as the government is concerned. With the resignation of the hon. member from Niagara Falls last July or August, a by-election became imminent in the old riding of Niagara Falls. The date for the by-election was set for the 26th of October last. On the 7th day of October, a statement was released to the press stating there were irregularities in the Fort William division.

Now I ask the hon. members of this House, might it not have been possible that such statement could have been

given on the 27th of October, instead of the 7th? That was not the case. The statement was made at that time. I will say this. I imagine perhaps in the riding of Niagara Falls the matter had not developed to the point it did later. I should imagine perhaps the matter there was not of paramount importance in that by-election. I should say what was of paramount importance in that by-election was the record of the government. What happened?

The hon. member for Niagara Falls, who used to sit beside the hon. Leader of the Opposition, had a 3,500 majority in that riding. Last August 10th, I think that was the correct date, he was elected in that identical riding to the Federal House with a majority of 7,500. Yet on October 26th, the now new, good-looking hon. member for Niagara Falls was elected to support this government with a majority equal to the majority given to the hon. member who had resigned.

I think when the hon. Leader of the Opposition refers to confidence in the government, perhaps he might bear these things in mind. On the 26th of November last, the Division Engineer in the Fort William Division was suspended and a statement was made then which gave full import to the seriousness which was placed on that situation. In addition to that, on December 4th, our great friend and hon. member of this House, Doctor McPhee, passed away.

Again I ask, Was there any hesitation to face these issues fairly in the face of the talk and the editorials in the newspapers? The by-election was called, the writ was issued on December 23rd, returnable on the election day, the 8th of February which has just passed.

Did the government then take the position, "We will do nothing about this matter. We will hush this up until February 8th, and we will keep things going along and say nothing." That was not the case.

On January 20th, right in the face of a by-election in Simcoe East, a most serious statement was made by the government, and the firm of J. D.

Woods and Gordon was appointed and given an unlimited commission.

I point out these things to the hon. Leader of the Opposition who has referred to newspaper clippings to some of which I want to refer to myself. I have a very large number of them here and I can assure you in the face of that by-election these clippings gave me some concern. One of the papers said some \$7,000,000 or something of the sort, was missing. Mr. Speaker, I could have gone to Simcoe East and I could have told the people there that a great many fine roads had been built up in that country. I think the hon. member who comes from up there will agree we have built some magnificent highways, and \$7,000,000 is almost our whole share of it.

I could have said in Simcoe East, "It might seem unbelievable that very nearly the whole amount of money would have been stolen." I could have referred to some other things such as the story that bridges were missing. I must admit I do not know of any bridges that are missing to date, but I could have said that. I could have talked about the mystery road, but I do not know about any mystery road. I could have said, Ottawa was over-charged \$2,000,000 on Ontario roads, but I do not know whether they have been over-charged at all. This government stopped payments weeks and months before the difficulty arose and there is no possibility of them losing a copper. If you do not think our credit is good, look at the budget and see for yourself.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred rather facetiously and somewhat inaccurately to a \$58,000,000 surplus. Perhaps I might refer to that later. Let me point this out to you: If I had gone up to Simcoe East and told the people what I am telling you here now, they would have been very apt to say, "Oh, well, Mr. Frost has come up here and he says there is nothing to this thing at all." Mr. Speaker, we do not take that attitude. We do not discount the seriousness or possible seriousness of this. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to read another news-

paper, I would refer him to the *Free Press Herald* from Midland, which contains the statement made up in Simcoe East. I did not subtract one tittle from anything that was said relating to the possible seriousness of the situation for the reason I thought it would be unfair to the people.

What was at issue in Simcoe East was this: How this government would treat this problem; how this government would regard it. I did not turn to the people and say, "There is nothing to this. There is no bridge missing. They talk about \$7,000,000, that is practically all the money that was spent on these roads so far as the Ontario Government's share. If it was not all, it certainly was a very substantial part."

I could have gone up there and said, "How were these great roads built? What built them? How was this money missing?" I could have gone up there and laughed about the Federal Government being "gypped" out of \$2,000,000, Mr. Speaker, but I did not do that for this reason: I did not want to give to the people of Simcoe East the impression that we did not regard this matter as serious, and that was the way the issue went to the people.

We stated on the 20th of January that there had been action taken by the government to appoint this firm of consultants, and what had been done, and remember, Mr. Speaker, that this matter was unearthed by the Provincial Auditor and by his very fine staff. That is where the matter came from.

The point is this: would the people of Simcoe East accept what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said? He practically put the words of this motion before the people of Simcoe East. He asked for a royal commission. I have some of the election literature here, and very good looking literature it is, too, and this is written right into it, a demand for a royal commission which he now asks for.

What did the jury of the people who heard this matter say? They listened to it, and they very emphatically supported the government after hearing the matter, after having read all of these

newspaper headings—and a great many more which I have here about this matter, reams and volumes of them. Having been bombarded by all this, and on the radio, but having no word from me or from our people except that we would deal with this honestly and fairly, what did they do? Why, they voted by a 2,788 majority to return another good looking man, who will be introduced to this Assembly in a few days.

Yes, they voted by 2,788 and when I look at the municipalities in that riding I know that that figure did not come from one municipality, it came from all but two. Taking the town of Orillia, the great township of Orillia, and the township of Oro to which I referred a few days ago from where Mr. Drury comes, every poll gave a majority to the supporter of this government, except one.

MR. OLIVER: You did lose a number of votes.

HON. MR. FROST: If you will figure this out, I think you will find it amounts to between 53 and 55 per cent. of the votes, which was just about the same as in 1951 which some people say was a landslide.

Mr. Speaker, I come here today and say we think we have taken the proper course which is in the best interests of the people, and the people to whom this has been submitted, have said overwhelmingly "Yes." I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to remember that in connection with commissions. I would point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I realize at another time, and under different conditions, he said a great deal about "Royal Commissions," and I did wonder he would go up to Orillia and Midland and Coldwater, and the township of Medonte, and other places, and urge the people to accept a Royal Commission in this matter. When he made that statement, he did not refer to a time back in 1949, about five years ago, when he said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one more subject, and that has to do with Royal Commissions. We almost had another one today. If we had said "Yes," we would have had it.

I am saying this, Mr. Speaker, because to me, these Royal Commissions are a "pain in the neck" for all we get out of them.

That is quite a bill of goods to try and sell to the people. No wonder it was not sold. No wonder the people said, "Here is a government which having discovered certain conditions is endeavouring to right them in a business-like way, has met them in an honest way, and we are confident that is the way they will meet them in future, in the interest of all the people of this province."

I was quite interested in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said about the necessity of improving and strengthening our Departments and our organization, to see that we do our best to be sure these things cannot happen again. I am in perfect agreement on that point, with the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

As a matter of fact that is one of the great problems of government and business today and I want to face that with you very seriously. My hon. friend pointed out very fairly that the practices in the Department of Highways have grown up from some 30 years ago. They are practices common to various governments, starting with the Drury government and going through the Ferguson government and the administrations of Henry and Hepburn and the rest up to the present time.

No system that you devise will work unless you have honesty. Honesty will make almost any system work. To be frank with you, I am not one of those who think that our system of government here is perfect by any means, in the Department of Highways or, indeed, elsewhere. I feel we must be alert to strengthen government, and to strengthen the means of government, for the reasons I will give you, in every way we can.

However, dealing with the matter of honesty—and I do not want to say anything that is unfair to anybody, or impute anything, and, therefore, I am not referring to specific cases—one is dependent upon the elemental things such as trust and good faith which can be

destroyed when dishonesty gets into things. I would like to refer you to a paper published by the "Big Interests." I do not want to alarm the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) by such a reference. I do not often read the papers of big interests but I do read the papers in which the people are interested.

In January 1953 there was an article in *Inspection News* by one of the heads of the Continental Casualty Company—that is a big concern—and he says this: "The Federal Bureau of Investigation's crime report for 1951 shows that the lowest figure for embezzlement, fraudulent conversion, theft and other crimes committed by business employees is estimated at more than \$500,000,000 annually. The average term of employment is nine years and three months. A person works for you for six years and nine months before he steals a dime and then he continues to steal for three years and two months before he is caught." I tell you that to point out the difficulties there are in some businesses. It would be absolutely impossible for me to attempt to tell you the way to stop a businessman from stealing, because no one has ever compiled a complete list of ways in which a business employee steals, and every day some employee discovers a new way to embezzle.

In an article published in the *Saturday Evening Post*, about two years ago, a nationally known expert listed 210 ways whereby business employees could rob a bank, including one official who was not content with stealing the bank's entire assets, but he even went so far as to mortgage the real and personal property and pocket the proceeds.

In the Government of Ontario we are in big business and we have to recognize that. When you start handling \$350,000,000 a year you are in big business. My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the growth of highway operations in the last few years. Now let me tell you my first budget in this House ten years ago this month or next month, was something around \$118,000,000. Last year it was considerably over \$350,000,000. In other words, the business due to the expansion

of this great province of ours has grown by three times. So that I shall not give my hon. friends opposite any ammunition against me, I point out that this was without a sales tax, with the lowest gasoline tax in Canada, with no meals or tobacco tax and without raising any taxes, but coming, and arising, from the expansion of business in this province.

I think this is indicated by the tour hon. members took yesterday on that great underground railway which will shortly be opened in this city.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have here a great business to keep up. The highway business has expanded roughly thus: I think in 1938, the total highway expenditure was about \$73,000,000; it was roughly the same in 1939. In the war years, 1943 and 1944, they fell to \$19,000,000. By 1945 they were up to the pre-war levels—some \$75,000,000.

Now they are up to \$150,000,000, which shows you the tremendous expansion that has taken place. At a time like this you can make a profound mistake. There are, I believe, approximately 600 contractors in Ontario. There are very few bad apples in that barrel. As a matter of fact, they are pretty sound, good fellows who have done a good job for this country, for this government, for the Ottawa government and for industry. I would say you have thousands of highway employees in this province. There are very few, you will find, I think, engaged in things that are not right. As a matter of fact, these people are good people, and at a time like this we want to take a common sense, decent view. We have got to carry on with this mighty work. We have got to go ahead with the job there is to do. One of the problems included in this concerns keeping that organization that has done a mighty job for this good old province.

Go to any state of the Union, go to any province in Canada, look at the highways and see what has been done, and you will find you will be proud of our good old province of Ontario when you see the jobs that have been done; everywhere you go, including the Lakehead, in a big way. These are some of the things we have to face. What have

we done about this? In the fall of 1952, as you know, we revised the Highway Improvement Act and we provided that funds should be voted in this House. That point was raised on one or two occasions by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). We took machinery which was well designed in its day, and we remodelled it to meet the requirements of today. We introduced into the Department of Highways the office of the Comptroller, which with modern practices has had a good deal to do with the uncovering of the situation of today. We have been looking at the matter of government and the handling of finances from another position, that is, from the standpoint of the treasury. When the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, were in another government, in those days the executive details were pretty well handled by the Deputy Treasurer. Such a thing as that is impossible today. The making of a budget was perhaps a matter of two or three weeks. Nowadays it is a matter of 365 days. Today, on this 18th day of February, our men are working on the budget not that we are going to introduce now, but the one we are going to introduce a year from now.

We have now a Comptroller of Finances and with him we have a Provincial Economist, a post created since those days, whose job it is to look at the money markets, to look at the economic outlook of the province, to estimate the returns the government will get from its taxation and its various sources of income, and to know in these delicate markets where "Old Ontario" can get the \$300,000,000 to build the St. Lawrence Seaway, to go "back to Niagara" and to do all those things.

Then we have a Comptroller of Revenue whose duty it is to extend his forces in every department, and to be responsible for the collection of all revenue in all departments, either by himself or by those who are deputized to do so.

Then we have the Chief Accountant. He will shortly be called the Comptroller of Accounts, who will also extend into

every department the representatives of the treasury, for the purpose of providing for Ontario the best fiscal system that can be devised to meet the requirements of 1954 and the years to come.

It will be my duty to introduce here shortly a new bill, a new Finance Act, such as we never have had in Ontario before, under which there will be a Deputy Treasurer, a Comptroller of Finance, a Comptroller of Revenue, and a Comptroller of Accounts, who will all have the rank of Deputy Minister so that they can go to any department with their men and with their forces and see things are properly done.

In doing so we are laying the foundations for taking care of the fiscal future of this great province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to overlook the fact that there are two very important points, to both of which my hon. friend has referred. One is that in regard to the person who is dishonest and who has defrauded this province, whether he be big or small, it is our job to see justice is done, and that will be done. On the other hand, it is our job to be big enough to see if there are lessons to be learned, if there are ways in which we can improve the system of this province, we ought to do it, and that, I can assure you, will be done.

Time has gone by and I would like briefly to refer in conclusion to one or two other things. I have discussed at length this problem, because this is the first occasion on which I have really been at liberty to elaborate in that connection. But I should like to refer to some of the issues in which I think the people of this province are interested, and that is what we call "Good government."

This government was elected to office a little less than two years and three months ago. It was elected by a great following, and gained 79 out of 90 seats. Some people said we were complacent, that with the great majority, we would grow indolent, and perhaps we would grow fat, and would not be as anxious and keen as we were before. That has not been the case. I think that is the principal reason why the people of this

province have endorsed us by giving us another seat at this time.

Let us look at the work of the past two years and three months. I will say to the House—and I am sure the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) will agree with this—I do not see how he could do anything else. These two years and three months have been marked by more monumental achievements than any two or three years of the many years the hon. member for Brant has served in the House, or, indeed, before that.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to some things municipally. After thirty years in this province, last year we introduced and passed in this House, a bill creating the Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, that was the largest confederation since the Confederation of our country.

A year ago, on the 18th of February, 1953, I would not say I had misgivings, but I had some fears, because people had told me that bill would promote and develop things which would be introduced into this metropolitan area which might be disturbing. Indeed, some went even so far as to warn me about that.

Today, on the 18th of February, 1954, we can say it is there, and it worked. You can take a ride in a motor car around the metropolitan area, and you will see the development which has taken place, see houses in their thousands, and the industrial development in this great area, and at this time, perhaps I should pay tribute to some of those who have been at least partly responsible for this development. Everybody did not see eye to eye with us. One of those who was a little critical was my old friend Louis Shannon, a controller of the city of Toronto. He is one who has not been of the same political faith as myself, but has been a great public servant, and the last occasion on which I was with him was, I think, a week ago tomorrow night. Louis Shannon was a great man, and was doing a great job, and he will be missed in the Metropolitan Council.

He was one of those who saw the pos-

sibilities early when the bill came into effect and was passed, he was one of those who gave his whole heart in support of the carrying out of the objects of that bill, and the success of this venture is due in no small measure to that very fine man, who will be greatly missed.

My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) talks about housing here in Toronto. What has cut the chains which prevented housing in this metropolitan area? The Metropolitan Bill passed here last session. And who voted against it? The hon. Leader of the Opposition, who talks about housing. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, and, I am sorry to say, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). I thought I would carry him along with me in that great progressive measure, but he was against it. And so were others in that group across the way. So was the hon. member who sits in the back row.

So were the other two gentlemen, whom I thought would support that great measure which was designed to provide housing and transportation for the people. But they were so short-sighted they could not see it.

Coming now to the question of assistance to municipalities, Mr. Speaker, where in Canada were unconditional grants passed before but in this House in the past two years and three months. Just last year indeed, those unconditional grants were passed. May I remind the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), and will he please tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition this when he goes outside, that the amount of our contributions to municipalities have risen from \$18,000,000, in the days when he sat here, to nearly \$130,000,000 this year, and that is quite outside the unconditional grants.

You can talk, about dividing tax fields, and about taking over responsibilities, but do not think other provinces have not this problem. Last November I was asked by my good friend the hon. Douglas Campbell, the Premier of Manitoba, to visit him and address his Municipal Association. I went with

great misgivings. I wondered what they might ask a Prime Minister from a Progressive-Conservative province; but I went out there and I had a very interesting experience. I found the report from their own municipal committee and their treatment of the problem pretty well parallels what we are doing here in this province, making the point that it is very difficult to take away the power to do things from the level of government best suited to carry them out. That, sir, applies to so many things but you finally come to the point where a certain level in government can best and most efficiently do a certain thing.

However, I would like to refer to "unconditional grants." My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition referred to me the other day as one who was "Pulling the wool over the people's eyes." That was said in reference to another motion I made here.

May I remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that is not the way to win elections. I read an advertisement published in Simcoe East a couple of days before election day. Perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) wrote it. However, I do not think he did because I think he has too much political sense. It said:

Are you a \$4 citizen or a \$1.50 citizen?

That referred, Mr. Speaker, to our unconditional grants, and it is worth reading:

There is no secret about it, the government thinks the big-city voter is twice as valuable as the voters up here. What do you think? Remember this.

Mr. Speaker, the people did remember it to the tune of nearly 2,800 majority given to this government.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) knows better than that. He should have consulted the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), who commended this bill and the way it was drafted. As a matter of fact when this bill came up, the hon. Leader of the Opposition voted

against the Toronto Bill, the one that is providing housing and a way for people to live today, but regarding Bill 81, which was the bill covering unconditional grants, he certainly did not vote against it. There was no vote so I assume it was unanimous. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) never said a word about it in any event.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Prime Minister quoting something I said about it now?

HON. MR. FROST: I cannot quote the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) when he said nothing. I can only draw an inference from his action. He did not vote against it. The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) rose on that occasion and I thought made a very sensible speech about that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will send this advertisement over to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and hope that he will go into the quietness of his room tonight and read it over and think of how he and his followers attempted to "pull the wool over the eyes" of the people of Simcoe East by talking about "\$4 citizens and \$1.50 citizens."

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that bill is designed to do what he says, to compensate those municipalities and the people for welfare, administration of justice and social services which they perform. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows so well that social services in Ontario range from 30 cents per head in some municipalities to \$9 in some of the larger centres. What was done in this case was an attempt to find a formula covering a thousand municipalities which would reasonably meet the situation, having regard to the differences in assessments and the like. To that end this formula was devised, which gives to rural townships at \$1.50, practically 10 per cent. of their tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, the people that made really the most from this, percentage-wise and tax rate-wise, are the people who got \$1.50. I am using figures which now may be a little out of date in view of the more optimistic statement which

the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has given me, but it seems safe to say that the townships were 10 per cent., the villages about 9 per cent., the towns 7 or 8 per cent. or in that neighbourhood, and that the cities themselves amount to about 7 per cent., and the metropolitan area, which gets the \$4, amounts to about 6 per cent. On the other hand, sir, I do not want to make the people from the big centres feel badly about that. May I point out that there are differences caused by the fact that they have industrial assessments which perhaps compensate in some measure. That is the reason for that arrangement.

Those are just two of the things this government and the hon. members of this House, have done in two years and three months.

My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has mentioned "disabled pensions," now to be extended across Canada. Ours was the first government in Canada to attempt anything of this sort. By agreement, which was sparked and sponsored by this government, we have, after 20 years of talk, provided pensions for needy persons from 65 to 70 coming in at that time—true, by Federal-Provincial agreement—but that is one of the ways you get things done.

What are we doing in education in this province? Last year some 55,000 new pupils entered our schools and we were able to accommodate them by reason of the assistance afforded by way of substantial school grants which today are almost half as big again as the total budget, when Mr. Hepburn introduced it in 1935. We have been able to provide rooms and desks and teachers for those children. Next year in this province there will be built and occupied schools for another 56,000 or 57,000 children. In other days that alone would have been counted as a mighty thing, but when combined with such other things as pensions and pensions for the disabled and unconditional grants and a new government for Metropolitan Toronto, it becomes almost beyond comprehension. When I tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that in

those two years and three months, after twenty years of talk, "back to Niagara" is an accomplished fact with one of the great engineering schemes of this continent by which we will get another 1,000,000 horse-power, and when the hon. Leader of the Opposition replies we have said this over and over again, I am reminded, sir, that when he and his colleagues were in office they did nothing "over and over again." That is why they are over there at the present time.

May I point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition the progress which has been made in other fields, our co-operation on the great power projects, our attempts at co-operation with the Federal Government to get the St. Lawrence Seaway under way, and the hon. Mr. Chevrier and I agree when he is optimistic enough to say that we are going to win through this year. After thirty-five years of talk, that has been accomplished in this two years and three months.

Such things as our working in bringing to this province the great resources of natural gas from the West, our consultations with Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe and with Mr. Manning and others, show vision beyond the mere humdrum of party politics in the Province of Ontario.

What about our fiscal arrangements in those two years and three months? We entered into a tax agreement with the Federal Government in the fall of 1952, confirmed by this Legislature that fall, not perfect—of course it is not perfect—but it is a step which has meant for the people of this province no extra income tax, and—although the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) may not like it—has relieved our corporations, which relief is passed along in costs, of some 3½ per cent. in toto. The foundations have been laid, I believe, for rational arrangements and it has enabled us to maintain, what we have accomplished, the lowest taxes in this country. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to take it on a per capita basis, it appears large but percentage-wise and from the pockets of the people—and that is where it

counts, when you put your hand in your pocket and see how much money you are losing by taxes—it is the smallest in Canada.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) mentioned what the Provincial Auditor very properly referred to in his report. Last year I reported an excess of revenue of some \$58,000,000 over what I estimated. Well, sir, I made \$40,000,000 of that for "Old Man Ontario" by a good deal with the Federal Government. And what did I do with it? I did not spend the money. I paid off the mortgage on Old Man Ontario's farm. That, Mr. Speaker, is why I think we can count on the confidence of the people in carrying on the government of this province.

With that, sir, goes the credit of this great province of ours, our ability to do things, our ability to face with confidence the future, whatever it may hold; the development of our land; the building of the St. Lawrence; the carrying on of a great programme in connection with the modernization and extension of our public projects; the providing of rural power for our people in the country; the providing of loans for young farmers; the providing of our share of the finances necessary for some 40,000 new houses in this province this year, which I am sure will reach an all-time high; the providing of funds necessary for the extension of hospitals, and

for the betterment of the services we have for our people in public buildings.

After nearly eleven years I can say that the credit of this old province was never higher and our people were never more sure of the means to carry on the expansion of this grand old province.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House, and in so doing, I would like to say that tomorrow the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings) will table and speak on the report of the Select Committee on Election Laws.

I assure the hon. members opposite that has no significance whatever. That report will be introduced, and perhaps the hon. member can devise a method of adjourning the debate, or something of the sort, to permit the hon. members of the House who want to speak with relation to that matter, to do so, and then we will continue with the bills.

MR. OLIVER: Could the hon. Prime Minister say what bills will be submitted tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: I will say, most of the bills are routine, and if there is anything which the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants kept over, I will be glad to do so.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.18 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, February 19, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, February 19, 1954.

Presentation of Annual Reports, Mr. Welsh	119
Reading and Receiving Petitions	124
Report of Committee on Elections	124
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Porter, agreed to	140

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1954

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, would you pass over the next item, "Presenting Reports by Committees"—and go on with the other routine business and then revert to that later?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Secretary and Registrar): I beg to present to the House the following reports:

Report of the Minister of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year ending March 31st, 1953.

Report of the Statistics Branch, Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year 1952.

Report of the Ontario Food Terminal Board, Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year ending December 31, 1953.

Report of the Ontario Stock Yards Board for the year ending June 30th, 1953.

Report of the Ontario Veterinary College for the year ending March 31st, 1953.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture respecting Co-operative Market-

ing Loans made under The Co-operative Marketing Loan Act for the year ending December 31st, 1953.

Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Farm for the year ending March 31st, 1953.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrews): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh). The Provincial Secretary has been presenting these annual reports and I would like to ask what, if anything, is being done to expedite the printing and distribution of these reports earlier than is now being done. I wish to draw to his attention the lamentable fact that it was necessary for me to bother a very important official of the Department of Welfare today to get certain facts which should not have been necessary. But the last printed report we have from the Department of Welfare is for the year 1950-51. It was mailed to us, at least I received it on January 23, 1953. Their last report is not in. It is no fault of the Welfare Department or any other department. There is a terrible amount of time consumed between the receiving of the reports by the Provincial Secretary and the printing of these reports and that is due, as I said, to the fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: This is my question. Does not the secretary think that this is due to the fact that he is giving most of the printing to a few houses?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I cannot allow that. It is not for an hon. member

asking a question to make a statement answering that question. I will allow the question to the Minister and I will allow the Minister to answer, but I cannot allow the one who asks the question to state an answer.

MR. SALSBERG: I have not finished, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, the question has been asked as to why there is delay in printing the reports.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the information contained in these reports is not public until they are tabled, and immediately they are tabled the printing is gone on with as expeditiously as possible.

The little interjections the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) made about the printing being allocated to a limited number of firms is, I want to assure you, absolutely untrue. There is no basis for it at all and when my estimates come up I will be very glad to go into that and explain it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, and before reverting to the matter of presenting reports by committees on which there will be some comment, no doubt, by the members of the committee on the revision of election law, may I say that on Monday the purpose will be to receive a report in the form of a White Paper to be submitted to the House by the Minister of Lands and Forests. We are very glad to have the Minister of Lands and Forests back with us after a serious illness last fall, and I understand he is in good shape now to undertake the pressure of his duties in connection with his department.

This is the first occasion, I think, in the history of this province, that a White Paper has been presented to this House. It is a form of parliamentary practice which is very well known and extensively used, I think, at Ottawa and certainly at Westminster.

I noticed some comment in one of the

papers the other day about the Beveridge Report. That has no relation to the liquor situation in the province, but it is in connection with security in Great Britain from the cradle to the grave. That report was submitted to the British House of Commons by the government of that day in the form of a White Paper. We have had sittings continuously of certain experts, General Howard Kennedy, Dean Sisam of Toronto University, the Advisory Committee on Forestry consisting of gentlemen of many and varied views, the Minister, until the time he was taken ill, representatives of the Minister, various members of the Department of Lands and Forests, including the Deputy Minister, and some others.

Mr. Speaker, they plan to submit for the consideration of this House a report in the form, as I say, of a White Paper, to be placed before members of the House for study. The purpose is to submit that to the Committee on Lands and Forests and for General Kennedy, Dean Sisam and others to come before it to express their views in connection with this great problem. I think the situation is this, as will be explained later, we are at the point where the forests inventory is virtually complete, or at least it is complete for a very large part of Ontario and now the point arises: What is the policy in this province for the next 20 years—what is the long-term policy? That was part of the Kennedy Report of a number of years ago and it is a problem that has to be considered, with all its checks and balances, by the people of this province. In this there are undoubtedly problems. There are some pinches that will come because of long-term policy. I think the fairest way to put it to the people, and to members of this House who must make decisions, is to place this long-range thinking in the form of this White Paper before the House, and then allow people to come before the committee, General Kennedy, Dean Sisam, and others who are interested—people who may approve or disapprove of ideas that are put forward in that document—and from all that help available I am satisfied a long-range policy, which will be the

policy of this province, as I say, for perhaps 25 years, perhaps for more, may emerge.

That will be the business on Monday. The Minister of Lands and Forests will introduce that matter. Following that there will be the consideration of bills and other business and on Tuesday we will proceed with the debate on the Speech from the Throne in which my hon. friends of the Opposition will continue to take the government to task for the things they may allege we are omitting to do or doing incorrectly.

If we may now revert, sir, to presenting reports from the committees. I think on this occasion, sir, when that Order is called some of my hon. friends may want to say something. I think members of the committee may have something to say about the election committee reports. This is not for the purpose of receiving or debating the report itself, but for the purpose of tabling the report for consideration.

MR. S. J. HUNT (Renfrew North) : Before the Orders of the day there is a matter, I feel, which should not go unnoticed. On February 20, 1912, an event of some considerable importance took place in the town of Pembroke. A very young man, I may say a mere boy at that time, took unto himself one of our very fine Pembroke girls as a partner there for life. Since that time this young man has met with considerable success in public life and today we find him sitting as the Minister of Municipal Affairs in this Legislature.

I am sure the Minister would give credit to his wife for the assistance and inspiration that she has offered for these many years. This help has brought about a great deal of the success that has come his way and I am sure I speak for all the members of the House when I say that we offer the hon. Minister and Mrs. Dunbar our heartiest congratulations as they celebrate their 42nd wedding anniversary tomorrow, and wish that they may both be spared for many years to carry on the sphere in which they find themselves today.

MR. A. J. REAUME (Essex North) : Mr. Speaker, before the Orders

of the day may I mention this is a very important week—Brotherhood Week—and I have not heard one word about this mentioned in the House, nor in my absence have I read about it in the paper. Nor is there anyone trying to practice it.

This House is made up of honourable men from all parts of the province and in service, are a very fine agency in promoting goodwill and good feeling among all of our people. Certainly I hope that until the House adjourns around 4 o'clock, we can at least refrain from getting into any arguments other than calling each other "gentlemen."

In Windsor, of course, which is I think the capital of the Province of Ontario for practicing brotherhood, we did in the early part of the week issue a proclamation, inserted in the paper, calling upon all our people to practice what they preach. As the province is growing and expanding and becoming more important every day, it would appear, whether we are Protestant, Roman Catholic or Jew, whether our colour is white or black, that we all are part and parcel of God's creatures, and there is no use in trying to push the other fellow over the edge of the earth, because there is plenty of room on it for all of us.

I only mention it because I think it is well that the week should not pass without saying a word about it. Thank you.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition) : Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, I want to draw your attention to certain deletions which have taken place in the printed *Hansard* report of the proceedings of the House. I do not know how many instances there have been, Mr. Speaker, in which deletions have taken place, but it has been brought to my attention that on one particular occasion, on February 15th, when the hon. Attorney-General moved The Mechanics' Lien Act, there were a number of comments made with respect to that bill on its introduction which have been deleted from *Hansard*.

One of the remarks was made by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.

Salsberg) who asked whether this would go to the Labour Committee, because it is for the protection of labour, and the hon. Attorney-General replied something along this line, that "all our legislation is slanted toward the protection of labour," and then the hon. member for St. Andrew made some other comments.

Mr. Speaker, I am not arguing as to the substance of the remarks made by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), nor by the hon. member for St. Andrew, but I am arguing against the principle of deleting remarks from *Hansard* which are made on the floor of the House.

HON. MR. FROST: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggest there should be any deletions? I never heard of such a thing myself.

MR. OLIVER: I am coming to that, Mr. Prime Minister, if you will allow me.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, in your capacity, you have some knowledge of what has transpired in this regard. My only point in bringing it up is to insure what I think is something of which we are all in favour, and that is, that the words which are said by the hon. members in this House should be recorded in the printed copy of *Hansard*.

I bring this up because in this instance there was a deletion, and I think if you, Mr. Speaker, would enlighten us as to the procedure in this regard, it would be helpful to the hon. members of the House generally.

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition may reflect somewhat on myself. If I said something, or the hon. member for St. Andrew asked me a question which does not appear on the record, I can assure the House that I never read the record, and I do not know whether it is in or out.

As a matter of fact, I never read *Hansard*. I leave that entirely to those who are employed to carry out faithfully, the recording of what we say, no matter whether it is for or against us.

I never like to look over past errors. I leave it to the hon. members, and if it is not in *Hansard*, I am not responsible and I do not know why it is not there, in fact, I do not know whether it is there or not.

I hope there is no suggestion there was any interference with *Hansard* on my part.

MR. OLIVER: There was no such suggestion at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, since I am the person involved, I would like to make it clear that I in no wise asked for any deletions, and certainly knew nothing about them, until they were drawn to my attention. I read *Hansard*, because I have not a staff to read it for me, and bring to my attention anything they think I should know. I have not got around to that as yet.

I want to make it abundantly clear I did not seek, and I did not desire, nor am I at all happy over the deletions, and I am very glad the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised that point.

For the record, I want to say that what I said, to the best of my memory, which is not contained in the printed report, was this:

Would you not agree, Mr. Attorney-General, that this be referred to the Labour Committee, since it is supposed to protect labour?

And the hon. Attorney-General replied by saying:

All our laws are written to protect labour.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not think those are the exact words. I did say that our legislation was in the interest of the working man, which it is. If it was not in *Hansard* the last time, it will be today.

MR. SALSBERG: To which I replied, "You should be the last one to say that."

MR. PORTER: I happened to be the first one to say it.

MR. SALSBERG: I repeat my words, to the best of my recollection. I was addressing myself to the hon. Attorney-General, and I said, "You should be the last one to say that because most of your laws are for the protection of property and property rights."

Those were my remarks, and I am sure they will be on the record now.

HON. MR. PORTER: Surely the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) does not suggest a working man is entirely devoid of property. He has property rights, the same as anybody else. Just because the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) does not claim property rights, the working man can.

MR. SALSBERG: When I spoke, I had in mind, of course, property rights of the sort and in the category which was never attained by the working men.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is not what the hon. member said.

MR. SALSBERG: You did not say that; I did.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in reference to *Hansard*, before you say anything may I refer to another matter in connection with it. I never have heard that anything was deleted from it, but I know there are the most terrific inaccuracies in it.

I made a few remarks here the other day in connection with the appointment of the Public Accounts Committee, which I read over afterwards, and I must admit that I could hardly recognize what I was alleged to have said, as having any relation to what I said here in the House.

I would say, sir, that I have never been enthusiastic about *Hansard* at all. Really, I oftentimes have felt that preferably there should not be any *Hansard* here. However, I acquiesced in that, but when I see pages of a report which will require at least twenty-five corrections, to make it resemble anything which bears any sense, then I am almost

brought back to my feeling we should not have *Hansard* here at all.

If we are going to have it, let it be accurate, and let us have our words taken down.

I imagine the report of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and my own, will require a half-day's work to get it into some kind of shape to mean anything and I object to taking hours of time from a busy day to correct what I am supposed to have said in the House. If it is going to be that way, let us abolish it.

HON. MR. HAMILTON (Minister without Portfolio): At this time, it may be the proper occasion to seriously consider a more modern method of recording the debates. Surely, in this day and age, there are better methods than writing the record by shorthand, and I think through a recording machine, we would be able to much better record the debates.

MR. SALSBERG: Then we could listen to ourselves all over again.

HON. MR. PORTER: Heaven forbid!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has asked what I can do to remedy this situation.

I think, if I remember correctly, there are five copies of *Hansard* made on the typewriters. These copies are submitted to the hon. members who have made various speeches, or have entered into any debate.

The reason for the submission of these five copies is that a copy may be placed on the desk of an hon. member by ten o'clock in the morning, so that an interested hon. member go over his own remarks, and make such corrections as he feels are right.

I think the hon. members are willing to agree there are many weaknesses in the system, but we have endeavoured to make it possible for the hon. members to assume some responsibility for what they say in the House.

I receive a copy of *Hansard*, usually around seven o'clock in the evening, and

I glance through it, but I cannot be expected to remember every word which is said. I do correct some little things which I have caught, but my memory is as fallible as anybody else's.

As the hon. members were notified at the opening of the session, their corrections, if any, are to be completed before six o'clock in the afternoon.

There is a good deal of merit in what the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hamilton) said. We have gone into the matter of the possibility of tape recording our speeches. I am certain some of us would not have too much appreciation of having an absolute record of what we say.

It is a big question, and we have looked into it, but have not taken any action on it as yet. At times, we wonder if it is always advisable to have a *Hansard*. Sometimes, I can assure you, I wish we did not. Perhaps some of the hon. members feel the same way about that; I do not know.

But we have agreed on a *Hansard* this year, and I will do my level best to see that every word spoken in the House will be included in the printed *Hansard*. I will make as many mental notes as I can of what is being said, but it is up to the hon. members to correct their speeches, as long as the substance is not changed.

I can assure the hon. members I will do my best to see that it is better than it has been previously. I will meet *Hansard* immediately the House rises, and we will discuss the matter thoroughly.

HON. MR. FROST. May we revert to "Receiving petitions"?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. C. G. MACODRUM (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. MacOdrum, from the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, presents the following as the first report of that committee:

"Your Committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Expenses Act.

Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act, 1954.

Bill No. 46, An Act to amend The Mechanic's Lien Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): Mr Speaker, I beg to leave to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to act with the Chief Election Officer, and the Assistant Chief Election Officer, for the purpose of studying The Voters' List Act, and The Election Act, and move its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, before I enter into the few comments in reference to the report, I would like to say to the hon. members of the committee that I deeply appreciate the time they have given to the study of the several Acts during the sessions of 1952-1953, and 1953-1954. It was a privilege to me to have the honour of chairing this committee.

I do not know whether people generally know exactly what the private hon. members sacrifice by way of their time in coming to Toronto. It is easy for me to come from my office downtown, which I can do in a matter of about 15 minutes, but when hon. members have to come from all parts of the province, their work should be appreciated by all the people of this province. May I say,

Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members take their work very seriously. I would like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, with just a few of my own observations in reference to that. Let me first refer to the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope). He could very well at the last meeting have absented himself, but he telephoned me long distance when he found it was impossible for him to be here, and asked to be excused.

The same thing applies in regard to the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. James). During the two years, if he was going to be away, he always wrote me a note, saying he would be absent from one date to another, in case I should call a meeting of our committee.

I have always received the same co-operation by the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hunt) and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edwards).

I might make special mention of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). I believe he attended every meeting of our committee. In fact, the membership of our committee was practically 100 per cent. at every meeting.

I also believe the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) was a 100 per cent. attendant, except at the last meeting, when it conflicted with another committee, of which he was a member.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) was present at every meeting, to my knowledge. May I say, Mr. Speaker, how much I appreciate the co-operation of the members of the committee, which made the job of chairman much more easy.

I would also like to thank the Chief Election Officer (Mr. R. G. Lewis) and his staff. It was a pleasure to have Mr. Harvey with us as our secretary. He has given a long and faithful service to this province, and I understand now he has earned his retirement.

This report comes to this House with practically the unanimous support of the committee. The hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) mentioned something about everything being peaceful and quiet. We had that in every meet-

ing of our committee. I do not recall at any meeting where there were any flare-up of tempers.

Mind you, it was a committee in which the hon. members opposite could have a little fun at the expense of the hon. members on this side of the House, but that always worked in reverse, and we had the opportunity of having a little fun at their expense.

I believe the highlight of our committee meetings was when the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) related to us the story of the travelling ballot box, where the ballot box, and the staff, went out for business, and made a little tour around the area for the collection of votes. That was taking the box to the people, in other words.

MR. SALSBERG: What Party controlled the election machinery?

MR. COLLINGS: I forget whether that was in the hon. member's riding, or not.

MR. SALSBERG: What Party controlled the election machine?

MR. COLLINGS: Mr. Speaker, your committee is proposing twenty-eight amendments to The Election and Voters' Lists Acts. As you know, the present Election Act provides for a period of 31 days from the date of the issue of the writ to nomination day. Then 7 days elapse from nomination day to election day, should the election be called in what we call the summer months, and in the winter months 14 days from the date of nomination day to the election day.

Your committee recommends 31 days from the date of the issue of the writ to nomination day, and 14 days from nomination day to election day, or a total of 45 days, no matter what time in the year the election is called.

To successfully carry out the provisions of The Election Act, and in preparing a good voters' list, your committee recommends the appointment of permanent returning officers. They feel this would enable the returning officer

to be properly schooled and become informed of any changes which may take place in the Election Act between elections. It would also give him an opportunity to become acquainted with the political organizations, so that when the election was called he would know immediately whom to be in touch with to secure the names of the enumerators, because by definitely saying that the election must be held within 45 days, it is imperative for him to have a list of enumerators so that he can quickly start the enumeration of the voters, and we believe that a permanent returning officer would aid in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, your committee examined thoroughly every section of the Election Act. With the aid of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) with his keen, legal mind, we found there was some question as to whether the chap who went out and posted billboards, for instance, was in fact "clerical help," and would be barred from voting in that particular riding. Therefore, we recommend the repeal of subsections 2 and 3 to section 16 of The Election Act.

I call to your attention recommendation 16, which I believe will have the unanimous approval of all hon. members of this House, and is a widening of the privilege of voting at advanced polls. We are not suggesting any change in the three days of polling in advance polls. Let us assume that the election is held on Monday, the advance polls would be held the previous week on Thursday, Friday and Saturday. The recommendation of our committee reads as follows:

The amendment to subsection 1 of section 88 by striking out the words "will be."

That is to say, if you will be away from the riding on election day, you may vote at the advanced poll. We recommend that be changed and substituted therefor the words, "except to be." So there you have it, Mr. Speaker, that if you expect to be away from the riding on election day, you have the privilege of voting at the advanced poll.

I believe this is a great step forward in providing the means to the electors of this province whereby they are able to cast their vote if they expect to be away on election day. I think this point might have the support of the government, because I do recall the hon. Prime Minister speaking in Montreal, I believe it was, at the Labour Convention, in which he advanced something like what we are proposing to do, that every effort should be made available to those who might be out of the riding on business, or in fact on holidays, and especially if they were delegates to a national convention. It is a holiday more or less, but at the same time they are there on union business. I believe that recommendation will have the full support of all the hon. members of this House.

At our committee meetings we had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to reminisce about how things went during our own particular campaign. It was unanimously considered that the repeal of section 169 should be recommended. How can you expect to carry out a successful campaign today without the aid of motor cars? What is wrong with your friend, or your friends, sending along on election morning one or two or three cars? If he does that, naturally he has to pay for the driver, so I say, "What is wrong with that, I see nothing wrong with it." Our committee was of the unanimous opinion that we should repeal section 169 of The Election Act.

MR. SALSBERG: Was that unanimous?

MR. COLLINGS: Yes, unanimous. I want to say a few words on recommendation No. 12. It was the opinion of the members of our committee that as quickly as possible after you have received your endorsement as a standard bearer from your convention, either yourself or your official agency should quickly get your nomination papers into the hands of the returning officer.

A certain time must elapse for the preparation of the list. Therefore your committee is now recommending in subsection (c) of section 58 to provide that nominations may be filed with the

returning officer at any time in the period of 10 days immediately preceding the close of nominations.

That means simply that within the 10 days prior, you have the right now to file your nomination papers with the returning officer. We are recommending that we reduce the number of qualified electors who must sign your nomination papers from one hundred to ten, so the returning officer could quickly certify as to whether your nomination papers are in order with reference to the electors, and give you a certificate, and you may go about your business. You know the worries of filing your nomination papers are over, they are quite in order, and you can go about your business of being elected.

We also provide that any candidate who files his nomination papers with the returning officer on the date set for the nomination, that the returning officer will certify, up to 11.00 o'clock on the morning of the election day, that you have a right to put your nomination papers in, and he will then certify as to the correctness of your papers and give you your certificate. However, should you not file your nomination papers until after 11.00 o'clock on the day of nomination, then he has the right to not certify that immediately, because it is running too close to the hour of closing. But, should the nomination papers be found not in order, the right of the candidate is not immediately taken away from him. The returning officer would, in turn, notify the Chief Election Officer, and it would then be the duty of the Chief Election Officer to notify the returning officer if there is anything wrong with the nomination papers.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard from the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Prime Minister. In their wonderful speeches, in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I am sure each of us sitting here must have felt proud to be a member of the Legislature of this great, old Province of Ontario. Your committee feels that if a candidate presents himself to the electors of this province hoping that he will be elected, he should accompany his nomination

papers with a deposit of \$200, either by marked cheque on a bank doing business in this province, or in cash or by postal order. We believe the Ontario law should conform to that of the Federal law in which a deposit is required to be filed with nomination papers.

MR. SALSBERG: Was that unanimous, too?

MR. COLLINGS: No, I believe there was probably one dissenter, who will probably speak for himself on that section.

Sections 23 to 28, in the recommendations are simply for improving the Voters' Lists Act and to enable the Chief Election Officer to carry out his duties in the 45 days as prescribed in the recommendation. The principal one is No. 24 in the printing of the voters' lists. Your committee felt, after hearing from the Chief Election Officer as to the time required for printing of lists in several of the ridings—and we so recommend—that the lists can be "printed or otherwise reproduced." We feel that would help in some of the ridings.

As I say there are other recommendations which are simply in order to clear up and tidy up the Election Act, and the Voters' Lists Act.

In tabling this report, Mr. Speaker, there has been placed on the members' desks a copy of the committee's report.

So there it is, Mr. Speaker, the report of the Select Committee. We now only hope that the government will pursue it and probably bring in the necessary bill, and I am sure it will receive the unanimous support of this House.

HON. MR. FROST: I think perhaps there may be some hon. members of the committee who would like to say something about this report, and if so, I think the hon. members of the House might be granted your indulgence to permit that.

Concerning this matter, Mr. Speaker, this is a report of a committee. It is a report summing up the consensus of opinion of a committee representative of three Parties in this House. I do not know if the report is a unanimous

report, because the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) told me there were some points of difference. However, in any event, it is not a minority report.

May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and for the benefit of the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), I do not know whether you would say he has a "leader at large," I suppose that describes it, but this "leader at large" has accused me of the most terrible things in connection with this report and has associated me with people whom he obviously does not like from other places and other provinces. I was held up in various places in this province as being a terrible man because of certain things which are contained in this report.

May I point out I have nothing to do with the formulation of this report. I think it is a very worthy document which comes here for consideration, not necessarily for adoption in its entirety, but for consideration. I do not know of any way in which I can correct such an impression, other than to say I would not like to suggest that either one of the hon. members for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) or Ontario (Mr. Thomas) should perhaps make way so that their leader might be better informed as to the practices of this House.

I would not make that suggestion because I would not like to lose either one of them. They are very fine members and I do not know of two members from Opposition Parties who give more thoughtful consideration to matters than the hon. member for Cochrane South and the hon. member for Ontario, and they have my very best wishes until the next general election.

I just point that out because this report is tabled here for consideration, and while it may be the consensus of opinion of the members—and very excellent members—of that committee, again it may not reflect the consensus of opinion of the hon. members of this House.

It is a good document presented here for consideration. We will have a number of such documents during this

session, and in sessions following. I am a believer of freedom of thought on the part of all members, and I would like to have their advice in consideration of this report.

MR. SALSBERG: Will there be a discussion on this report?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: When?

HON. MR. FROST: Right now.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe the best way to deal with this report would be to proceed with it section by section.

As you know, the items dealt with concern different sections of the Act, and totally different proposals, so if we speak on the report in the abstract, we will not get very far.

The chairman has very ably covered the report in a general way referring to some of the sections, but in order to find out what the hon. members of the House think, we should take it and deal with it section by section. That is the only way in which we can find out how the House considers it.

A copy of the report has been placed on the desk of every hon. member. Some of the members might feel they want to take time to read it, but I would suggest that the chairman read each section and then discuss that particular section.

The hon. Prime Minister referred to the fact it was not a unanimous report, perhaps. There is only one small point in which I disagree with some of the other members of the committee, and that was on the question of the \$200 deposit. I do not want to elaborate on that point if we are going to deal with it section by section. When that number 12 item comes up, I would like to join in with the other members in debating the possibility of paying a deposit.

HON. MR. FROST: There are one or two corrections I have. In reading over the report yesterday evening I noticed points which I thought we

should have discussed at the time. I blame myself for not being careful and not reading over the draft which I received, but I think there are one or two points which will need further discussion, and I will take these up when we come to these particular sections.

If we do not finish today, I am going to speak to the chairman and point out to him these little observations, or these small matters that bother me. I might have the wrong slant on them altogether, but I would like to have the questions clarified before we finalize the report.

I am going to give the floor to some other member for his suggestions, but again I would suggest that we deal with this report section by section.

HON. MR. PORTER: May I interject at this moment in reply to what the hon. member has suggested? This is merely a motion for the tabling of the report. Eventually the bill will come before the House as a bill, either in its present form, or it may be that all the recommendations of this committee may not be reflected in the bill, and in due course that bill will come before the House as a committee of the whole.

I think the proper procedure at this stage is any discussion on this motion as to tabling the report I think should be on any section, or any part of this bill, and that discussion should be of a general character, because there will be ample opportunity eventually to deal with this report as it appears in the form of a bill.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I agree with the hon. member for South Cochrane. This should be considered carefully, section by section, because I feel now, listening to this bill being presented, that I cannot support some of these recommendations.

From my experience in public life, I have never seen any objection to any man being allowed to offer his services to the public in public life, and I do not see why he should be penalized and should have to pay \$200 in order to have his name placed on the paper.

I have never been in favour of that

kind of thing at all. What does it amount to, a permanent returning officer, because a member has the power to recommend that at any time, so how could you make a person permanent? If you appoint a permanent returning officer for my riding in Ontario, any time I feel like I can make a recommendation for some other person to replace him—without cause, too.

I would not be in favour of cutting down the number of names required from 100 to 10, raise it from 100 to 200. If a man has 200 people who say they desire his name on that paper, then let it go. Do not cut the number down to 10, for goodness sake. Then you would have some "crackpots" in. In 27 years of public life I have never objected to people running against me, opposing me in elections. They bring out their good points, they are well meaning, they may not agree with what I say, and I do not agree with all they say. I like to have the CCF in my riding. Last year they decided they would vote Liberal instead of CCF and the Liberals came a little closer to my vote. I only got a majority of about 7,600 instead of 9,000. But I can see a great advantage of having CCF in my riding. To get my majority down from 9,000 to 7,600 was "something."

MR. SPEAKER: I could help here, I think, to have the matter clarified. It is entirely in the hands of the House as to how this matter should be considered. If it is the wish of the House that you discuss it clause by clause, as in committee, then I think it will have to go to committee. If you decide to discuss it clause by clause, while we are in the House, I can only allow one speech. The House is its own master but I would point out that if we discuss it clause by clause you make a speech and you are over. It would be possible to speak on every clause, but as far as the arguing and bantering back and forth is concerned, that cannot be allowed so long as we are constituted as a House.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, even if I have to repeat what I said before, this is merely a motion to table that report and the decision of this House to

table the report has nothing to do with what may be decided as to what to do with the different sections of the report when they come before this House in the form of a bill. There may be great advantage from a discussion at the present stage on the report in general or on particular sections which any member wishes to discuss. It may be very useful. It may be very useful to the government, and to the followers of the government, in deciding what should be put forward in the form of a bill. This is almost, in a sense, an Election Act Committee. It is now extended to all members of this House and I would suggest at the present stage that it might not be the best time for the House to come to any definite decision as to any one section or any other section of this report. I think we should wait until we see it in the form of a bill, and also I see many advantages in doing the way the hon. member suggested.

I think, in view of the fact that this is not a motion for the adoption of the report, as I said, or any part of it, it is merely a motion for the tabling of the report, that discussion should be wide open and it should be left to any hon. member to present his views. He is not necessarily bound by this, he is not bound by any vote that takes place on any particular section of this report this afternoon. We may have the benefit of the views of any hon. member who wishes to speak on this bill without his being under the impression that anything he says is going to be put in the form of a vote and he has put on record his vote one way or the other on any paragraph of this report, so I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a general discussion should ensue on this bill, leaving it open to any hon. member to deal particularly with any section as he sees fit.

MR. SPEAKER: I am quite prepared to accept that, but I say you can speak once, you can speak on any section, you can elaborate on it, you can speak as much as you like on every section as long as you like, but once the hon. member has spoken, that finishes his portion of the debate so far as the tabling of this report is concerned.

MR. SALSBERG: On the question of procedure, would it be agreeable to the government to proceed with a general discussion? That, I think, is sound and will help guide the government on what to do. But the report has just been brought down and for an intelligent discussion I think hon. members should be given a chance to read it, check with the original Act and then make a contribution that will be thought out and have some value. The hon. members of the committee are, of course, up to date. I would suggest to the government an agreement on those lines.

MR. FROST: It may not be necessary to close off this discussion this afternoon. We have some time. There may be some hon. members who are ready to speak now. I suggest we proceed.

MR. SALSBERG: Then I move the adjournment.

May I move the adjournment of the discussion on this motion? Nobody else wishes to speak.

MR. OLIVER: May I say with respect to this report and the tabling of it this afternoon, I find myself in disagreement with my hon. friend from Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) and in agreement, strange as it may seem, with the Attorney-General, because this is after all a report tabled in the Legislature and my objection to discussing it clause by clause would be that we would be discussing each clause as if it were impending legislation being considered by the House. Actually this is not the case at all. This is a report from a Select Committee and it will not become authoritative, or any phase of the report become operative unless the government decides to recommend to the House any form of a bill which would include those particular sections which the government is prepared to accept.

What could be done this afternoon is to deal with this in a general way, and if any hon. member has particular thoughts which attach themselves to a particular section, then that could be

dealt with, but the real discussion and the decision of the House as to whether they are going to accept or not will come not now but in the bill.

It does seem that any discussion on this tabled report today might be just a waste of time. Perhaps we have other important things to discuss. We have heard that even though we talk about this it does not really mean anything because we have not considered it.

So I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we move on to something else. We have had this very capably presented by the hon. member for the Beaches (Mr. Collings). It was very well done. I would like to have the opportunity to read it over and come to my own opinion and I do not think that can be done this afternoon, so that if there is anything else that can be done this afternoon, I would sooner go on with that.

MR. SALSBERG: I move the adjournment of this motion.

MR. PORTER: This is a motion for tabling a report and it is not usual on such matters to have an extended discussion, but in view of the contents of this report, if it is merely a question of tabling it, I suggest that the motion be adopted and the report be tabled, and if hon. members want to have a discussion on this report we could have the matter re-opened at a later date, but I do not see any positive advantage in leaving this discussion open at the present stage. This will come forward in the form of a bill and if we have not the advantage that members wish to express themselves on it this afternoon, no doubt we will have plenty of discussion when the bill comes forward.

MR. OLIVER: What procedure would be followed to bring the matter up again?

MR. PORTER: A motion could be tabled if desired. We could always reopen the discussion.

MR. S. F. LEAVINE (Waterloo North): I suppose this is one of the occasions on which spontaneous thoughts

can arise and they may be very apt. I cannot support any bill requiring a deposit of \$200 because I think this is futile in this inflationary age. I would rather go along with the suggestion for the raising of the number of names required on the nomination paper. I was somewhat surprised at the amount of work that this committee has done and feel that on the whole they are to be commended, but I am a little concerned that no mention has been made of two items that I think are of considerable importance. We know that our western provinces have adopted some of the more modern methods of voting, and I am forced to the opinion that I, being a minority representative, may very well be the victim of such innovation, but I do not think it is my responsibility to be elected but rather it is democracy to represent the majority of the people and I would have thought that there should have been some consideration given to such a voting system.

The other point is this. We talk about the small vote that comes out. We talk about the costs of elections and it has been mentioned that sometimes funds are collected by means that are not regular. All that may be true. I think the error is in not throwing on the candidate the responsibility of getting out the voters—and what I am about to say is not calculated to get myself re-elected—but it is the duty of every citizen to vote. There is only one way to achieve it. Many things I have to do, such as paying my taxes and so on which I do not find particularly agreeable. If you can compel a man to do these several things I think he should be compelled to vote. I must recognize there may very well be reasons in cases of religious belief of people as to why they should be exempt. There may be physical and mental reasons why some people should not vote. I would accept this, but I do think if there is no provision made for compulsory voting, you will always have a small vote, an expensive vote and a vote that could be very well influenced by lobbying.

As to the operation of election machinery I notice scrutineers have been mentioned. After the last election the

first telephone call I received was from the official agent of the former member for Waterloo North and his chief protest was: "You did not have any scrutineers." To this I replied: "What use are they anyway?" And I think in the main that is true. I believe expenditures on elections should be a charge against the province and I think a certain limited sum should be allowed for advertising.

I do not know in what particular party the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will place me this afternoon. At least, this is my considered opinion, and the opinion I am going to support.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am sure I will have something to say about this when it comes down in the form of a bill.

I do hope sincerely that the government will not bring down a bill containing all the recommendations made by the committee. When this does happen, sir, whether the bill contains all or only a portion of the recommendations, there will be need for discussions. I believe the report deals with a very vital question, and the bill that will incorporate some of the recommendations will be a major piece of legislation. I sensed, as did other people in the province, that the sense of the committee's recommendations come out with a clear move for a further infringement of the rights of people and of the election processes. Reference was made to the Leader of the CCF. He can defend himself and explain his position but I want to state here for myself that my reaction was not far from his own when I received the report—that here was an attempt to narrow down the number of candidates and to ease up in areas where the tightening of restrictions is necessary.

I am not discussing the report as intelligently as I would like because we have not yet read it but being compelled to discuss it at this stage, I will discuss it, but return to it after I have had the chance to read the report fully. Let us take a couple of items as an indication of what I have in mind.

This establishment of a permanent returning officer—I am not in favour of

it and I am glad to have one hon. member of the treasury benches take the same view. My experience with returning officers has been—well—very unhappy. My experience has been that the party in power usually appoints whoever they want, and the retiring officer turns the thing into a very good thing for himself without regard to the requirements of the electoral machinery. It is common to find a returning officer appointing his wife as a deputy or a secretary, his daughter as a clerk, his living room as office space and so on. In other words, it becomes a family affair, whether they can read or write, whether they can type or not. The idea is to make as much out of it as you can for yourself. That is the situation and it will not be improved by the appointment of permanent returning officers.

The hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is quite right when he says that the hon. member for a riding will, of course, seek to influence the government to give the appointment to one of his own supporters. He is right, and he is frank about it. The only trouble is he will always succeed in getting it for the person he recommends whereas the opposition never will.

I would give the job to a well-known and generally acknowledged impartial and honest person in every riding. Yes, I would give it to a minister of the church.

If a minister is not eligible I would make some such person eligible and let him act as returning officer. I have seen cases, Mr. Speaker, and so have most other hon. members, where returning officers are so incompetent that the party in power which gives them the appointment runs the officer to all intents and purposes and he is merely a rubber stamp.

That is true and it should be said Federally and Provincially.

I do not think this is an improvement, and I believe that improvements are necessary. I would like to see an improvement which would guarantee the establishment of a constituency machinery which will be above suspicion, and above influence. I think such a way can

be found, and that will be our task now that we are dealing with the improving and overhauling of our election machinery.

Another recommendation the committee brought in was to remove section 169 of the old Act. The chairman of the committee spoke of it lightly, but to me, it is extremely significant. He said that everybody knows it is a regulation or a law or a restriction which is more observed in its violation than its observance. In other words, you can rent cars and pay for them, while the law says you must not. I suggest in this type of legislation, we should not ease up on the regulations, but make them tighter, and make them more difficult to violate.

I venture to say if we were to have election methods less costly than they are now, with less money required by the Parties, including the Party in power—the old-line Parties—in order to fight elections, we would have less graft, less corruption, and less “Fort Williams.”

I think these are truths which should be stated. Surely if you can go out and hire all the taxi cabs in a riding, and send them out to bring in the voters, somebody has to pay for them, and the money has to come from somewhere. Perhaps the odd candidate can afford to foot the bill. I daresay there are some candidates who can, but, is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that in the old-line Parties, the candidates would turn to the Party leaders for a handout, and would get perhaps \$500 or \$600 or \$1,000 or \$1,500, depending on the amount required, and the ability of certain people to chip in.

But where do you think the man who gave you the \$1,000 or the \$5,000 got it? Where do you think he gets it from? It does not come from Heaven, like manna. Manna comes from Heaven, but money does not, and if the government is in the valley of humiliation now, the Liberals, too, were in that valley more than once. Is that not true?

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): You take up a collection?

MR. SALSBERG: We take up collections. We have collection cards in the

shops, and the workers give us what they feel they can afford, and people come with their cars, but there is no remuneration. But it is wrong, and I do not think it can be made legal, that is, to hire a fleet of taxi cabs and use them on election day. I say we should not allow that. We should tighten up on that.

There are many other points in this bill which require some plain speaking, and a good, common-sense approach. I am sure there are many hon. members on the government side who feel the same way as I do.

I was not prepared to participate in this debate today, but I would recommend the hon. members of the House should read a very stimulating article which I read in *Maclean's Magazine*, some months ago, on this question, where the writer quite correctly says that there are members of the House of Commons in Ottawa who privately violate the Election Act, before they are even elected, and these are the men who are supposed to make the laws, and expect everybody else to uphold them, but they are the ones who violate them in their elections.

I suppose we will have that as long as there is capitalism, and industrial and other large corporations handing out hundreds of thousands of dollars to Parties, in order to assist them in conducting their elections.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): We will not need any elections, when your Party gets into power.

MR. SALSBERG: We should do nothing to make it easier; what we should do is to make it more difficult. I think the proposals before us in the report of this committee can serve a very useful purpose. Some of the proposals may be very valuable and should be adopted and enacted in the form of legislation. Some, undoubtedly, should be rejected.

But if the report will introduce and inaugurate a good, thorough, frank and full discussion of the problems in connection with our election machinery, the costs of elections and the sources

from which the money comes will have served a very useful purpose, and I hope that will be the outcome of this discussion.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken, and I do not know whether you will rule me out of order, but I would like to say a few more words in connection with this report.

I would like to point out to the hon. members of this House that the members of this committee sat down on several occasions, and very carefully went over the two Acts, The Election Act and The Voters' List Act, and we considered them section by section, and it was the considered opinion of the members, that the recommendations as contained in the report would improve our election machinery.

As I said before, I cannot recall a difference of opinion being recorded on any point other than the \$200 deposit.

I, for one, disagree with the inclusion of that recommendation in the report. I still maintain that to ask for a \$200 deposit from a candidate is not democratic.

The argument used by some who favour the inclusion of the \$200 deposit in the Act is that it will do away with the "nuisance candidates." I do not think a "nuisance candidate" does any harm. I believe it was pointed out to me at the time that one candidate who opposed me in the last election received less than 3 per cent. of the votes. That is his right. He has a perfect right to run as a candidate.

But to ask any man to put up \$200, I maintain, is taking away his democratic right. It is quite possible that the \$200 deposit, for some of the larger Parties, will not amount to very much. They can get the amount from Party funds, but for the independent candidate, or the man who has no Party affiliation whatsoever, a \$200 deposit will be felt by him or one or two of his friends. It is a problem for a Party, which is not in a position to get large donations toward election expenses. If the amount has to be contributed by a very few, how many will pay the deposit

for all their candidates? At the present time, it would take \$18,000 to pay the deposits of the candidates of any one Party, if they ran candidates in each one of the 90 ridings.

That is all I will say now on that point.

Coming to the question of the permanent returning officers. I am strongly in favour of having permanent returning officers. I have been in quite a number of elections, and I believe that with the securing of men who are trained, and who understand the Act, we will be getting much more satisfactory elections.

On many occasions, I have seen disputes and "squabbles" with returning officers, who did not understand the provisions of the Act. In fact, during the election of 1951, I had a dispute with a returning officer myself. He stated that he would appoint the enumerators from whichever Party he wished. He proceeded to appoint them from the Conservative and the Liberal Parties, and told a representative of mine that was his privilege, and he would do as he pleased.

This representative called me and said, "Do you not think we are entitled to a few?" I said, "A few? We are entitled to 50 per cent."

I got in touch with the returning officer, and he gave me the same answer, and I said, "I will give you until eleven o'clock tonight, or I will call upon the Chief Election Officer."

He called me later on, and said that I was correct. I had quoted certain sections of the Act, and suggested that he read them.

I give that incident to show that with a permanent returning officer, problems such as that would never arise.

The returning officer might be an official of the county, such as the Sheriff or the Registrar, or the County Court Clerk, or somebody else in a similar position. They would have time to study their duties, and be prepared to act.

If we followed the procedure of appointing returning officers after a writ

has been issued, the Chief Election Officer would have to find someone in the area who would take on the job, which might take some time. And since we have narrowed down the time between the issuance of the writ and the election, we have to have the machinery which will facilitate the election, and a known returning officer should be located in each riding, to whom material could be sent, and then there would be no delays.

Permanent returning officers in each electoral district, in my opinion, is absolutely necessary.

As regards the question of having 10 people nominating a candidate or 200: I am in full accord with ten. Why should we have to go travelling, going around collecting signatures of 200 people? Surely ten nominators would be sufficient. They can signify their desire to have a person run, and if you increase the number, you are only increasing not only the burden placed upon the candidate, but also increasing the burden placed upon the returning officer because he will have to examine the list of nominators and certify each one—or at least 200 are qualified voters. It means increasing the duties placed upon the returning officers.

I am in full accord with the recommendation of the committee that 10 persons only be required to nominate a candidate.

I do not think the question of "advance polls" needs any discussion here. I am sure that each hon. member of this Legislature will agree it is a big step forward, and there will be no disagreement on that point.

When the bill is introduced, we can again discuss these points. The arguments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. Attorney-General have not yet convinced me it would not be more advantageous to this Legislature, to have gone through these recommendations, and obtained the viewpoints of each hon. member of the House.

That would have guided the government and would have shown what the

opinions of the different members were on these points. In leaving it to a bill, I think the government then will have to run the risk of opposition to some of those points, but if we had all discussed these points and agreed on them, then it would have been a simple matter to introduce a bill which would have been acceptable to all. But now, should a controversial point be introduced into the bill, we will have to argue the point in the House, which would not have occurred had we settled on this report as it stands.

MR. J. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve on this committee under the very able chairmanship of the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings). In attending the meetings of the committee I was interested in two things, one in certain fundamental changes which are thought to be fit and proper and especially to my mind the section that deals with absentee voters. There were other fundamental principles in which I was interested.

I also was interested in another factor. To me a document such as The Election Act which governs the bringing into being of the people who are to administer the affairs of this province should be a document which clearly sets out the procedure and requirements of a proper election. It is my feeling that this committee on both counts fulfilled its duty. It has introduced certain fundamental changes which are good and I believe its recommendations when put into legal language by the officers responsible for it will produce a document which will lead to the more orderly and a better understanding of the elections to be run in the future.

I was interested in some of the words of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) which he dropped so lightly in the course of his comments, comments such as: "Who controls the elections," and "The fact that infringements are being made on the rights of the people." Mr. Speaker, I know of no other place where elections are run better by and on behalf of the people and I think this time is a fitting time to bring to the attention of the people of

Ontario the way this administration has brought about elections.

Coming now to control of elections, the committee has retained what to my mind is one of the most democratic principles of control of elections in that it is permitting enumerators to be appointed not only by the representatives of the government in power but by those who ran second. To me I can think of no more democratic spirit, as a matter of fact, that was one of the things I learned during the course of the last election. When the former hon. member for Bellwoods riding walked in with 150 or more nominations of enumerators—I may say I was not as well prepared as he was—that list of enumerators was to me one of the most interesting lists I have ever heard of. And if anyone wishes to know the organizations which certain Parties have for the conduct of elections, they should see the people who participate in that somewhat lowly but very necessary task of enumerating to make sure that the people who were entitled to be on the list were on the voters' list.

I do not know how my hon. friend the member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) made up his lists, because the list of enumerators in Bellwoods riding represented the top leaders of the Party, not the rank and file, but the top leaders. And surely, Mr. Speaker, for a member of that Party to come into this House and speak slyly about "controls of elections," that election campaign was controlled from the date of the issuance of the writ, I know by the people from the Party represented by the man who, having sat in this House, regardless of what Party he belonged to, was entitled to appoint the enumerators who controlled indeed who was to be on that vote.

I may say in all modesty I was fortunate to be able to also draw up a list of people who went out jointly hand in hand in most cases and eyes watching eyes in the enumerating. The initial control of who has the right to vote and then on polling day—and in this regard I disagree with my hon. friend the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr.

Leavine) with regard to scrutineers—under our Election Act each candidate is entitled to have a scrutineer in the polling booth from the time the booth opens until the time it closes, from the time the first ballot is put in until the time the last ballots are counted, control of elections at the very beginning and at the very end by people working on behalf of the Party to which they subscribe.

During the course of elections many comments are made by one candidate towards the other. I listened to the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) speak on "control of Party funds." I remember a certain piece of literature which was put out by the former hon. member for Bellwoods, portraying myself sitting on the knee of some man with a top hat. That caused me more difficulty than anything, because all my supporters wanted to know when we were going to get some funds for some printing and for distribution. They were confused: "How many shall we order? Ten?" "No, eight, cut down expenses."

Mr. Speaker, I can conceive of no country in the world where elections are able to be run as closely by the people. Every citizen has an opportunity to become directly involved in an election campaign not only by the marking of his ballot but also by participating on the behalf of the Party he supports. I am convinced that under our election laws the control of the election in in the hands of the people.

With respect to the deposit. This item came into being this way, to my mind, that some discussion had taken place of the difficulties—I should not say "difficulties," but the chore attendant upon candidates going out and getting their nominations completed. I have seldom heard of anyone who could not get 100 nominations, but it is a chore, it is something that has to be attended to. However, in the past it seemed to be that it was little enough to require of a man who was going to participate in an event which cost the taxpayers some money, that he should at least have 100 supporters to show that he is quite serious about the election business.

Some hon. members felt it was a chore. They decided that perhaps the number should be reduced to 10. But having reduced the number to 10 and having made the business of nominations so easy—for, Mr. Speaker, whether there have been and whether there will be “nuisance candidates” is something we cannot pass on—surely with the knowledge that almost anyone could go out and get 10 people to sign any document, surely being aware of the responsibility of an election, we should impose some sort of obligation so that a man can say: “I am in this, I mean business. This is no light thing. I am taking it seriously enough that I am going to put up a deposit of \$200.”

I can sympathize with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and yet I cannot see the difficulty he pointed to, because members of his Party had no difficulty in filing 100 nominations with 100 deposits—it is unfortunate that all of them were lost.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not speak about the number of signatures required at all.

MR. YAREMKO: I am speaking about the \$200.

MR. SALSBERG: I did not speak about that either, so the hon. member (Mr. Yaremko) can save his sympathy for someone else.

MR. YAREMKO: Fine.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not need it, I did not speak about that.

MR. YAREMKO: Then Mr. Speaker, I perhaps agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) that he did not state that, but I am sure that some discussion must have at one time taken place about the \$200 and I am sure that when the time comes the hon. member for St. Andrew will probably speak on the point, if the government sees fit to bring it in.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member (Mr. Yaremko) is far-sighted tonight. I may do so.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, just to bring it to the attention of hon. members of the House, it is interesting to note that of the eleven jurisdictions in which election campaigns are carried on, there are seven which require deposits of \$100 and more, and there are two jurisdictions which in addition to the \$200 require 25 signatures; and that, Mr. Speaker, was the only point in which I too disagreed with the finding of the committee. It was my opinion that there should be 25 signatures in addition to the \$200.

There was one section, Mr. Speaker, which I should just like to bring to the attention of hon. members, which the chairman upon which I do not think commented, and that was the redrafting of subsection 3 of section 165 to the following effect:

The dissemination by any means by a candidate or his agent of political information or material or other material of public interest at any time shall not be deemed corrupt or illegal acts or a contravention of this Act.

All members of the committee felt that there should be full opportunity to all candidates regardless of Party to have the fullest opportunity of conveying their viewpoint to the people at large. In my mind—and I think most of the members agreed—the section as it had read prior to this was rather ambiguous and certainly did not deal with radio or television, that appeared to have been left in the background. I think that that section too backs up my earlier statement that this administration—and indeed it was the attitude of all the members of the committee representative of the three major Parties that our concern as a committee was to lend whatever assistance we could to make sure that the elections in the Province of Ontario would be run for and by the people and give the fullest opportunities to all Parties to present their facts before the people.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, in tabling the Report of the Select Committee on Election Law the chairman very kindly made compli-

mentary references to members of the committee, on their attendance, and on their co-operation with him in the work of the committee. I would like to join with the last speaker in reciprocating his kind and complimentary words and say what a pleasure it was indeed to work on this committee under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Beaches. Never at any time did he show any bias. He listened to the views of any member notwithstanding the Party he represented, just as courteously and as seriously as he did to those of any other member.

I shall certainly not make any personal comparisons, but I will say the committee could not have chosen a finer or better or fairer chairman than the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings).

Certainly we had no thought in presenting this report that it would be accepted without argument by hon. members who are so interested individually, as we all are, in elections, but it was the consensus of the members who were chosen by this Legislature to do this job and work for them.

One of the recommendations which seems to have met with considerable opposition and that I thought would be acceptable unanimously, was that of a permanent returning officer. This has obtained in Federal affairs for many years and I think has worked out well, at least they have returning officers who have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the provisions of the election law. The Chief Election Officer has an opportunity to visit them, call them together in convenient centres and spend considerable time, sometimes a day or two days, in discussing all aspects of the Federal law with them and answering any questions or giving any information that these permanent returning officers desire to have, and should have.

That certainly has not been the case here in my experiences, and they have been now quite some in number, in Provincial elections. I know in the last election the returning officer in my riding received a telegram that he was appointed to that responsible position

and he had not even received a copy of the election law. I know for certain that he proceeded with the appointment of enumerators and certainly without knowing what the provisions of the election law were, because the enumerators were all appointed before I even knew he was the returning officer, and I had to appeal to the County Board to override him, because nothing was clearer than the provisions in the law that in certain urban areas it was the duty and the responsibility of the returning officer to get in touch with the candidate who had the largest number of votes in the last election and secure from him the nominations for enumerators.

I know this was not intentional on his part, he was a personal friend of mine of many years standing, he even ran against me in one election some years ago. But he was not familiar with the provisions of the Election Act and he made this mistake quite innocently. Certainly had he had an opportunity to be informed by a reading of the Act, by instruction and advice from the Chief Election Officer, he would not have made that mistake.

It seems to me there is everything to be gained and nothing to be lost by having returning officers who know their job, who have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the work and then once the writs are issued the work of preparing lists can proceed expeditiously and properly and without the friction and trouble that otherwise might occur. I can certainly recommend that provision to hon. members of the House most sincerely. Certainly it is not my intention at this hour to go through the report that is before you section by section, but in regard to the subject of the permanent returning officer, I think we can well in this case follow the practice of Ottawa and have officers of this nature.

With respect to the deposit, I have some responsibility for this recommendation being before the House. This is not the first occasion that it has been before this House, sir. I can recall some years ago, I think it was about 1926 or 1927, when the hon. Mr. Ferguson brought in a special bill, not in

connection with the general revision of the Act at all, but he felt that the need for it was so obvious that it should receive attention by a special bill, and that provision was placed upon the statute books at that time. However, it was subject to proclamation by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and when it was not proclaimed in the next revision of the statutes, I believe it was automatically dropped.

This provision has stood for many, many years in the Federal election law and I have not heard anyone complain about the deposit. It is a principle which I believe has been recognized by at least eight of the provinces anyway in Canada. In seven of them it amounts to \$100 or more, in some of them it is considerably less. I think in one case it is \$10. But I am firmly of the opinion and always have been that submitting one's self as a candidate for a Provincial election is not a frivolous or a light matter and one should be expected to represent some little body of public opinion among electors, and to show that responsibility by putting up a deposit of some kind. My friend's suggestion, frankly, was \$100, Mr. Speaker. I do not know to what extent one should go into the discussions that took place on the committee, but I do know that the law of Canada has provided for a deposit now for many years and I have never heard of any candidates at Federal elections complain of that requirement. It is just taken as an accepted fact and they comply with it. Possibly the amount is too high in this recommendation, possibly the number of signatures still required may be too small. Frankly I think that if there is to be a deposit, that it should not be necessary for the candidate to go to all the trouble of securing such a large number of signatures to his nomination papers as 100 or 200, as the case may be. I have known candidates to put in nomination papers with thousands of names on them, in one case well over 4,000, and when the votes were counted he did not have as many votes as he had names on his nomination paper. I have known other nomination papers to be filled out very mysteriously in the back room of

the meeting where the candidate was nominated, and certainly there were not nearly as many at that meeting as there were names on his nomination paper, which was turned in at once to the returning officer. I have not very much confidence and I do not place much importance on a great number of names being put on a nomination paper. But this matter has found universal approval in Federal elections. I have followed *Hansard* from Ottawa fairly carefully and I have never seen any hon. member of that House suggest that that provision should be dropped from the Federal Act, and the fact that nearly all the other provinces have some provision of a similar nature I think is one that this Legislature could very well consider at this time.

Another matter that has seemed to arouse considerable discussion and difference of opinion—although I think we are all agreed on 16—is in connection with the advance poll, where those that could vote at the advance poll were limited to a certain extent by the provisions of the last Act by being required to say that they intended or believed they would be absent on business. It was always my feeling that if they were going to be absent for any reason, sir, that they should have the right to vote at the advance poll.

I think the recommendations from the committee would make that very clear, even if you were absent on holidays or attending a convention as occurred in the last Federal election. Many representatives of that convention lost their vote because of absence. You should be able to make use of the advanced poll. I do not think that will meet with much opposition.

Then there is the suggestion of the repeal of section 169, which has to do with the supplying of cars and conveyances to take voters to the polls. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) speaks of hiring fleets of taxi cabs, and of course he, in my opinion, presents a rather extreme suggestion in that way. However, those of us who are country representatives and rural representatives where there are vast distances in many cases for voters to

travel to the polls, know that provision has to be made in some way—is made and has been for years, for conveyances to be supplied for this purpose. Our friends who go to the trouble of providing their cars probably expect to find a little gasoline in their car at the end of the day, and not to find the tank completely empty, and one never enquires too closely as to how those things are done, of course.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is the rural way of life.

MR. NIXON: But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, in ten general elections in which I have participated, I am sure there have always been cars driving voters to the polls, and I have never asked my friends just how those were provided.

If one would read the section, he would see every candidate who himself or by any other person on his behalf, and every other person who hires or promises to pay or pays for conveyances, and so on, shall be guilty of a corrupt practice and shall incur a penalty of \$100; and every person who provides or furnishes transportation free of charge is guilty of a corrupt practice and shall be fined \$100; and disqualified from voting at the election.

We might as well be realistic in this matter. Certainly in the rural constituencies cars are going to draw voters to the polls, Mr. Speaker, no matter what we do. I do not like to be guilty of a corrupt practice, even if nobody hears about it, and I do not like my friends to be guilty of a corrupt practice under the law of the province. I suggest that section should have some consideration.

As these seem to be the sections which have aroused the most contention here this afternoon, I simply agree that the discussion should not be limited to the members of that committee. They have discussed these matters in meetings, and they are particularly interested at this stage in hearing the views of the hon. members of the House, who are not members of that committee.

I leave this, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, and if legislation should follow the tabling of this report, the hon. members, as has been pointed out, will have every opportunity to discuss the provisions of the amendments which come in clause by clause on that occasion.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to prolong the discussion. I am quite sure the hon. members are awaiting the adjournment of the House.

Our position as to the deposit of \$200 has been very ably put by the Leader of our group. I do think it has the effect of restraining people of modest means from qualifying for election for this Legislature, people who would be desirable representatives. Therefore, I do hope that recommendation will not be acceptable to the government.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in section 16, the advanced poll. I think that is quite a concession, and I suppose that is the result of the Federal election last year when the election was called in the middle of the holiday period on August tenth.

I think you will agree the first two weeks of August are usually regarded by most people in the province, and in Canada, as very good weeks to take a holiday, and there is nothing in that section, Mr. Speaker, which would stop the Provincial Government from calling an election in the first or second week of August of this year and depriving a good many people of their right to vote, because they would be away from the constituency.

I do hope that is a consideration to which the government will give some thought. There is still a possibility of this government calling an election in the first or second week of August, and we would have a repetition of what happened in the Federal election last year.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.20 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, February 22, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, February 22, 1954.

Reports by Committees	143
White Paper; Suggestions re Programme of Renewable Resources Developments of Ontario, Mr. Gemmell	149
Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	161
Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	162
Division Courts Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	162
Evidence Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	163
Judicature Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	163
Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	163
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	164
Warehouse Receipts Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	164
Wills Act, bill to amend, second reading, Mr. Porter	165
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	165

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1954

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Supplementary Report of the Special Committee of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario charged with the revision of the Companies Act, Ontario and related Acts.

I am, Mr. Speaker, in fact tabling the report, and with your permission I would like to make a few observations with relation to it.

The main report of this committee was made at the last sitting of the Legislature, and was followed by statute, a bill which has now been enacted as the Statute of 1953 which is in the red book and which will take effect on April 30th. of this year.

The committee was continued from last session in order that we might have further time to consider any additional comments or reflections on the work which we had done. I might say that a number of letters and representations were made to the committee. We had three sittings. I would just like at this point to say that our report now is as was the case in the first instance, a unanimous report, and so far as government members are concerned, perhaps it was not unexpected that we

might agree. However, I would like to say that the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) who attended all our hearings this year and who contributed considerably to the comments and work of the committee, has joined with us, as has the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), both of whom represent Opposition Parties of this House. Therefore it is a particular pleasure for me to present the report as a unanimous report after deliberations continued this year.

I presume the hon. Provincial Secretary, in due course, no doubt will present the Act to the Legislature. Added to the report as a schedule is a draft bill, which the committee recommends. Without going into details I think there are about 30 sections, most of which deal with changes in the wording, improving the wording of some of the sections, clarifying some of the sections. I will not worry the House with comments of that sort, but I would like to draw attention to three or four major changes or additions.

First of all, in Part 4, which is the Mining Companies Part, representations were made to us, first of all by a well-known Ottawa lawyer, and later by several other lawyers familiar with this particular type of company work. As a result of those representations, we have seen fit to recommend that no longer is it necessary to include in the name of the mining company the word, "No Personal Liability," but proper amendment to section 121 is recommended which would remove that requirement, which will make it necessary to indicate

on share certificates when share certificates are due for shares issued under that part, that they are either subject to call or not subject to call.

With regard to Part 5, the Co-operative Corporations Part, we had representations further from competent representatives of the co-operatives, and we are recommending that subsection 3 of section 124 be amended by adding certain words which will restrict the use more than, even at present, of the word, "Co-operative" in business ventures. The words we are suggesting will make this subsection read, if it is enacted:

No person not being a corporation to which this Part applies,
—that is the co-operative part—

shall use in Ontario a name that includes the word "co-operative" or any abbreviation or derivation thereof, whether or not the word, abbreviation or derivation is used in, or in conjunction with the name.

We are also adding a further section to that amendment and a further section to that Part which will permit, were by-laws are passed by a co-operative, for up to \$1.00 a year per member to be deducted from patronage returns for use in educational work.

With regard to Part 6, which is the insurance Part, we repeat again in our report that we think with insurance experts the wording of this Part could be considerably improved.

However, on the representations of the Superintendent of Insurance, we are recommending in the meantime certain additions, the effect of which are to give to Farm Mutuals somewhat broader powers of insurance to go beyond just agricultural property of a non-hazardous nature to include new suburban dwellings of a non-hazardous nature, and also to enable that type of Farm Mutual—and I think there are some 66 of them in operation in the province—to insure for weather insurance, providing they re-insure if the risk involves more than \$100, in any case, with a recognized weather insurance company.

Likewise in the same Part we are giving what I may call the Millers Insurance Companies similar powers except in that case we are not asking them to re-insure if they cover weather insurance.

Section 308 of the general Part, which is an improved new section, a section which gives the power and the right to a representative minority group to present through the channels of the company itself, or its secretariat, a resolution for presentation at a meeting of shareholders and an explanation up to 1,000 words of a point which they wish to be brought before the shareholders at a meeting.

That section, as it appears in the Statute of 1953, is still not as complete and clear as it might be, and we are re-drafting certain Parts of it to clarify it. We are also adding, as a result of representations, two subsections which deal with a point which I think is rather important, and in this we are following the English practice again.

In the case of a statement being presented by a group of shareholders to be publicized in the manner that a company would send out its own notices, there might be libellous matter contained in that material, and we have allowed for presentation to the court for a decision if the management feels that course is necessary.

We have also recommended that, in any event, if notice of that sort is sent out at the request of a requisitioning group, there should be no liability for libellous statements on the part of anybody sending out the notice as a result of the requisition.

Then we have an addition to section 322, which is really a new idea and was submitted on behalf of companies, or individuals who are interested in companies of foreign origin, particularly companies in the States, which might be said to be bordering states on the Iron Curtain, for example, to enable a company normally operating under the laws of Belgium, Luxembourg or Switzerland, or others of that sort, to change its allegiance—perhaps that is one way of putting it—to an Ontario company, by

means of a mutual arrangement beforehand between that state and our own. For anyone who might be interested, the discussion appears in the printed proceedings on pages 3171 and following.

What we are recommending is a section pretty well in the form recommended to us, with a slight improvement in the language, the effect of which will be:

That in the discretion of the Provincial Secretary—where there is a reciprocal arrangement ahead of time with the state concerned—in an emergency, certain steps may be taken by such corporations so that they can operate from the Province of Ontario and not be interrupted by pending or actual invasion that might come overnight in the area in which they reside.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that this committee and myself as chairman—perhaps more than the others, because I had the honour of occupying that position—have received a number of congratulatory messages with respect to the work done by this committee. Of course there has been some criticism, but I am particularly pleased with a letter I received from a veteran former parliamentarian, Mr. Charles Parent, Q.C., of the City of Quebec, who for 18 years sat in the Federal House. You can guess what stripe of politics he has when he was able to sit continuously for 18 years in Ottawa. His letter reads as follows:

May I point out that I was 18 years a member of Parliament, and that I have tried for over 10 years to have our Dominion Companies' Act revised to protect the small shareholder in giving him more information through a consolidated report or separate reports on each subsidiary, but I never got more than a conference with the provinces in the autumn of 1952.

I am, therefore, in a position to realize and gauge the great work that you have done and wish to express to you my congratulations.

I might say with respect to minority shareholders; in this Act, as enacted last

year, and with these amendments if they take place, there are at least six main points where minority shareholders receive more protection than they did in the past. First of all, the cumulative-voting provisions, if desired, can be obtained; secondly, section 308 provides that information can be given to shareholders through the channels of the company; thirdly, the aggrieved shareholders section, section 340; fourthly, the right of shareholders of a private company to be bought out if the sale of the assets of the company is consummated and they are diversified; and the financial sections which, of course, are very important; and the director sections which also are very important and indicate a number of changes.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in saying that, I am just repeating what the hon. Prime Minister of this province has said on many occasions, that this government is a Progressive Conservative Government, a government of the people.

I will conclude my comments in a moment. I may digress for a moment, and I hope you will not call me to order because I will only be a moment or two, Mr. Speaker.

Last Friday, we had a discussion in the House in regard to *Hansard*. I see the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is in his seat. I was going to say it all happened because of that turophilo opposite who represents the riding of St. Andrew in this House.

MR. SALSBERG: Was that parliamentary or not? I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: Before I get through, you can judge. *Hansard*, tired of the continual flow that comes from that source, missed a ripple or so, and what happened? The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) then came up with what might be termed a "clobber" of the reporter concerned, which, if there had not been a "flub" might have brought about a very serious situation. I am sure that the reporter concerned would have wished at the time that he was either in Bizelon or perhaps even farther away in Serendepity or some other place. At any rate, I will

look with interest tomorrow morning on the production of my copy of *Hansard* to see how they get along with that.

The hon. member for Middlesex North (Mr. Patrick) in a whisper, asked me to explain a little more the word, "turophilo," and the hon. member opposite suggested I should, and if Mr. Speaker thinks it is necessary to rule on it, I would say there are several versions of that word.

MR. SALSBERG: What dictionary did you get it from?

MR. ROBERTS: There are two new dictionaries in existence. The hon. member will find it in either or both of them. One of the versions is that it is a word derived from two words, "taurus" and "philo," and if he wishes free translation, it is a "lover of bull."

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Before the Orders of the day are called, may I refer to an article, an editorial appearing in the *Toronto Daily Star* on Saturday, February 20th, entitled, "Of All Things, Mr. Frost!" Then it says:

No government of this province ever before had the courage or the hardihood to try putting a crimp in telling tales out of school.

That refers to The Telephone Bill. I think it should be put right by saying it is with reference to conversations over the telephone. This bill still is law. It is on the Statute Books now and in fact you will find this clause became law in 1917, and the one with reference to obscene language, in 1915.

As far as the present Act is concerned there is no intention that the authority should do the policing, but rather the clause is a guidance to what the rights of private and/or public telephone companies are in case of abuse of the telephone system, or better still, it would support any private or public telephone company which might wish to adopt a

code of ethics as to what use the telephones should be put.

It will therefore be the duty of a company or private individual to take action if any action is desired.

Returning to the statement that "no government of this province ever before had the courage or hardihood to try putting a crimp on telling tales out of school," I would say that has been on the Statutes for 37 years, and the other one has been on the Statutes for 39 years.

The editorial goes on to say:

"The boys at Queen's Park are certainly covering a lot of territory."

It is very difficult for me to ascertain what territory, as this was covered 37 or 39 years ago.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): As a matter of personal privilege this editorial refers to, "of all things, Mr. Frost!"

The purpose of the legislation before the House, as I understand it, is to modernize the Statutes, place them under one Statute under a new Authority. I imagine the great majority of provisions in the new bill are those which were in the old bill. I think that is mentioned in the Statute itself. It says it refers to the Acts of years ago.

I would not want to suggest to the committee what they do; that is for the committee to decide. But when the bill comes back to the House, if there are things we do not like in it, we can alter them.

As I said on a previous occasion, I am a rural telephone subscriber. I have good neighbours and find that everything is satisfactory. I did not know about these Acts of 1915 and 1917, but the points which are raised, to which reference is made, have been the laws of the province for very many years and they seem to be satisfactory. If one goes by what one hears, the views of the people seem to be that these things are quite satisfactory.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I take it the hon. Prime

Minister does not want the innocent pastime interfered with.

HON. MR. FROST: I will say that I will leave things as they are today.

MR. SALSBERG: It is an humorous editorial. The hon. Prime Minister has lost his sense of humour.

MR. ELLIS P. MORNINGSTAR (Welland): Mr. Speaker, may I have your permission to ask a question? We have a large number of unemployed in the Welland area. I wish to know what the Government of Canada has indicated; if the gas pipe line from Alberta to Ontario has been approved, and whether the Government of Canada will be in a position to place the order for the pipe in Welland; firstly, because of the unemployment situation, it would seem that priority should be given to an area with unemployment; secondly, the Paige Hersey Tube Company of Welland is the only firm who can manufacture this pipe in Canada.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say what might be in the mind of the Federal Government as to the letting of contracts for a pipe line, when the route of that pipe line has been decided, but I think I can say at the present time that the Federal Government has passed legislation providing for the incorporation of the Trans-Canada Gas Line Company for the purpose of building a pipe line across Canada, at least from Alberta to Quebec, through Ontario.

That company, when it begins to function, which I understand it is just about ready to do, will, of course, no doubt, be letting contracts, but to whom they let the contracts is something we in this government have no control over. I do not know whether the Federal Government will exercise any control over that at all.

My understanding is that the federal policy is to arrange for the building of this pipe line by a company which has been incorporated, and the company will raise, presumably, the necessary capital to carry out that project.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the government, primarily, I believe of the Prime Minister, on a matter of great urgency and importance. My question is this: In view of the fact that the building of an all-Canada seaway has long been recognized as a matter of great national need, and in view of the fact that this Province of Ontario is more than any other part of Canada interested and, therefore, vitally concerned with the whole question of the seaway; and in view of the fact that the people of Ontario and Canada have been led to believe that the seaway will be an all-Canadian effort, even if built in partnership with the United States, and that further, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister stated only a couple of weeks ago that he wants our American friends to get out of the way and let us proceed with the construction of the seaway—a statement, by the way, which I think was applauded on all sides and in all parts of the country—in view of all these things, the newspapers, and I think the *Globe and Mail* notified us first on Friday that there seems to be an undisclosed understanding or agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States that the construction of the seaway would be of a sort that would deprive it of the all-Canadian aspect. Furthermore, in view of the evidence given before an American Congressional Committee by American military authorities that the seaway should be proceeded with on a basis of building locks in the United States—three locks—and that they should retain full control over these three locks, even to the point of determining unilateral charges and rates on ships passing those locks; and in view of the fact that those military authorities appearing before the committee stated that the construction of the seaway is in the same category as the construction of the Panama Canal, implying very much a sort of unilateral action which would lead to the surrender of this country's rights and controls of the St. Lawrence Seaway and allow it to become an American lake or an American canal, does not the

government think we should not lose one minute in coming to grips with this problem during this session so as to make abundantly clear to Ottawa and to Washington that so far as Ontario and this government is concerned, it will not stand idly by and allow the robbing of the people of this province and of this country of their rights to construct an all-Canadian seaway over which they should exercise control and authority and utilize it for the advantage of Canada for all the years that lie ahead of us?

Mr. Speaker, you will recognize that this is a long question and it is one that leaves one breathless. But I know from experience that unless I continuously make it sound like a question I may be stopped. Now that I have asked it, I can possibly have a breather and hope the Prime Minister will give as broad and as lengthy a reply as he thinks necessary and for myself I think we should devote a long and fruitful discussion to this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is quite right. I think the question is very long and involved, and if the Prime Minister is able to give an answer to all that, I think it will be more than satisfactory, not only to the Prime Minister but to everyone.

HON. MR. FROST: I will do my best to answer that several-pronged question that the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has propounded.

I think at the outset I can say this, and I think I can say it kindly, if I can put it that way. The people of Ontario, for whom I think I can speak, are satisfied Canada can do this job herself and they are anxious that as Canadians we do the job ourselves. We have not asked for participation on the part of anybody else, and I think that arises from the fact that this question has been bandied around now for some 30 or 40 years. We have always been brought up to the point where we can get ahead with this matter that is so essential to our country, and then something happens.

This government and the government

at Ottawa are in complete agreement. We are prepared to do the job ourselves. I think this makes the matter perfectly plain. We have the means, and our people are quite willing to assume the obligation and go ahead.

As far as Ontario is concerned, our great task is in relation to the development of power on the international section. The part of the Government of Canada would be in relation to the building of the canal on the Canadian side of the river. That is what we would all like, I am sure.

On the other hand we have to face facts as they are. The St. Lawrence River is in fact an international river, an international waterway for a good many miles. In order to get ahead, if Canada does the job herself, you have to have United States participation to this extent. The United States has named an Authority, and that Authority has to be prepared to go ahead. The Authority so named is the Power Authority in the State of New York and they are as anxious as we are to go ahead. Now there has been certain litigation pending in the United States which will shortly be cleared away. I can only say what hon. Mr. Chevrier, the Minister of Transport, said in this city a few days ago. Either there is a type of participation by the United States or there is an actual participation in the building of the canal and the waterway in the international section. One can imagine the United States would not want, as a government, to act in connection with the building of the international section unless there was an agreement on the part of the Government of Canada and other authorities to carry on the building through the part of the river which is purely within Canada. That is the situation.

I think Canada's position has been this: We have never said to the United States, "You cannot come in." It would be ridiculous to say that. Of course they can come in. The river is, in part, their river. All we have said is this: "If you do not want to come in, then do not get in our way, and let us go ahead and do it."

As regards the connection between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, that is purely a matter for the Federal Government. We do not negotiate directly with authorities in the United States other than with what has been named as our opposite number, namely, the State of New York. It is not the function of this government to discuss matters with the United States Government. That is for the Federal Government and the Department of External Affairs.

I cannot add anything more to what I have said. If the United States desires to act in all of these matters, it would appear to me that the river is a boundary river; there are rights the United States has which we certainly must recognize, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiations, if the United States indicates its desire to come in to these negotiations, must be conducted by the Federal Government of Canada and the Government of the United States.

Our position, under our agreement with the Federal Government, which we signed, I believe, in December 1951, relates solely and wholly to the possession or development of power by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission and that forms a very vital part of this whole problem. I do not think there is anything further I can say on this matter.

MR. SALSBERG: Can I follow up with another question? I fully appreciate the responsibility of the Federal Government, but does not the Prime Minister agree that if his friends are strongly in favour of an all-Canadian seaway, and since such a seaway is separate and apart from our arrangements for joint Hydro developments with the State of New York, does not he think that this House should make it clear to Ottawa that we have strong wishes and strong opinions on this question instead of merely trailing behind what the *Globe and Mail* calls, correctly I think, "all-Canadian seaway barter"? I think this House should be opposed to the bartering of the all-Canadian seaway, and I think we should

come out with some resolution which would be unanimous in this House.

HON. MR. FROST: I can only point out that there is an international section of the river. On that international section of the river, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission and the New York State Authority are designated at the present time by their respective governments to look after power.

It is impossible for us to tell the United States that they cannot participate in something which relates to that part of the river in which they have joint ownership with us. It is a matter for the Federal Government and the Government in Washington.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. WELLAND S. GEMMELL (Minister of Lands and Forests): I beg leave to table a White Paper on suggestions for the programme of Renewable Resources Developments of the province, setting out the long-term aims and objectives for this department. I may say this report is being referred to the Committee of Lands and Forests of this Legislature.

HON. MR. FROST: Before my hon. friend speaks on the matter, which he has tabled, I would like to table an answer to question number 8.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: May I, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence take this opportunity of first of all expressing my gratitude to the members of the Legislature who were so generous to me during my recent period of illness. I want to assure them I have returned to the House in good health and I will try to give to my important duties very vigorous and active attention. I say that with the thought in mind that one of my hon. friends, representing a riding situated I would say beyond the Mason and Dixon line, made reference to my health, and he felt that more vigorous direction should be given to the department and that I should be retired to a function of less importance. I want to assure the hon. member, and I am not

critical of him for making this comment that I now feel perfectly fit. May I take the opportunity, because this is the first time I have spoken this year, to congratulate the new member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) who moved very ably the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and thank him for the very kind comments he made on that occasion about myself; also to my good friend the hon. member for Rainy River who similarly expressed these feelings. May I also refer to the remarks of the Leader of our Party (Hon. Mr. Frost) and to others for their welcome help when I was inactive, and who were so kind as to wish me well during that period.

In presenting this White Paper to the House, Mr. Speaker, I feel signally honoured, because this is the first time, I believe, that a White Paper has ever been tabled in this Legislature.

May I, Mr. Speaker, refer to it as a blueprint for the future. It covers in many fields the widespread responsibilities of the Department of Lands and Forests which administers our renewable resources. I would not, in tabling this report, wish this House for one moment to think that during the course of the management of this department, particularly under my regime and that of my predecessor in this government, that everything possible has not been done to give to the people of the Province of Ontario the best possible management which could be given. I want to say on this occasion that we are ably supported—very ably supported—by many people, officials of the Department of Lands and Forests, a Deputy-Minister who has devoted his life to these things, and by many division chiefs whose whole history of endeavour in this province has been to ensure that the people of Ontario should have the very best that is possible in the various fields of endeavour with which they are associated.

I must express my appreciation of the very able and kindly manner in which they have supported me as Minister of the Department, and I cannot help but thank them.

Mr. Speaker, I have a soft spot in my heart occasionally for the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), not because of the particular Party which he represents, but rather because of the name of the riding he represents—that good old name St. Andrew. That name is associated with my ancestors down through the centuries. I want to assure him that our department, in one of its great divisions, that of surveying and engineering, is continuously carrying out investigations into the water resources of this province, and in that report much information of great value to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and other power producers of this province will be made available, to ensure that all potential power sites in this province are available to supply our ever-growing needs. I would not like members of this House to feel for one moment that we were only now beginning to approach this problem and suggest that a greater programme be encouraged to ensure the adequate management of our resources. I want to make special reference to the beginning of this programme, the foundation which culminated in, and to a large extent produced the report I am tabling today. While the former Minister, the Hon. Mr. Scott, is not here with us—I see him sitting in the gallery—I would like to point out that it was his responsibility to make the decision to carry out the Forest Inventory which began in 1946 and to which we are going to make considerable reference today. The suggestion I am going to make to you is that the recommendations contained in this White Paper are to a large extent directly attributable to the information gathered during the inventory, and for the benefit of hon. members may I say that in 1946 this government made the decision to try in some way adequately to assess the timber as well as other renewable natural resources of this province.

Since that time we have also made a decision to carry on an aerial survey of Patricia, an area, I believe, of approximately 15 or 20 million acres.

We are also surveying parts of the south of the province. I want to remind

hon. members that these aerial photographs which form a major part of this inventory, serve many other users besides technicians of the Department of Lands and Forests.

We supply every other department of this government with these photographs and that is of great help in the programmes they have to carry out. You may have noticed in the metropolitan press the other day, Mr. Speaker, where the City of Toronto carried out an aerial survey in an effort to solve the traffic problems in the metropolitan area. So I say to you that this aerial photography programme of ours carries with it a great deal of usefulness beyond the supplying of information on the timber resources of this province.

I would like to impress again upon the hon. members the importance of our lumber and pulp and paper industries and the great part they play in the economy of Canada, and what they mean to the prosperity of our people, not only in Ontario, but in many other provinces.

I might say the Federal Government recognized this some years ago when they passed an Act making it possible to contribute from the Federal Treasury to the cost of some of the work I have mentioned. Unfortunately Ontario's first five years of that work will not be included in such grants, but we shall benefit in subsequent years. So far the Federal Government has only seen fit to make contributions in regard to the inventory of timber and to aid us in the reforestation of unalienated Crown lands.

Because of the importance to us of such grants, we hope the Federal Government will see fit to increase its forestry grants and so help our province to carry out this great programme of forest management.

Now, before going on to another subject, I would like to say that our accessible forests cover an area of 172,000 square miles and that half of this land is held under lease by the large operators of the great mills at Sault Ste. Marie, Espanola, Sturgeon Falls, the Lakehead, Kenora, Dryden, Kapus-

kasing, Iroquois Falls, and many others. Every company which holds land under these agreements greater than 50 square miles, has been required to supply to our department, working plans from their inventories, which covered age classes, species, and other information. These plans have been placed before our department and from these will be worked an operational policy to ensure the proper cutting which good forestry management requires.

I may say, too, that it is to its credit that industry has been very co-operative. In fact the whole programme has been one of mutual respect and mutual success.

The inventory has now been completed, and we are able to table before the hon. members of this House, this document, to give them some idea of what this Legislature and this government should do to ensure our people a policy which will guarantee, in perpetuity, the economic operation of our forest resources. Research and science no doubt will provide improved silvicultural and other methods, through which we may expand that programme far beyond what we are now able to foresee.

At this time, I think no one can question the future of this industry. We must realize that our greatest market for this production is our neighbour to the south. That great nation is growing at the rate of 5,000,000 people annually—in other words, the United States population is increasing annually to an extent equal to the present population of Ontario. We must also realize that the use of wood fibre is entering into many new fields of application. I say the future of this industry is assured, thanks to the management features we are bringing into force.

May I say that the saw-milling industry in this province began away back in the 1870's. I believe in the years following Confederation, we produced in this province, 177 million board feet of pine timber. I might say that red pine and white pine timber are the basis for the supplying of material to the saw-mill industry.

By 1908, we had reached the peak, with well over 800 million board feet—very close to one billion—annually.

Since that time, it has tended to decline, until today, we are getting in this province about 150 million board feet.

According to figures with which I have been supplied it would appear that in a period of from 17 to 20 years, at the present rate of exploitation, our stands of white and red pine will be extinct.

I want you to remember, Mr. Acting Speaker, that I am saying that the red and white pine are the bases of the saw-milling industry in this country.

When we turn to the pulp and paper industry, we find that our vast spruce forests have given Ontario much of its power and strength as a paper producer.

There are other species used, but I think no one will argue but that this specie which produces the high quality of Ontario newsprint is what makes Ontario strong in this field.

The inventories just completed indicate to us and our department that what happened to our white and red pine saw-milling industry can well be repeated with pulp and paper mills.

They are now experimenting with the use of other species but still spruce is the predominant wood upon which depends our success in the future.

So it is our important duty now to examine this condition immediately, and pass legislation which will ensure a continued supply of spruce species for the industry we now have, and, as I say, if research and silviculture give us better methods and better production, we can carry on and expand this industry to meet the whole requirements of the market and maintain Ontario's outstanding quality production.

I am trying to draw a parallel between what happened to the saw-milling industry in this province, and what could possibly happen if we do not take measures now regarding our spruce forests and their continued availability.

Legislation will be introduced at this session of the Legislature which will, in

some measure, take care of this situation.

When you look over this inventory of our forest resources, you will find there is not a great deal of difference between the volume of soft woods now standing and that of hard woods. Unfortunately most of our hard woods are not in great enough demand. Research will probably help establish a better balance here.

So I say it is the task of the Legislature, and subsequently in the discussions in the Committee on Lands and Forests, to go thoroughly into this matter, and I do hope that adequate time will be given to discussing these matters thoroughly, and that we shall be able to implement, as a result of a study of this White Paper, methods which will ensure for future generations, an adequate supply of our natural resources. We should inaugurate now, a 10-year programme, the result of which will ensure in years to come a constant supply of renewable resources to meet all needs.

It takes a long time to grow a merchantable tree to meet the needs of our woods-using industries and you will find in reviewing this report, for instance—that the average for a rotation crop in spruce is about 85 years. Putting that into simple language, may I say in regard to the 85-year cycle, it means that when an area is cut over today, it will probably be 85 years, even with good silviculture and good conditions to reproduce the same species of inmerchantable spruce.

That same situation will not pertain to the saw-milling industry.

If you want to produce saw logs, you will have to provide for a longer period than 85 years in the rotation of crops.

This report will point out to the hon. members of the Legislature the difficulties respecting the saw-milling industry.

And not only have we the timber industry to consider, but when the St. Lawrence Seaway is constructed in this country, a great amount of piling and timber will be required in the construction of that great venture. And not only will the St. Lawrence Seaway demand saw-mill types of timber, but we will

also have to be able to supply timber within a competitive price range.

So I think you will agree with me when I say that a decision has to be made by this government and this Legislature, that the saw-milling industry, as far as we are able to assess from this report, could very well amount to very little from 17 to 20 years from now.

We must take measures now to ensure that does not happen. This report will point out to you there are saw-logs on the pulp and paper concessions of this country, about which there has been considerable argument. And there is saw timber on the unalienated land still in the hands of the Crown and not under licence, which we feel certain 15 or 20 years from now can help maintain the present production of saw timber at its present rate.

It is true a mill may have to cut down the size of its production in certain areas; it may have to switch to various other species; it may have to learn the "know how" for the use of poplar which we refer to as "weak specie," although I have seen it cut, and a good job done in many mills of this province.

These are some of the things which face our department. Negotiations are continually going on in an effort to assure this, and I think I can say to the hon. members of this Legislature this afternoon that the Department of Lands and Forests of Ontario is prepared to do things that will ensure the survival of the saw-milling industry in this province.

We are not concerned about the next 15 or 20 years. What we are concerned about is the next 30 or 40 or 50 years, and possibly 100 years from now, and the responsibility rests upon the shoulders of each one of us here to stand behind this programme.

I made some reference earlier to the fact that in this report we had spared nothing, as far as I am aware, in an endeavour to get the best advice and the utmost support in the preparation of this report. Mr. Acting Speaker, we used the abilities of every man in the Department of Lands and Forests, those men whom I consider to have no peers in

this country, at least in connection with forestry matters.

They prepared for us, on behalf of their several divisions, a programme which they felt would meet the needs at the moment.

After the assembling of these facts by our departmental officers, this information was submitted to the Advisory Board, and from them to the Minister of Lands and Forests.

For the benefit of those who do not know the composition of the Advisory Board, may I say that we have, sitting as chairman, the Dean of the Faculty of Forestry of the University of Toronto, Dean Sisam. Not only does he represent the Faculty of Forestry, but he represents education in general. We also have sitting on that board representatives of the mining industry, banking, labour, construction, pulp and paper, the saw-milling industry, and railways, which are great users of these materials, as well as others.

This report was submitted to them for their consideration and approval.

I might say in passing that Dean Sisam and Major-General Kennedy—who is the author of the report by the Royal Commission in 1947 in connection with forestry—and Mr. MacDougall, the Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests, spent a great deal of time studying the original report, they edited this report, and it is now being presented to you as a report which has received the benefit of all the advice we have been able to assemble, in a sincere endeavour to make this report worthy of this government, and for presentation to our people, and to enable the people to know where we hope to go in the future.

I should not forget to mention that the hon. Prime Minister and myself referred this matter, in regard to the aspects of economics, to the Provincial Economist, Mr. George Gathercole, in regard to certain information we wanted as all these industries could contribute to the various phases of the welfare of our people, and under his direction, a very exhaustive report was prepared by Mr. Goundrey, and it appears in the

form of an appendix, and will be found in the back of the report.

All these various methods were used in ensuring that this report would be of some benefit to our legislators when discussing this very important issue, and I hope that suggestions can be offered which will tend to ensure the future of this great industry.

I hope that every hon. member, and particularly those sitting on the Committee on Lands and Forests, will take the time to read this as thoroughly as possible, and I want to assure you when the Committee meets we shall try to have available the staff of the Department of Lands and Forests, representing all the divisions, and including the Deputy Minister. We shall have Major-General Kennedy here, in order that he may give the members the benefit of his advice and counsel, and explain perhaps some of the things appearing in the very excellent report they prepared in 1947. We also hope to have present Dean Sisam, who is, as I have said, Dean of the Faculty of Forestry of the University of Toronto.

I might say, in passing, that Dean Sisam prepared a special report for our department in connection with our staff at the forestry school at Dorset, for the benefit of our organization. It was to enable use to plan in the future for the betterment of the training of the staff, which goes to make up this great organization.

Major-General Kennedy has, on various occasions, made some extensive examinations into economic conditions on the west coast of Canada, which may seriously affect our industry. His experience has enabled us to get in our department knowledge as to the proper methods to apply to the Act which we now have, and subsequent legislation, to keep this industry healthy, in the best interests of our people. I want to assure you that, as far as I am concerned, I am more concerned about the health of this industry, and the effect it will have on the lunch pails and the homes of the people in our great North Country, from which I come, than I am in any other factor. I shall not leave the department

without first of all ensuring that development, and I shall accept advice at any time, and shall apply it in every possible way I can, in order that I may secure the best assurances for the future.

The protection of existing forests is of extreme importance. As a matter of fact, Mr. Acting Speaker, I think I can say that forest protection in this province cannot be ignored, and before we start regeneration and reforestation schemes, and nurseries, we have to be sure that what we already have is taken care of as near to 100 per cent. as possible, so that it will not be jeopardized either by forest fires or by damage from insects and diseases.

The forest-fire protection service of this province is second to none on the American continent.

Connected with this great branch is research in connection with diseases and insects. In passing, may I make reference to the insect laboratory at Sault Ste. Marie which is carried on in conjunction and co-operation with the federal department. We constructed the laboratory, and the Federal Government staff it and carry on the work.

Our forest protection service includes all the different species of destructive agencies which exist in our forests.

May I say that we have completed the Research Pathological Station at Maple. I would like some day during this session to have the hon. members go up and see that for themselves, and I will be glad to arrange for such a trip at any time. This is something which is being carried out by agreement with the Federal Government, in a large building we constructed just north of this city. There is carried on the pathological research in connection with our department, and also research is being conducted in conjunction with the Biological Division of the University of Toronto. I feel sure that every hon. member of this House would find a visit to that institution very interesting, as it would enable him to see what is going on.

Not only do we carry on research in connection with insects and destructive matters concerned with wood fibre, but

we carry on research into the equipment we use in the suppression of forest fires.

As a matter of fact, the Department of Lands and Forests can take a great deal of the credit for the construction of the Beaver aircraft, which operated so well that subsequently large numbers were sold to the United States Government for use in Korea and other theatres of operation, as it was much better than any aircraft produced in the United States for this particular purpose. As I say, the Department of Lands and Forests can take much of the credit for the construction of that very versatile aircraft.

In connection with the Division of Fish and Wildlife I do not think there is anyone who is not conscious of its importance, and also of what it means to many of our people; not only in regard to the tourist industry, but because of the recreation facilities it provides for this great industrial province in which we are now living.

It is only in recent years that hunting and fishing pressure has become so great that we have to realize the need for measures of protection as well as regeneration to ensure good sport to as many people as possible.

One thing this report will bring to your attention, Mr. Acting Speaker, and to the attention of the hon. members of this House, will be the importance, first of all, of the assessment of all the resources in connection with fish and wild life in this province. For instance, I think those who are familiar with our trap-line management programme throughout the north will realize the great work this division has done in that connection so far.

This has got to go much further, but it is significant to note that in the past years Ontario produced as a result of this programme more fur than any other province in the Dominion of Canada. We have added numerous biologists to our staff as readily as they are available so that we can properly assess the results of the fish planting and hatcheries transplantation that is being done in this province. This is being done in a manner in which we are getting the best for our dollars.

To illustrate the fishing pressures that have developed upon this great resource which I have just mentioned—and I see the former hon. Minister of Fishing and Game has left his seat; sometimes he contradicts me on some of these issues and I am glad he has left so that I will be free to say what I like here—the non-resident angling licences issued in this province in 1940 amounted to 66,226.

In 1953, that is 13 years later, this number had risen to 300,500. The resident hunting licences during a similar period rose from 97,218 to, in 1953, a demand of 274,000. Resident deer licences jumped from 27,000 to 98,000 over the same period.

It is important to ensure to the tourist industry of this province and to our great and growing population adequate supplies of fish and game to make Ontario a happier place in which to live; and not only that, but to maintain the livelihood of many of the people with whom I have been associated all my life. The goal of fisheries and wild-life management should be that of sustained yield, as is the case with forestry.

I have made reference particularly to timber management and to fish and wild life because, as I said when I began, I did not intend to deal with everything in all the various phases of this report, except to mention specifically and in some certain detail these two divisions which are of such great importance.

Up to this time, of course, reforestation has been largely confined to Southern Ontario. Today we have under contract with the counties of this province 80,000 odd acres, by agreement in which we participate 50-50. But the management of these forests is carried out entirely by the Department of Lands and Forests. Then there are township agreements and various other agreements with different municipalities which add greatly to this. From that great experience has come the pattern for the future of reforestation in Southern Ontario.

To show one how easy it is to be mistaken and the nature of the foresight which one must use in carrying out a programme in connection with the

department—because as I say you are looking ahead always 50 years and in some cases a century—there is the reforestation programme for instance, at St. Williams. I am happy on this occasion to be able to mention this, and I do not know whether he is in the gallery or not, but retired as of last year is a great and grand old gentleman whose contributions in that field are without question of great importance to us all and a great credit to him. I refer to Mr. Ed. Zavitz, whom many of you have known, and who recommended to the government of that day the reforestation of the St. Williams area, which now covers 4,000 acres.

I had a chat with him just before I came here today. He is now a gentleman of 76 or 77 years of age, whose vigour and enthusiasm are neither more nor less now than they were, I suppose, when he was in his twenties. In our conversation he referred to something that happened in 1908 when he visited Australia in connection with the reforestation programme of the British Commonwealth of Nations. He is one of those to whom they refer when they say "Old soldiers never die." This gentleman is thoroughly familiar with everything that has happened in this field and I want to assure hon. members of the House that he will continue to contribute to the advice of the reforestation division of this province. In referring to some of the county forests, he mentioned to me today that they are rapidly arriving at a position where they can carry themselves financially with the thinnings. I believe they ship from the Midhurst Forestry and Nursery, and maybe one other, at least 1,500 cords of pulpwood, of which they made a shipment to the KVP Company at Espanola. This is a typical example.

To illustrate how this gentleman has worked out a pattern, he said to me: "You do not need to spend billions to do this, Mr. Gemmell, but you need to use the experience and the wisdom of those who have gone down through the years in working out the programmes which are now showing us what we should do in the future."

The companies of this province cutting on the great concession areas are very, very much alive to the importance of regeneration. I had occasion in the past year to visit many of their operations and I want to assure hon. members that they are spending as much I believe as their budgets can stand economically to carry out these programmes and to find what is the best method of doing this. I visited an operation where they are using 27 per cent. of the poplar, a weak species, in the process of their making pulp and craft paper. This same operation 5 years ago used old methods for harvesting the tree crop, which included the horse and sleigh method. Today on that same operation work goes on 12 months of the year, thanks to mechanical methods. In this process the soil is scarified and thus regeneration is helped. In the process of being loaded pulpwood is dragged through the bush a distance of at least 700 or 800 feet in some cases, but in all that process the land over which the complete cut has been made is scarified, the mineral soil underneath is worked out and regeneration takes place. I was able to stand one day in one of those operations and see the difference between where the land was not disturbed after cutting and where the land was disturbed with the cutting, and to see the regeneration of jack pine and spruce without reforestation and alongside of it another great area cut 5 years before where the soil had not been disturbed and which was growing up entirely in poplar.

That is only one example, but these companies who are greatly interested in the reproduction of the crops which they cut are doing a grand job to assure that we find out the best silvicultural methods to ensure perpetual yield.

I think many hon. members will remember the trip the Legislature made to Northern Ontario. I am referring specifically to a visit to Kapuskasing where the great Spruce Falls Paper Mill is operating, they took us on that trip to a nursery outside the town of Kapuskasing providing a volume of trees to replant some cut-over section on their limits. I refer specifically to the spruce ridges which were not returning to

growth. This is but another example of what industry is doing to help improve our forests and the stands they are operating.

Our research division, our reforestation division and forest protection division along with the companies in this province to the best of my knowledge are using everything they can possibly devise to assure the application of the best silvicultural methods for the Province of Ontario.

Some people may say: "Why do you not go to Sweden and get the methods they use there? And why don't you go down to New Brunswick and see them spraying the budworms and so forth?" However, Mr. Speaker, every division of this country is different, every division of the world in silvicultural methods is different and the methods that apply in Sweden and the Scandinavian countries—and their methods are of the best—do not in most cases apply to this great Province of Ontario, nor do the methods of the west coast or the east coast apply. First of all on the west coast and on the east coast you have climatic conditions, including a heavy precipitation which provide for a more rapid growth of trees. Then you have different species of trees to deal with as well. Now while some of their methods may help, most of them are not applicable to the Province of Ontario. Neither are the methods that we use in Southern Ontario for reforestation applicable to growth in most sections to the north, where temperature and rainfall are not the same. Nevertheless, I want to assure hon. members we have been sending men to the different projects both on the east coast and on the west coast and have had men examine programmes in the eastern United States which were being carried out last year in connection with insect and disease control. Our men are completely alive to the best means and methods which will adequately meet some of the situations which I have outlined to you, sir.

I have dealt probably at some length with the subject and I do not want to tire the hon. members of the Legislature with this programme, but I have tried

in as brief a manner as I could to outline the importance of the work and also to give them some assurance that this government and this Department of Lands and Forests are completely alive to the needs of this province.

I want to assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that I am not being entirely critical about the period when he was a member of the government of this province. I am thinking of the hungry thirties.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Very charitable of my hon. friend (Mr. Gemmell).

MR. GEMMELL: I am going to make some reference to that period for this reason. The forestry programme of this province was retarded, first of all, in my opinion, by the depression of the thirties. During that period economic conditions made it impossible financially and otherwise to carry out programmes which would have probably today ensured us a greater stand of timber than we now have. Then after the hungry thirties, we came into a war period when the processes and the demands of the industry for war purposes were tremendous and as a result of that, certain programmes which we today would call necessary had to go overboard to meet the needs of a nation at war.

Therefore beginning with 1946 this government inaugurated a programme the beneficial effect of which will be felt in the days ahead—and we have not missed much in the years that have gone by since 1946. We intend to ensure for our people an adequate supply of wood for the great mills which toughen our economic sinews and fill the lunch pails in the towns of our North Country.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the discussions which take place in connection with this White Paper which I have the privilege to present today, that every member of that committee will give it his utmost attention and I am sure that we shall bring to it men of great experience to answer your questions and to discuss the various problems with you.

There will be no hampering of discussion in connection with the programme which this government intends to recommend to this Legislature in the days ahead and I want to assure every hon. member, whether on the government side of the House or otherwise, that that is my objective and the objective of the leader and the hon. members of the treasury benches.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I should like to make some comment from this side of the House about the remarks just concluded by the hon. Minister for Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell). I want to assure the hon. Minister that there was no unkind thought in my mind last week when I made some comment about his health, because as he knows I have commented to him about it personally from time to time over the last year. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gemmell) is well known to us in the Opposition and well respected, and I am certainly heartened that he has been able to stand and display, by his speech today, that he is able to continue with the rigours and demands of his job, because he certainly did make an extended outline of the White Paper he has presented to the House.

One thing that has been concerning us, and I am not going to burden the House with much discussion this afternoon until we have seen the White Paper, one thing which has been concerning the Opposition and concerning many people in the North Country is the fact that the lines of unemployed are gradually increasing. I was a bit disappointed the other day when the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), my colleague from the North, in seconding the address to the fine Speech from the Throne, seemed to indicate that it was this government's policy which had brought about the reduction in pulpwood and raw wood exports from this country. I think, Mr. Speaker, that an examination of the record will reveal that the exports of raw wood from the North Country, particularly into the United States and other places, was not greatly decreased, or at least not up until

last year, and the very sharp decrease which has taken place this year and during this current period is due entirely to economic conditions; in fact it is due almost entirely, from what I can learn, to the price of our product.

I read in the press not long ago where the town of Hearst had made some representations to the government about conditions resulting from the falling off of wood export. From those press reports, I learned that at Hearst as well as certainly in our part of the province, they have unused export quotas, therefore I would suggest that what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that to a very limited extent through government policy and to a far greater degree through economic conditions, the export of raw wood has fallen off from this province.

The tragedy of the situation is that there is nothing which is taking its place. I hope when we read this White Paper and get down to the business of discussing it in committee that we will discover that the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) and his advisory committee and staff have produced some alternative to the limiting of export raw wood.

We have a situation in the North, even with the timber management which has started and is being carried on to a certain degree of success even at the present time, we are finding now, as timber men will tell you, that we are getting an in-balance in quotas of certain species. We are finding that particularly in the jackpine species and in hard wood. Something is going to have to be done and something will have to be done quickly if we are not to lose markets and lose a good deal of the use of those woods.

I made a note of the remarks the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) made about his staff, and particularly about his Deputy Minister and some other officials in his department and the services they have rendered to this province over the years. With those remarks I heartily concur, because there are men in that department, particularly the Deputy Minister, who have given many years of faithful service to this province. I am

proud to say that many among them, regardless of which government appointed them—and our Party naturally did appoint several—we have among that staff some of the finest forest administrators that can be found anywhere in the world, I would not limit that to Canada.

This programme the hon. Minister speaks of this afternoon, which he says began in 1946 for the purpose of assessing renewable natural resources and for the purpose of guaranteeing an adequate supply in the future to all our mills, is just a bit lacking insofar as his remarks extend today, because he does not say—and again I expect this White Paper will deal with these subjects—what we are going to do with our surpluses of wood; what we are going to do about the utilization of certain species and what we will do about the jackpine and hard woods.

I was glad to hear him admit, which one of the hon. government members did not seem prone to admit the other day, that the Hepburn administration did take some steps of a constructive nature in forest management and, secondly, the seven years and one or two years afterward when materials and men were difficult to obtain, that during those years there was little which could be done aside from those things which were absolutely necessary.

I was a bit disconcerted to hear the hon. Minister's remark about the lumber industry, with particular reference to the saw-milling industry. I was not enabled to draw a final conclusion as to what he did mean, because perhaps inadvertently he contradicted himself once or twice when first he said the saw-milling industry would be extinct in 15 or 20 years unless something was done. Another time he said the saw-milling industry would continue provided we devote our attention more to spruce and alternative soft woods rather than devoting our attention to the hard woods and to red and white pine. I will check that more closely in *Hansard* and get the actual meaning from it. Nevertheless, I think this House will realize, Mr. Speaker, that the saw-mill men generally

in Ontario, and I think in other of the internal provinces of Canada, are expressing deep concern about the saw-mill industry generally. Again I suggest that it is not entirely a matter of forest management or of policy, it is a matter of economics.

But one thing, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the timber dues insofar as the lumber industry is concerned in Ontario are now too high and do not enable saw-millers in the Province of Ontario to meet the very severe competition which has developed in recent months. As an example, in certain points in the northern part of Ontario it is now possible to buy No. 1 grade B.C. lumber landed for example at Sioux Lookout and F.O.B. Sioux Lookout, at a price which is just about that which our own saw-mill operators must have in order to show even the slightest profit. There is something wrong either with the costs or with their operators, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Gennell) gave us the assurance this afternoon that by and large our lumber operators are a pretty efficient group of people. So I think there is some other answer to it, something which should cause us concern when we can find competition of that kind where the finished product has to be shipped over several hundreds of miles and can still be sold at a wholesale price equal to ours.

Another thing I was interested to hear the hon. Minister say was that research activities in the Department of Lands and Forests would be accelerated. Again I am looking for more specific information on that subject in this White Paper. One thing he did not mention and one thing which is, perhaps, not within the jurisdiction of the committee and I quite agree, is one important feature of costs in our timber operations generally in the north. That is transportation. There is one aspect of it which Ontario can and should deal with, and that is in the development of access roads and assistance to timber operators in the building and maintaining of these roads. The other is the subject of freight rates and I think that this House should in some way at some time during this session indicate to the

powers that be in the transportation boards in Ottawa that some consideration should be given to the timber industry generally, particularly in the North Country, and some preferential freight rates set up along the lines of those enjoyed by other types of industry across Canada.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) mention the paper mill at Sioux Lookout. I wish there was one there. But it is disconcerting to me to read in the papers very frequently—and it has been frequent in recent months—of new mills being erected in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and in the Southern States and at one point on the eastern seaboard, and yet we find our own department concerned with the supply in perpetuity of pulpwood to maintain our present paper mills' present and expanding production. I submit, Mr. Speaker, we are losing in the North Country now more wood by waste through overmaturity and attacks of spruce budworm and other insect infestation than we might gain by timber management in the next few years. I submit to this House again, as I have said before, that it should be the consideration of this government to erect in the north, in the midst of the wealth of virgin pulpwood, timber mills of their own. In other words, by Crown company enterprise if private capital cannot or will not undertake it. It would serve two purposes. I repeat, as I said last year, it would serve two useful purposes; the first would be to set up a model area of silviculture; to set up a model area of forest management and development within which the kind of mill operation and wood operation which the department theoretically might think is the ideal type. The second useful factor in the matter would be one of simply using wood at its source, using it according to its immediate access; and I cannot yet, despite all I read about it and despite the many talks I have had with officials both of the department and of pulp and paper companies in many parts of the province, I still cannot reconcile the fact that people can operate successfully

other inland mills in Canada and yet we cannot seem to do the same thing in Ontario. In fact, we are told from every side when the matter is raised that it is uneconomic to build these mills inland, and yet other people have done so in other provinces.

I was interested also to hear the hon. Minister's remarks about our natural life and resources in the north, the game and fish. I think the figures he quoted in angling alone, as I wrote them down as he was speaking, he mentioned that in 1940 we had in this province some 66,000 non-resident anglers and in 1953 we had in excess of 300,000, certainly does point up a very desirable area. It must be a desirable area to other people who visit with us and return again, because among that large increase there must be a large number of repeaters.

I would point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot lose sight of the fact that even to our fish resources there is a limit. I am not very old, but I can remember in my part of Ontario, just a few short years ago, when I was going to school, I could go out to several lakes and streams and catch a fish in a matter minutes. At the present time, it sometimes takes a matter of days to catch a fish. There is a limit to these resources, and while we may be proud of the ever-increasing numbers of visitors who are coming to this province to hunt and to fish, we must never lose sight of the fact it is a rightful heritage of ours which we should pass on to the coming generation, and we should never take the risk of not passing that great and priceless heritage to these younger people coming along.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude this afternoon, and I would again compliment the hon. Minister on his presentation of this White Paper. I confidently expect it will be fully discussed in committee, and I can assure you as far as the Opposition members are concerned, we are looking forward with great eagerness to that opportunity.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, apparently there are no other speakers and perhaps I may

be pardoned for suggesting to the House and to the committee that one of the things which will contribute to its success is that it organize and get down to business at an early date.

I would very much like, as I know the hon. Minister and the hon. members of the House would, to meet men like Major-General Howard Kennedy, Dean Sisam, the Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests, and any members on the Advisory Committee. There are some on the Advisory Committee who are experienced in the lumber business. Of course the Advisory Committee is designed to be representative of labour and industry, but there is a great opportunity to have people who are interested in this matter come before the committee.

As was reiterated several times by the two hon. members who spoke, this requires a long-term policy, involving problems in which there are complexities and difficulties, and it is well to have these things before you when you come to this point, which is rather a turning point, because the forest inventory is completed, or practically so. You come to a point where a long-term policy should be considered by the people, and by the hon. members of this House, and there should be the greatest opportunity given to the people to consider it.

The hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) raised the matter of the export of pulp and the problems of surpluses which arise in some species. I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of export is not just as simple as cutting exports off nor of permitting exports to be carried on without limitation. It is a matter involving more than the balances of species and the surpluses into which you run from time to time. It is a matter which the committee could well consider and could well discuss with the people who will appear before it. It will be found that there is by no means unanimity of opinion in that regard, and there are very, very cogent and weighty reasons advanced by persons who take opposite views in connection with that matter.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems, as has been said here many times, is the fact that much that we are doing in connection with forestry has arisen from practices of other days that really have little relationship to the problems of today. Remember in the first settlement of this province the forest was regarded as a weed and as something which should be ruthlessly destroyed. Many of the great stands of forests in this country were destroyed in those days, because they were in the way of the development and settlement of land.

Some of this attitude still exists today, but I might point out that there are now many great industries in this province. We have communities—not only communities, but very vital parts of our economy, which are dependent upon and are affected by these great industries, and our job here is to lay out plans for the future, and to see that they are well laid, and that they carry the conviction of the people who have the opportunity of knowing the reasons for the adoption of certain policies.

I think that is the position. I am hopeful that out of this there will come to this committee matters of very great interest and importance, and there might come before the committee even a diversity of views and opinions of people, so we will achieve the right results. After all, that is the way by which many great decisions are made, by sharing our views, sifting them down, ascertaining public opinion, the opinion of people who have the opportunity of listening to and weighing these various points of view.

I am hopeful that the committee will be able to meet at a very early date and that great care will be taken in organizing the appearances before the committee of those who will give evidence in the form of an expression of their opinions.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

THE BILLS OF SALE AND CHattel MORTGAGES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill

No. 35, "An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act."

HON. MR. FROST: In connection with these several bills, they concern matters which will go to the Legal Bills Committee, nevertheless there may be points on which some hon. members would like information, and it would be a pleasure to give that information here in the House.

HON. MR. PORTER: This bill I propose should be sent to the Legal Bills Committee, as well as all the other bills of which I intend to move second reading this afternoon, and as the hon. Prime Minister has suggested, if there are any questions I will endeavour to answer them; I do not know with how much pleasure—it all depends upon the question. If there are no questions I shall proceed.

MR. SALSBERG: Why the amendment? I think there should be some explanation.

HON. MR. PORTER: I gave the explanation on first reading, but if the hon. member wants me to explain it all over again, I can do so. I am always glad to do it on second reading, I will be in better form.

Under The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, it is provided that at present when a chattel mortgage is renewed, there must be a statement set out in the renewal, of the payments made of the amount of the mortgage. In other words, those payments must all be itemized, both interest and principal payments, and the amendment provides that the renewal statement will only show the amounts still due for principal and interest or the extent, or amount of the liability still secured by the mortgage, as the case may be, at the time of renewal.

It overcomes the necessity of making an itemized statement on the renewal. It is a matter of convenience, and as the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) well knows, is in the interests of the working man.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is in line with some other bills which have been introduced and some of which are up for second reading, and authorizes judges of Juvenile and Family Courts to try cases of child desertion. It is our policy to endeavour to place in the Juvenile and Family Courts all classes of cases, to as large an extent as possible, which deal with family relationships, as well as juveniles.

It also provides that judges of Juvenile Courts may try cases of wife desertion.

MR. SALSBERG: Am I right in concluding its purpose is not to help the working man, but the wives and children of working men?

HON. MR. PORTER: The "wife desertion" is where the wife deserts, and the working man is the one who is interested in these things more so than the wife.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act."

He said: In view of the fact my explanations were made several days ago, I think it perhaps would be better to explain again that this is an amendment to The Division Courts Act which simply provides that the responsibility for the payment for books, stationery and the jurors in the four Division Courts, having jurisdiction in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, shall be within the Metropolitan municipality and taken away from the individual municipalities.

The other amendment simply corrects typographical errors.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend The Evidence Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill was recommended by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada, and it brings the terminology of the Evidence Act in line with the Canada Evidence Act. It deals with affidavits which might be taken outside of Ontario for use in Ontario, and outlines the various persons before whom those affidavits can be taken.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): May I ask the hon. Attorney-General what would happen in a case where an officer in the armed forces makes an affidavit and signs his title to it which gives the force of fact to the document. Suppose there should be an impersonation? What guarantee do we have of the authenticity of the person taking the affidavit? Suppose the person says he is a major in the army, and that happens to be false, what security do we have as to the authenticity of the rank of the person taking the sworn declaration?

HON. MR. PORTER: Of course rank and unit of the officer who swears the affidavit must be stated below his signature and that can always be checked. What security have we in any affidavit sworn before a Commissioner? Nobody checks it in every case.

MR. CHARTRAND: If a sworn declaration were to be made, and the signature could not be authenticated by the person taking the affidavit—?

HON. MR. PORTER: An affidavit sworn in Ontario before an officer of the army, has always been perfectly good, but if that officer is outside of Ontario, it is just as easy to check on it, if anyone wishes to do so, as if he were inside Ontario. He is still under control of the government of the country.

MR. CHARTRAND: What I mean is this: I think the principle is good, and I think it is in the interest of the armed forces if an officer in charge should be able to take an affidavit. But the point I wish to raise is that in case there should be an impersonation somebody should sign his name and say "I am so-and-so." Suppose there is an impersonation? Do you not think a certificate should be required to be attached to the affidavit stating the rank and authenticity of the officer in charge taking the affidavit?

HON. MR. PORTER: I would suggest the hon. member bring that up in the Legal Bills Committee. We can discuss it there at great length.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 43, intituled "An Act to amend the Judicature Act."

He said: This amendment to the Judicature Act provides for the sittings of the Court of Appeal in three divisions instead of two as at present. It is permissive. They may sit in three divisions concurrently, and the amendment gives that power. There is also a section which makes uniform the provision dealing with the absence of, or vacancy in, the office of local registrars, County Court Clerks and Surrogate Registrars.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MINORS' PROTECTION ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 47, intituled "An Act to amend the Minors' Protection Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill gives jurisdiction in cases under this Act to Juvenile and Family Courts. Where there is no such court, cases will be tried in a Magistrate's Court.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill no. 48, intituled "An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act."

This bill provides for the payment of an allowance to all those who have been appointed Surrogate Court Judges, but who are not, however, County Court Judges. Under the present Act, County Judges who are appointed also as Surrogate Judges by the province may be paid an allowance, but no provision was made in the case of an appointment of a person who was not actually a County Court Judge. Apparently it had never arisen before. Only recently when an appointment was made of His Honour Judge Barton, who retired as a County Judge in the County of York and it was considered desirable to appoint him to carry on in the capacity of a Surrogate Judge, has a case arisen. This amendment will deal with that situation and any similar cases which may arise.

MR. CHARTRAND: I presume nobody will be appointed a Surrogate Court Judge unless he has the qualification of a County Court Judge?

MR. PORTER: Not necessarily. There is no limitation on the appointment. Any barrister could be appointed a Surrogate Judge. The appointment is entirely within the control of the province.

MR. CHARTRAND: Is it the intention of the government to open the door to the appointment of anybody who may not be a County Court Judge to be a Surrogate Court Judge?

MR. PORTER: There is no such thing in contemplation, but we have always been willing to do it if occasion arose. Judge Barton is not a County Court Judge, because he has reached the age of retirement.

MR. CHARTRAND: I know about that.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am not closing any door. I say we have no such

programme in contemplation, if that is what the hon. member would like to know. It is generally desirable, and has been the practice to appoint County Court Judges to that capacity so that they can carry on the Surrogate work in conjunction with their own County Court work, and generally the Surrogate Court work is not sufficient in volume to occupy a person fully and it would perhaps be embarrassing to have part-time judges in different parts of the province, so that practice has been invariably followed.

MR. CHARTRAND: What I had in mind was this—you would not, for instance, appoint a Juvenile Court Judge to be a Surrogate Judge at some time?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know why we should not, if we thought it would be a good thing, and that the appointment was a good one. I do not think we should be limited to someone whom the Federal Government might appoint.

MR. CHARTRAND: This is quite a departure from established custom.

HON. MR. PORTER: We are always prepared to depart, if it is in the right direction.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill Number 49, intituled "An Act to amend the Warehouse Receipts Act."

He said: The Warehouse Receipts Act is a statute that was passed some time ago which deals with the title to goods that are held in storage warehouses.

It provides for the negotiability of warehouse receipts, something like the negotiability of bills of exchange and promissory notes, so that the title to the goods in storage warehouses may pass from hand to hand simply by the delivery of the warehouse receipts.

But there was a section in that Act which says "This Act shall not apply to the storage of furs, garments and home furnishings, other than furniture, which are ordinarily used by the persons placing them in storage or a member of his family or household."

The present Act goes on to say that the Act will not apply to that class of goods until a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor by proclamation. That section of the Act has never been proclaimed and I think it is quite clear that goods of that kind, stored not for purpose of storage merely, but furs or garments to be cleaned or washed or home furnishings to be repaired or something of that kind—the storage is incidental—and that the person who stores them is the person who wants to get them back it is not within the contemplation of the Act. On the whole that type of storage should be governed by the provision as to warehouse receipts. It is therefore proposed in this amendment that this type of goods should be excepted from the Act, and that the words enabling a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor by proclamation should be deleted.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

THE WILLS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 50, intituled "An Act to amend the Wills Act."

He said: This is a bill that is recommended by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in

Canada, and it deals with the question of the validity of wills that are executed outside of the province. The conflict of law which applies to circumstances of this kind is somewhat complex and some of the rules require clarification. This statute is the result of prolonged consideration by the committee in question as well as by a number of amending authorities on wills and it is felt the drafting of this section goes as far and clearly as can be to rectify some of the difficulties, doubts and uncertainties which have existed up to the present time.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: I think those problems will give the Legal Bills Committee something to consider, and I would now move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we will debate the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I very greatly regret that I shall not be here tomorrow at 3 o'clock to hear the remarks by the hon. member from Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett). I cannot say whether it was the influence of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas)—I might blame him, anyway—but I promised to go down to a hospital opening at Ajax in his riding tomorrow afternoon and I shall not be back, I suppose, before the hon. member has finished his address. I am sorry I may not be present.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.29 o'clock p.m.





ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 23, 1954.

Reading and receiving petitions	169
Department of Education Act, 1954, motion to refer bill back to Standing Committee on Education, Mr. Dunlop, agreed to	170
Town of Hespeler, bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Myers, first reading	170
Bees Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	170
Agricultural Societies Act, introduced by Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	170
Plant Diseases Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	170
Livestock and Livestock Products Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	170
London Foundation, bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Robarts, first reading	171
Town of Paris, bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Nixon, first reading	171
City of Peterborough, No. 2, bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Beckett, first reading	171
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Dunlop, first reading	171
Public Service Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, first reading	171
Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, first reading	171
Corporations Information Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, first reading	171
City of St. Thomas, bill respecting, Mr. Robarts, first reading	172
City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Weaver, first reading	172
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, first reading	172
Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. Kelly, first reading	174
Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Brandon	174
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	194
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	194

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: The following petition has been received:

Of the Corporation of The Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the Association to Sudbury's Young Men's Christian Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports.

MR. J. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): I beg leave to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Dempsey, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presents the Committee's Second Report as follows:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient:

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Hespeler praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the said town from the County of Waterloo.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of Toronto praying that an

Act may pass empowering the corporation to declare certain areas of the township to be 30 miles per hour speed limit areas.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Paris praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the said town from the County of Brant.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of St. Catharines praying that an Act may pass vesting the St. Catharines Public Market in the corporation in fee simple, free from any restriction; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of St. Thomas praying that an Act may pass validating the annexation of certain lands by the city; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass enabling the trustees of the R. A. Morrow Memorial Park to convey to the corporation part of the park for the site of a Memorial Community Centre.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Toronto praying that an Act may pass confirming a by-law respecting service and disability pensions for civic employees; and for other purposes.

Petition of Walter Juxon Blackburn, Verschoyle Philip Cronyn, Roy Watt Robertson, et al. praying that an Act may pass incorporating The London Foundation.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. WILLIAM NICKLE (Kingston): I beg leave to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Nickle from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills presents the Committee's First Report as follows:

Your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its First Report:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the Toronto East General and Orthopedic Hospital.

Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Town of Fergus.

Bill No. 6, An Act respecting the Town of Mimico.

Bill No. 15, An Act respecting Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the Toronto East General and Orthopedic Hospital and on Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Town of Fergus.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT, 1954

HON. WILLIAM J. DUNLOP moves that the Order of the day for the House to resolve itself into committee to consider Bill No. 33, "The Department of Education Act, 1954," be discharged and that the bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Education.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

THE TOWN OF HESPELER

MR. R. M. MYERS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Hespeler."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE BEES ACT, 1954

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW, in the absence of hon. Mr. Thomas, moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Bees Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: In connection with these bills which I am about to introduce, which will be administered by the Department of Agriculture, they will all be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, at which time we propose to call in the various heads of the branches concerned, and the committee will have an opportunity to go into the "whys and wherefores" in connection with these bills.

THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW, in the absence of the hon. Mr. Thomas, moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT, 1954

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW, in the absence of the hon. Mr. Thomas, moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Plant Diseases Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW, in the absence of the hon. Mr. Thomas, moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Livestock and Livestock Products Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE LONDON FOUNDATION

MR. JOHN P. ROBARTS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting The London Foundation."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF PARIS

MR. NIXON moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Paris."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF PETERBOROUGH, No. 2

MR. H. E. BECKETT moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough, No. 2."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT, 1954

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. OLIVER: Is this bill to go to the Education Committee?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Yes, it is the second instalment of the consolidation which I spoke of some time ago, and it goes on second reading to the Committee on Education.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. OLIVER: Will the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) outline the changes in this bill.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, at the present time in the Civil Service, we have those who are contributing 4 per cent., some contributing 5 per cent. and some contributing 6 per cent. This amendment has been discussed with the Civil Service through the Joint Advisory Committee, and they are in favour of bringing all the civil servants in on the same basis of 6 per cent., and that is the basis of this bill.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Corporations Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Will the hon. Provincial Secretary tell us if this Act incorporates the recommendations of the Committee on Corporations?

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to incorporate the report of the Corporations Act Committee which was given to the House yesterday by the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts).

There were one or two changes in principle involved which he covered very thoroughly at the time, and the rest of the sections are merely for the purpose of clarification, and in some cases to correct clerical errors.

THE CORPORATIONS INFORMATION ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Corporations Information Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is complementary to the previous one, in that it sets back the date of the Act coming into force from April 30th to

July 1st, in order that the 1954 returns from the various companies whose fiscal years do not always agree, can all be completed under the present Act.

THE CITY OF ST. THOMAS

MR. ROBARTS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

MR. A. C. JOLLEY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF TORONTO

MR. E. L. WEAVER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of Toronto."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. C. G. MACODRUM (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with Orders of the day, I would ask leave of this hon. House to speak on a matter of public interest, and certainly a matter which reflects on the good name and reputation of constituents in the County of Leeds, and more particularly referring to certain people in the Town of Brockville.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a clipping from the *Globe and Mail* which appeared in one of last week's issues. The heading of the clipping in bold black type reads, "Claim Fees Chief

Aim of Business Colleges." I am now referring to comments alleged to have been made at a meeting of the Committee on Education by the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), which comment in part read as follows:

All these Business Colleges worry about is whether the youngsters have the ability to pay," Mr. Wren said. "When they do graduate, they cannot meet the standards their qualifications say they can.

Mr. Speaker, in the Town of Brockville we have a college known as the Brockville Business College, founded in 1883, which has for the past 71 years carried on in the Town of Brockville, and for the past 48 years this business college has been owned and operated under a partnership by the Rogers family of Brockville.

Lest any hon. member of this House should feel I am speaking in support of some political friends, I wish to point out that Walter Rogers, one of the members of this partnership, ran as a Liberal candidate for Leeds in the Provincial Elections of 1914 and 1929.

In addition to operating the business college in Brockville, the Rogers family also operate the Kingston Business College, and in these remarks I am supported by the hon. member for the City of Kingston (Mr. Nickle). Mr. Speaker, the blanket accusations to which I have referred are, in my opinion, unwarranted, unjustified and uncalled for, and reflect on the excellent business colleges which I have named, and there may be others.

It is usually unwise, I have found by experience, to make general accusations, and I therefore respectfully suggest—and that not unkindly—that in future the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) to whom I have referred, should be more specific when suggesting or insinuating that any institution is guilty of what might properly be called, "an unethical practice."

The Brockville Business College has very distinguished graduates, one of whom is the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett).

Mr. Speaker, in closing, may I outline the policy of the Brockville Business College and the Kingston Business College with respect to the matter of fees. The sum of \$25 is usually collected each month and if a student drops out before the end of the month a portion of his or her fee is refunded and in like manner, if a student pays \$250 for a 10-months' course and if he were to drop out before completing it, the balance is also refunded.

Both colleges are registered under the Trade School Act where adequate supervision of the type of course presented is maintained. The standard for graduation is governed by the monthly examinations of the Business Educators' Association of Canada. In addition the competitive examinations for clerks, stenographers and typists of the Civil Service Commission are held regularly and when the results are published it is usually found that the candidates from these colleges take a high standing.

So I do very much regret that the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) should have spoken so loosely, because I have been told by many people that the best money they ever invested was in a business college course.

MR. ALBERT WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that subjects in this House were usually reserved for their own debate. I think this House will learn on proper examination—and I think this can be verified by many who are in the House here today—that I did not first raise this question as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. MacOdrum) suggests. The question was first raised by the hon. member for Hastings East (Mr. Robson) and I supported, I admit—and I do not retract a bit on that point—that hon. member's view that some of the activities of some of our business schools, trade schools and correspondence courses might be the subject for review by the Education Committee as constituted during this session, and the hon. Minister assured this committee that he would have one of his officers attend a subsequent meeting and outline the procedures used by his department

in supervision of these courses, and at some future date during the session opportunity would be given to business college directors to appear before the committee and explain the operation of their schools.

At no time did I make mention of any schools in Brockville or in the Province of Ontario. The *Globe and Mail*, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, inaccurately reported the statement made in this meeting and if hon. members would consult some of the other papers, a more accurate report might be found. I have nothing but good to say about most of the business colleges, trade schools and correspondence courses in Ontario but there are some that need supervision by this government and I am not going to hesitate at any time to say so. As the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh) mentioned in committee the other day, he himself purchased a correspondence course in violin lessons, secured his diploma and still could not play the violin and had to dispose of it.

There are a number of people in this province who have been "rooked" by some of the sales methods being used by these places and I still submit that it is our duty in this House as legislators to see to it that any person or any school hanging out their shingles as educators should come under the supervision of our Department of Education. If there are any loopholes through which they might be escaping proper supervision, these should be attended to.

I know of a good many highly reputable business schools. I also know of some that need closer attention by the Department of Education. I do not depart from that.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I might take this a little personally, having been the principal and owner of the Wills Business College on Sparks Street in Ottawa for 27 years, opening a school in Pembroke in 1903, which continued for 7 years, then, after I sold that school, opening a school in Renfrew.

I think I brought an opportunity to the people of that district to get a business education that was not offered by

the high schools of those days. And speaking about discipline, I only regret that the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) was not a pupil of my school. I would have taught him real discipline. If he is fortunate enough to meet some of my ex-pupils he will find out. The hon. member speaks about being overcharged. I suppose an advertisement did appear in the Ottawa papers, but all you require to attend the Wills Business College was honesty and integrity. You did not require money. I carried my pupils until they got positions—carried them through until they were able to pay me back. And I want to say there was not one pupil who I carried through, who did not pay me 100 per cent. of what he owed. I think I was doing something worthwhile for the people of Ottawa and of Pembroke and Renfrew and North Bay.

If you want to go to Renfrew with me tomorrow, or Pembroke, North Bay or Ottawa I will introduce you to the leading citizens there and ask them what they think of the schools I was conducting and I can speak in the highest terms of the other schools in Ottawa and the way they are carrying on.

Business colleges are a necessity because the other schools start with a certain course and if a pupil is not getting along well at high school, he can change and take a business course, or if any pupils wish to brush up on their shorthand or typewriting they can come at night to the business college. So far as I am concerned I am proud that I spent the greater part of my life helping the boys and girls of this province prepare themselves so that they might follow a successful business career.

MR. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure now in speaking about some other schools. I have three schools in my own riding of High Park—there are about 175 of the students in the gallery today—from Humberside Collegiate, Western Technical-Commercial School and Hughes Public School. I am sure we extend a hearty welcome to them. The hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) has also asked me to extend the same

hearty welcome to the students of Brown School in his riding of St. Patrick.

THE MINING ACT

HON. MR. KELLY (Minister of Mines) moves second reading of Bill No. 53, intituled "A Bill to amend the Mining Act."

MR. OLIVER: Is this bill going to committee?

MR. KELLY: Yes, this bill will be referred to the Mining Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Before commencing my remarks this afternoon I wish again, as I have done on previous occasions, to offer you my congratulations, Mr. Speaker, on your presiding over the House in your usual fair and genial way. I am sure it is a pleasure to us who serve here in the House to be under your leadership.

I was pleased yesterday to see the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) in the House to deliver the White Paper, and he spoke yesterday in a very able manner. He has been ill for some considerable time and I am sure every hon. member of the House was pleased that he was able to deliver the lengthy address in the manner he did. It shows he has recovered and is now able to fulfil the duties of the position he holds.

Also each hon. member here, I am sure, regrets the continued absence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) and hope that in the very near future he may again return to the House and undertake his duties. We are very sorry indeed he is not here during this session.

There is one problem which has rather worried me at different times and that is the practice in the Cabinet of apparently overloading some of the Ministers with work. Whenever a

Minister is absent or away on special duty, his portfolio is loaded onto the shoulders of another Minister who already has a great deal of work in his own department. I think some means should be sought whereby whenever there is additional work to be carried on by Ministers, it should be given to Ministers without portfolios. We have in the Cabinet two Ministers without portfolios. I think the duties of Cabinet Ministers who are absent should be given to these Ministers.

Now I know that Ministers without portfolio do not receive a Minister's salary. What I would suggest is that whenever the duties of a Minister are given to a Minister without portfolio that he, from the time he assumes those duties until he hands back the duties to the regular Minister, should be paid a Minister's salary. I think in that way a great deal of the burden which rests unnecessarily on some of the Ministers could be lessened. Some of them are continuously carrying two or three portfolios, and that is not proper.

I wish to congratulate the mover of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Jolley) and also the seconder (Mr. Noden). Both of the hon. members did a very excellent job. Both are comparatively new to the House. The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) only took his seat at this session and the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), at the time of the last election. Both did an excellent job. I noticed, however, in the press, both of them were "panned" a little severely for reading their addresses. I think that was unnecessary in connection with the speech in reply to the Address from the Throne. It is a very important speech and I think the motion in reply, and the seconding, should be permitted to be given from a text. It is quite a severe strain, especially on a new member, to rise and deliver an address within a few days of reaching the House as the hon. member for Niagara Falls did, without referring to a text. But I agree with the comment in the press that in all other speeches given in the House we should follow

strictly the rule. No speech should be read in the House. I think the rules provide that speeches should be given without reference to a prepared text, though, of course, you can use notes, but the continued reading of speeches does not tend to bring out the real intent of what the speaker is trying to "get across" and I think we should stick strictly to the rules in future.

I recollect that some years ago, when we were the Official Opposition in the House, that rule was strictly enforced and much to the embarrassment of some of the hon. members of the Opposition at that time. I remember one hon. member—I think he was from Welland—who sought several times to continue reading his speech but Mr. Speaker checked him and eventually he had to give up, as without the text he could not carry on.

And I think it would be advisable if we in this House returned to the same practice and used brief notes only.

I wish now to refer to quite a few remarks made by both the mover and the seconder as to the salary of civil servants.

I have on many occasions advocated an increase in the salaries for provincial police officers and other civil servants, particularly guards in penal institutions and so forth. I am very pleased indeed that both the hon. members who led this debate made reference to the same thing this year. It shows we are becoming more aware in this House of the necessity for better salaries for our civil servants. We can only obtain good civil servants if we pay good salaries. I must say for the hon. Attorney-General that he has in the Ontario Provincial Police one of the finest police forces on the North American continent, but if you want to keep it so, you will have to pay them good salaries. I know salaries have been increased during the past three or four years, but they are not yet sufficient to hold in the service able and efficient officers.

The only way you can get good civil servants is to have men who are determined to give a lifetime to the service, and if we want officers who are going

to remain in the provincial police for a lifetime, we have to pay them good salaries.

Another thing is providing them with suitable quarters. A start has already been made, and a very fine one, too, in building residences and quarters for police officers in Northern Ontario, and this has assisted greatly in areas where police officers were unable to find adequate living quarters for their families. Police thus accommodated are much more satisfied with their home life, and are giving better service. I think the same thing could be extended to all Ontario. I would like to see provincial police barracks and residences provided in all the chief areas so as to demonstrate that the police force is a respected body in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I am now going to take a line somewhat different from that I have taken in previous years. Usually I have devoted my speech to my own riding, referring to different matters appertaining to the riding, and have left the Speech from the Throne practically out of my remarks. I am going to refer this year to the Speech from the Throne, because I think it is a unique speech. If we go back 10 or 12 years, and read the various Speeches from the Throne, we will see that the one at present is totally different. I can recall in 1945, 1946, 1947, and so on, that more than one-half of the Speech from the Throne was taken up in self-praise of the government. They were, in other words, sort of "whistling in the dark," and they referred to some accomplishments they had put through in the past, in other words, they used one-half of the space devoted to the speech in boasting of what they had done. In this speech, Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely one word of boasting, and I congratulate the government on what I would consider to be a first-class Speech from the Throne.

HON. MR. PORTER: We are very modest, you know.

MR. GRUMMETT: The Speech from the Throne also gives us a greater indication of what is going to be brought

forward by way of legislation. I can recall several Speeches from the Throne in which we had no information as to what legislation was to be brought down. In the present one, they have set out, in chronological order, the proposed legislation for the different departments, and at the end, there is reference to no less than 24 amendments. I think that is a good departure from previous Speeches from the Throne.

We now have an idea of what will be brought forward by the government, and we can get a preview of what legislation will be introduced into the House during the session.

Dealing with the projects, or other items mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, I want to refer, first of all, to the St. Lawrence Seaway. I think any mention which was made in the House, coincides with my own thoughts in the matter, and that is, if we cannot secure the co-operation of the United States, and if they are going to delay the commencing of the project in any way, shape or form, it is time we get on with the matter, even if we have to go alone. The construction of the power project can be done by Canada without the co-operation of the United States. Of course, if they want to come in with us, we are willing to accept their assistance and co-operation, and we will work with them on the project, but if they are going to hold up the commencement of the project, as they have done for the past 30 or 40 years, it is time we now ended the farce and got on with the project. I hope the Federal and Provincial Governments will undertake it, going ahead on their own, if there is no indication on the part of the United States to assist in the project.

Another item mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is in connection with the gas pipe line. I realize the main pipe line coming from the western provinces is a project under the control of the Federal Government, but the distribution and use of any gas taken from this main pipe line is a problem for the Provincial Government. There is an opportunity here, Mr. Speaker, I believe, for the province to undertake

another project similar to hydro. Why not build up a great public utility, such as the hydro, for the use of gas from the pipe line, which will cross our province in the very near future? I think the project has great possibilities for parts of Ontario, at least, and in saying that, I am thinking of my own part, Northern Ontario, where I believe the use of gas will encourage secondary industries.

As you know, the great difficulty in Northern Ontario is the fact that we have only one industry in each town or locality. For instance, in connection with the mining industry in Timmins or the Porcupine camps, if anything happens to the mining industry—as happened this past summer—then the whole camp is very hard hit.

In Iroquois Falls, we have the paper mill, and if anything would happen which would cause a shut-down of that mill, everybody residing in that area would feel the effects. But if they had secondary industries in those localities—and I think that could be greatly assisted by the use of gas—then we could build up something more stable industrially in Northern Ontario.

I would like to repeat the suggestion that the distribution of gas from the main pipe line should be done by the province, as a public utility. The gas will have to be taken from the main pipe line, to the different municipal centres and there stored, and from there, distributed. I think the same set-up as was used in the development of hydro-electric power could apply to the gas supply, in the use and distribution of gas in our municipalities, that is, the gas distribution should become a public utility, under a Public Utility Commission.

Another point mentioned in the Speech from the Throne concerns welfare. I am very pleased to see the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) in his seat, as I would like to pay him a compliment. I know for many years the hon. Minister has been disturbed by what has taken place in our province in the way of desertions and so forth. I have spoken on many occasions in the House

about wife and family desertions, and I am hoping the new bill, consolidating three or four Acts, when brought down by the hon. Minister, will help us solve these problems, both as regards the deserting husbands and deserting wives. Something will have to be done to stop the terrific amount it is costing the province and the municipalities through desertions, and I am hoping, under the new Act, the punitive sections will be tightened up so that a man may know he cannot walk away from his family, without due regard to its welfare, and leave it to the municipality and the province to bear the costs of relief.

As you know, at the present time, if a man deserts his family, and his whereabouts are unknown for one year, the care of the family falls on the municipality until the expiration of the one-year period. Then the mother may apply for Mothers' Allowance and the care of the family then falls upon the province.

Here, a year ago or so—it may have been last year—we passed an amendment to the Deserted Wives' and Children's Protection Act, which I thought was going to be of great benefit to the province and the municipalities, as well as to the deserted families. That amendment contained a provision whereby the provincial police could be used to round up and bring back—as we thought—those who had deserted their families. It provided that the services of the provincial police could be used to locate deserting husbands or deserting wives.

From complaints lodged with me by municipalities, we now find that what we thought was originally intended, is not what is happening.

It now appears that the services of the provincial police are used to locate deserting husbands, and having once located a man, they notify the wife, and also the municipality, and if the family was receiving Mothers' Allowance, that is cut off. When we put through this amendment, we understood it to mean the provincial police would bring the man back to the municipality in which he had resided, and see that he was punished for deserting his family. How-

ever, it really does not mean anything of the kind; it merely means that the provincial police have located him, and when they do, they notify the local authorities, who, if they act quickly, may catch the man where he is residing, but if there is any delay, the man moves on, because the investigation by the provincial police has alerted him, and he knows somebody is after him, and he is gone by the time the municipality can send someone to bring him back.

The result is that mothers and families are taken off Mothers' Allowances, and the municipality has to again bear the brunt of supporting the family.

I think that Act may require a further amendment or some adjustment in regard to how the provincial police are used.

—Mr. Acting Speaker in the Chair.

MR. GRUMMETT: Another item mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is concerning parks. I am very pleased indeed to see reference made to them, because I think we can do a great deal for the province by setting up parks, such as these, and it could be possible we might be able to do a great deal to relieve unemployment, should any occur during the summer months. The unemployed can be used to reforest and set out these parks. That will provide a considerable amount of work during the summer months, and at the same time, assist in reforesting a great deal of our barren waste land, which should be put back into forests again. Land which should never have been farmed at all could be turned back into forests, and reforestation, undertaken in conjunction with the setting up of provincial parks, would do a great deal to help the province.

Another heading in the Speech from the Throne is that of "Rehabilitation." I am not just sure what that means, but I think it is the extension of the benefits provided by the Disabled Persons Allowance Act. At the present time, a pension is given to those permanently and totally disabled. Those who are only partially disabled receive no benefits whatsoever, and I am hoping that by the amendment to the Act, as suggested, assistance may

be given to those who are partially disabled, and that they may be trained, both academically and through vocational or trade training, to assist in supporting themselves.

As regards agriculture, I think I have mentioned before in this House the tremendous wastage of our farm lands, due to the young farmers leaving the farms, to enter industry. Some day, we will need those farms to supply the food needed in the cities. If we continue to build cities as we have been doing in the last 10 years, at such a phenomenal rate, the question will soon arise "where will we get the food to feed them?"

I think it is apparent to anyone who has driven around our countryside in the past 6 or 7 years. I am sure they have noticed that less than 50 per cent. of our farms are unoccupied. A great many of them are used as pasture land. The farmers have too much land to farm and they use the excess amount as pasture. I think something should be done to split up these farms, and endeavour to bring them into full production. I think also better advice might be given to the farmers as how to farm.

I was interested in a remark made by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) yesterday about clearing the farm land. I can recall, as a very young boy, seeing great areas burning, with respect to the available timber stand, which had been cut down, and burned, simply to get at the land. In those days, the owners of land felt that trees were simply nuisances, and of no value whatsoever. So they cut down these available stands of timber and destroyed them.

If they had left that timber standing until today, it would be worth many times the value of all the farm crops they have ever taken off those farms. They could have sold the timber today for many times the value of the farm crops.

I think a survey should be made of the farm land to ascertain what land is still suitable for farming, and what land should be re-planted back into forest.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) dealt very fully

with his department, in his White Paper yesterday. There were several things which rather indicated a return to the ideas contained in the Kennedy report. I think it is about time we took down the Kennedy report from the shelf, and dusted it off, and took a second look at its contents. I think perhaps the hon. Minister did take a second look at the report, and I think it would be well for all of the hon. members of this House to do the same thing, in order to refresh our minds as to what is provided for in the Kennedy report.

For one thing, it provided for 12 operating companies to handle and control the cutting in the 12 areas in the province. These companies should all be Crown companies, and control the cutting within their own areas.

In my opinion, reforestation again enters into the question of our forest programme. Some operators argue there is no use whatever in artificial reforestation; that it should be left to natural growth. I disagree entirely with that. I think we should, as we cut, see that the land is re-planted back to trees.

I was quite interested yesterday in hearing the hon. Minister say that the scarification of the land by the removal of the trees tended to reproduce the crop more quickly than if the land had not been disturbed.

I also heard some time ago, another thing which to me was very interesting. It is something with which I do not know whether the hon. Minister will agree or not, but I was told that a quick or flash fire run over part of cut-over land would promote a greater growth of trees of the same nature. That is, if the growth which had just been cut, was spruce, a quick or flash fire, which did not destroy the cones, and so forth, would provide sufficient heat to open the cones, and the trees would grow much faster. That was, to me, a very interesting observation I heard a short time ago.

I think that reforestation should be carried out not only in the north, but in Southern Ontario, where we find great belts, such as in the Muskoka and Parry Sound Districts, where the trees were

taken out many years ago, and if they had been reforested or re-planted at that time, it would have been of great benefit to the province, and I think the government should undertake a project whereby this land can be put back into forest acreage. The land was never intended for farming, and would never be of any use as farms, and I suggest the province should inaugurate a plan for putting trees back in those areas, and letting them stand as long as necessary, until they attain a growth which will be of some benefit to the province. At the present time, they are merely barren, stoney, depressed areas, and if they could be re-planted with trees, it would help the province, and would also be of assistance in preventing the flash floods from which certain parts of the province are suffering at the present time.

The next item to which I want to refer is not mentioned specifically in the Speech from the Throne, but it has been mentioned in the House on several occasions, and mention of it has appeared in the press many times. That is the question of highways.

The Fort William scandal has drawn down on the Department of Highways a great deal of adverse and critical comment, and I think the hon. members in the House are entitled to know what has happened to our Department of Highways. If we continue as we have during the past few days in the Legislature, receiving no information, and apparently getting nowhere, the session of the Legislature will end, and we will go back to our homes not knowing what has been done or what is going to be done in regard to highways.

I think we, as members of this House, are entitled to be told what has gone on, and what is going to be done.

It is unfortunate that the prosecutions stemming from the investigations have not been carried out some considerable time ago, so that they would be completed and out of the way, and we could proceed with any type of investigation we desired, either by way of a Royal Commission, by a Select Committee of the House, or by any other means whereby the whole question could be gone into very thoroughly.

—Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. GRUMMETT: I do not care what system is used to bring out the facts, but I want the facts. I want to know why these things have happened. It has been said, for instance, that contracts have been awarded, and as they progressed, it became apparent the contractors were going "in the hole," and were not going to profit by their contracts, but they were permitted—in fact, even encouraged—to continue, and in the end were paid on a sort of a cost-plus basis. If that be true, it has been totally unfair to the other contractors who may have tendered on a project, and totally unfair to the people of the province, because if a man knows he is going to be able to tender for a contract, and not to be held strictly to the terms of that contract, he will not be so particular in regard to the amount of his tender. Then he knows that, after all, "If I go behind, a very sympathetic department will permit me to submit a cost-plus account, and I will come out on top anyway."

But what about the man who has submitted a tender in good faith? His tender has been rejected, as being too high, for instance, whereas the tender may have been an honest one, but he is, under these circumstances, precluded from proceeding with his contract.

These are some of the many things we want to find out. I do not know whether these things are correct or not. I have heard them mentioned on several occasions. If they are correct, then I want to know it, and I am sure not only myself, but all hon. members of this House, would like to know it before the House prorogues its session.

There are many questions of a similar nature. I want to know how it could happen that the plans of the engineers could be altered without the department here in Toronto knowing about it.

Also, I would like to point out, it is necessary for banks to have their books inspected quite frequently by inspectors. These inspectors drop into a bank without the staff knowing anything about it. The door is opened some morning and in walk some strangers, and they say, "We are here to inspect the bank" and

the books of the bank are seized from then on until the inspection is completed.

Why could not the same practice be followed with the Department of Highways? I think when doing a business of \$153 million it warrants the employment of inspectors of that nature. You cannot expect your auditing department here in the city to look over the contracts of the department, but you should have your own group of specially-trained inspectors who would drop in on any divisional engineer, and seize his books, and in that way the department would be able to control them. There would be no opportunity whatsoever for that man to carry through the work which is alleged has been carried through in Fort William. If these inspectors or auditors had been on the job, the people would have been assured there was no opportunity for the kind of thing alleged to have happened in the Fort William area.

Mr. Speaker, owing to the absence of my colleague, I am unable to present an amendment to the amendment now before the House, and I would crave your indulgence and ask that I be permitted to have my colleague present an amendment at some time when he is in the House.

MR. ROBERT MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to come back to this House and to have an opportunity of taking some humble part in the debates of this great Legislature with my friends who are gathered here, and to learn something, as we do each year, of the problems of those other hon. members from other ridings with which we are not as familiar as with our own.

I am afraid that I am not perhaps of as persuading or genial or good-natured nature as the hon. member who spoke just before me (Mr. Grummett), but, I shall speak of specific problems which I would like to bring to the attention of the House.

The first is a matter concerning directly the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). Some years ago, a young man by the name of Paul Cachia was accused of armed robbery; he was tried and

convicted, although he did not commit the crime. He was at least 5 miles away from the scene of the crime at the time it took place.

Hon. members might ask, Mr. Speaker—and with much justification—“How can a man under a system in which we have much pride, be found guilty of an offence which he did not commit?”

I say to you this, Mr. Speaker, for several reasons, and out of this case we learn, in my humble opinion, two most important lessons which I would like to present to this House.

The first is this: that this young man was found guilty because basically he signed a confession that he had committed this crime. This is a most serious matter, Mr. Speaker. He signed a confession that he had committed this crime. When I tell you that he came from one of the toughest sections of any city on this continent, and from one of the most depressed kinds of background, and that the chap—to put it as fairly as I can—was not blessed by God with the finest and highest intellect, that he was an epileptic, and that a confession was beaten out of him with a rubber hose, and he was convicted by the court.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why this case is most important is this—and for this reason only. One can hardly credit this could happen in this country, or else I am terribly naive as to what is fairness. This young man, when he was being tried, during one of the recesses, I am advised by persons in whose integrity I have confidence, that the judge who tried this case the first time, called the Crown Attorney into his chamber, and pointed out to him what he felt was an inherent weakness in the case, namely insufficient evidence on which to charge and convict this young man. The Crown Attorney thereupon pointed out to the judge that there was a confession in the case, and he did one of two things. He either told the judge what was in the confession, read it to him, or allowed the judge to read it.

The reason this is most important—and in my humble opinion diabolical—was that this confession was never intro-

duced during the trial of this man and, in short, this young boy was tried partly upon evidence which he had no opportunity to rebut, which his counsel had no opportunity to examine, and presumably, the person who was in charge of the prosecution desired more to have a conviction than to see that justice was done.

I believe in this young man. He is the son of a constituent of mine. I know his minister. I know his family and I believe in him. I came to the hon. Attorney-General and I prevailed upon him to investigate this matter. The hon. Attorney-General is an able and fair man, and he instituted immediately an investigation which satisfied him—and his department also, as I believe—that this young man was not guilty.

As a result of that investigation, the hon. Minister of Justice of Canada ordered what I believe was the fourth or fifth time in the history of this country, a new trial for Cachia, and in due course, this young man was finally discharged by the court as “not guilty”—and I repeat to this House, not guilty of a crime that he did not commit. A great deal of credit, therefore, goes to our hon. Attorney-General and his department.

But from this case, Mr. Speaker, come two most important lessons, and these are the points I would like to bring to this House. Firstly, I think it is improper that any man in this country of Canada, and particularly in this Province of Ontario, should have to be tried upon evidence bearing directly or indirectly on the conduct of a previous trial, nor upon evidence which is not presented to the court, before the accused, but “sneaked in the back door” in some way.

It should be clearly understood that there is no reflection whatsoever on the judge who presided at the first trial, nor on the hon. Attorney-General's department. How could there be? After all, when this was said to the judge, he did not know what was going to be presented by the Crown Attorney, who, in this case, apparently desired a conviction above all things.

As I say, that is worse than the kind of trials which we fought wars to end, those in relation to the "Star Chamber" methods.

Why was not the confession put in at the first trial? The reason was the Crown Attorney knew it would not stand up in the face of public scrutiny. Heknewithad not been obtained under fair and proper circumstances and he knew his arguments would be decimated, and he would rather introduce it "through the back door." That is the issue. The issue is, are we to be tried in that way in this country?

The second lesson to be learned from this matter is that Cachia was not the first Canadian to be found guilty of a crime he did not commit, and will not be the last, under our system of the administration of justice, and under our jury system. I say to you this, Mr. Speaker, that when a man sins against the state, he should be punished, but when a state sins against a man, that man should have some recompense.

I may be wrong, and I am prepared to stand here and apologize in public, but I say that I think Cachia spent two years in jail and nobody so much as apologized to him, much less gave him any recompense for the two years they took away from him.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if we take away a man's car or his property, we will have to pay him for it, if it is in the interest of the state, because it is under the laws of expropriation, but if we take away his soul and his freedom, the things God gives to every man in this country, do we give him anything for it? Nothing at all. We do not even care.

I say there are lessons to be learned from this case. The second lesson is when you take away a man's time, freedom and soul, there should be some form of recompense for the time and the freedom of which he has been deprived.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer secondly to a matter about which I spoke of last year—in fact, to two matters. Firstly is the great need, I believe, of a central registry office in this province. I do not know whether hon. members in this House realize this, but if a car is pur-

chased by a man in Toronto, who does not pay for it in full, the seller can register a document in the Toronto or the County of York Registry Office, but if the purchaser takes that car to the County of Simcoe and sells it, that car is still subject to the conditional sales contract, that is, the unpaid amount is registered here in Toronto, although the man who bought it in Simcoe searched in the Simcoe Registry Office, and thought he was getting a good title, but he was not.

The only way we will circumvent that is by having a central registry office where a search, when made, will be good for the entire province. So I urge upon the government to give consideration to the setting up and operation of a central registry office in the Province of Ontario.

I would like to speak to the same matter about which I spoke last year—something I think will inevitably come to this province—and that is Certificates of Title of Ownership of motor vehicles. These vehicle ownership certificates are in effect in 36 out of the 48 states in the United States. I investigated the matter a month ago, and there were 36 then, perhaps now there are 38 or 40. So it is a good thing, and not an untried matter.

When you buy land, you get a deed, but you do not get anything when you buy a vehicle. A vehicle today has become one of the chief sources of barter against which money is loaned, and given as collateral, and so forth.

If there was a place such as a central registry office, to protect those who lend money or who may buy the chattel—the motor car—all the information could be placed on a Certificate of Title to be issued by the Department of Highways, and the transfers kept up to date by a central registry office, I believe we would come into line with other types of legislation which are so necessary.

There is something which may prove embarrassing, or may sound embarrassing, but I do not want it to sound that way at all. It is an idea of my own, and I may, perhaps be very naive, because I have had no discussion with anyone,

but I feel if we have nothing to hide, if we are doing the right thing, I cannot understand why tenders for public construction for the province should not be opened in public as they are in many municipalities today.

The second matter—and I do not accept the pounding on desks by hon. members, as a compliment, in fact I think it is insulting because I believe they do it for no other reason than to embarrass the government. I do not suggest it for that purpose. I suggest it because I believe it is important.

There are other persons and other corporations who do it, and I believe it should be done by all parties, and I would remind the hon. members with large, flat fists, that their friends in Ottawa do not do it.

With regard to the Department of Highways, I have always felt it was improper for the Government of Ontario to say to a passenger who stepped into a motor vehicle, "If you have an accident, you may not sue the driver."

If, Mr. Speaker, the driver has been guilty of ordinary negligence, that is so, and that should be so, but a passenger who gets into an automobile or who is invited into one, does not thereby give the driver a licence for murder. I feel sincerely that a passenger who steps into an automobile has the right to presume that although the driver may err in judgment, he is not giving him a licence to manhandle him in such a way as you might a poker chip at a table. Therefore I say that if a driver is found guilty of gross negligence by a court, then the passenger should be entitled to sue the driver of the car, for any injuries the passenger suffers.

Mr. Speaker, these are small, itinerant matters that somewhat concern me. I mentioned this morning in The Government Commissions Committee that I have had impressed upon me by many in my constituency the necessity for sanitary caps on milk bottles. It is a small matter, I recognize that, but I am a "small guy" sent here by a small riding who believes humbly but importantly in some of these matters and they impress upon me

the necessity for sanitary caps for milk bottles. Tremendous expense is incurred for the protection of the consuming public by way of avoiding T.B. and other communicable diseases, by the use of other sanitary methods and there seems no reason why sanitary caps should not be put on milk bottles. I spoke about this to the members of the dairy industry and they indicate it would involve very little expense indeed, and I hope the government may consider a feasible means.

Another small matter which concerns me, to which the hon. member who sits immediately before me referred and that is a man 65 or 67 years of age, whose wife died two days ago. He spent in the period of 7 or 8 years \$10,000 or \$12,000 to try and save her from a disease from which he knew God intended her to succumb. She died of a disease that no medical science could have cured, but at the same time, with respect to the Disabled Persons Pension, he had little money but he had just a little more than the minimum and for that reason he could not get this pension for his wife. It seems inequitable to me, and I have spoken to the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) about this and I almost believe he feels the same way about it, that it is most inequitable that that man could not have it for his wife, but could have had it if she had been his daughter. I therefore humbly beseech the government to give consideration to this matter, so there should not be difference in relation to a spouse, for example, on the one hand, and a child on the other.

I see that in this evening's paper unfortunately there has been a certain amount of publicity given to proceedings taken by the same committee this morning in relation to the times and hours of the opening of liquor outlets. I have felt for some time, Mr. Speaker, that all the bars in this province should be open for the same length of time. I cannot see why some should be allowed to stay open until 12 o'clock and others until 2, I believe in equity. I always have, and I believe hon. members of this House do also. I think if one bar

is to be allowed to stay open until 12 o'clock and another until 2, that is not equity, they should all be 12 or they should all be 2 or they should all be some other hour. I do not enter into a moral, physical or legal argument, I just enter into the equitable argument that they should all be the same, across the board.

Lastly I want to make some reference to the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). Although I have always taken very great pleasure in following the speeches of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, because he is indeed an able debater, a description which might well be applied to his speech was one which was given in this House some time ago, that his speech was "very much like the turkey 10 days after Christmas, nothing on it and nothing in it."

The other day after the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had spoken of the surplus in the budget as a means of making payment on the old mortgage, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) said: "Payment on the mortgage, nothing. It amounts to over-taxation." Mr. Speaker, I am not, with the greatest respect, prepared to swallow wholly both of those pills or either of them, for fear that I obtain the type of indigestion that Lord Porter did not fear in "Pinafore" when he said:

I always voted at my Party's call
I never thought of thinking for
myself at all,
I thought so little they rewarded me
By making me the ruler of the
Queen's Navy.

I only say that the difficulty of swallowing an argument of another without investigating it on your own behalf, no matter how little intelligence you may personally possess, is that when a thinker is gone from the room, no more thinking can be done until he returns. May I say this in reply to the argument of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when the Liberal Party has a surplus, the Liberal Party says it is the result of wise spending, sound saving and superior accounting, but the Liberal Party says when the Conservative Party

has a surplus it is the result of penny pinching, neglect of duty and over-taxation. I really believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be consistent, that either a surplus in Ontario is over-taxation or not, and if it is, it is also over-taxation at Ottawa. The old argument of whether one should "spend when times are bad," or "save when times are good," is the old argument of "deficit spending" and "surplus saving," which I think was the hallmark of the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman and has bothered all politicians since the days perhaps of Aristotle. I only say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I think in all fairness he should at least be consistent, that an over-taxation in one case should be considered and called over-taxation in all cases.

He next turned the might of his water pistol upon the hospital plan of Ontario, which he said he felt we should have. I should have thought my hon. friend had been smacked across his electoral bottom, less than 2 years ago, sufficiently so that he would have felt he could perhaps afford to leave that red herring in and under the compost heap perhaps at least for another 2 years. However, he has seen fit to haul it out into the light of day and in case he does not remember—which he obviously does not—and since he does not have confidence in what is printed in *Hansard*, I shall attempt to put it in *Hansard* for him in such a way that even he will understand.

We cannot have a hospital plan in Ontario for 5 reasons, and I should like the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) to read this matter tomorrow, or when *Hansard* next appears. Firstly, we have not enough doctors. Secondly, we have not enough nurses. Thirdly, we have not enough beds. Fourthly, we have not enough hospitals. Fifthly, the Party of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and its leader at Ottawa have themselves stated they will not take part in, nor do they believe, in a hospital plan at this time for Canada or any of its provinces. So I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition he at least might take the trouble of finding out the dictates from

Ottawa, so that although he may not agree with this policy, it would at least have the merit of consistency.

I see in *Hansard* the hon. Leader of the Opposition stated that:

We must at all times remember when discussing the Federal Government and its responsibility in these matters that the Federal Government has to deal with ten provinces. These ten provinces have ten varying conditions.

And so he went on in a manner which is in effect an apology for the inability of the Federal Government to cope with a problem which was directly handed to it by the British North America Act.

But in Ontario we cannot jump into the hiatus, into the chasm left by the Federal Government and fill in the holes that they themselves have not seen fit to fill.

It is clear that, regardless of the dictates of the Liberal policy, if any Provincial Government were to leap in every time the Federal Government has a responsibility and does not fill it, that Provincial Government first of all faces three problems, one, economic bankruptcy; two, that its legislation is ultra vires; and, three, a neglect of its own duties for which it must spend the money in its own budget.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition then turned to housing and gave an equally naive explanation of that. He said in *Hansard* I think one of the most outstanding statements, perhaps, which has been spoken in this House:

May I add this further suggestion, Mr. Acting Speaker, that if we find in this province that the National Housing Act and the provisions thereof do not adequately meet our needs and requirements—

oh what a masterpiece of understatement,

—it is our duty to supplement the National Housing Act by legislation of our own and get on with the building of houses for the people of this province.

What utter nonsense. If we were to enter into every field allocated to the Federal Government every time they did not have the courage to face the problems presented to them, this province would constantly face bankruptcy.

When the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) suggested this, he said we should return—and I think I am fair in saying this—to the second mortgage plan or some similar type of scheme. I would remind him that we got out of the second mortgage plan at the request of the Federal Government. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has got the cart before the horse. Even I, who have been born and brought up in the city, know at which end of the horse you place the cart, and I would suggest that the hon. Leader of the Opposition get a diagram if he does not know.

The important thing in this country is not to encourage inflation, the important thing is not to put money in the hands of the purchaser, but to put objects for sale in the hands of the vendor. The only thing that we will do by entering into the field of the second mortgage plan at this time is to put more money into the hands of the purchaser, which will only spiral inflation. What we want is more houses, not money, of which the hon. Leader of the Opposition I think perhaps has more than he knows what to do with. May I say to him that if he really wants a change from the housing legislation of this province, he should take the train this minute—and I will lend him my pass—and go to the Banking Committee which is at this moment sitting in Ottawa considering Bill 102. There are 5 things Bill 102 is intended to cure. It is intended to cure high interest rates, and yet we know the banking officials are now before the committee saying: "Interest rates will be the highest in the history of the Dominion Government." We need interest rates on these mortgages at 4 per cent. and the bankers themselves are saying they cannot be less than 6. Secondly, we must cure the high down payment which is required. The banks themselves say that it is still going to be from \$4,000 to \$6,000 and

the hon. Leader of the Opposition the other day said that is what we want to get away from. He and I are on common ground in that particular, because we can have a plan of a 4 per cent. mortgage requiring an \$800 down payment on a \$12,000 house if the Dominion Government has got the courage to lend money to the people who gave it to them in the first place.

The third point which the bill is intended to cure is the repayment policy, that is they should be amortized over 25 or 30 years rather than requiring payment after 5.

The fourth point the bill should cure, is to make possible more money, and yet the banks say they will not have any more money to lend, they will likely have less. So what is the bill for? To ameliorate and apparently placate a certain number of "feathered friends" sitting in the background who are waiting to go before this committee, one would assume. It is certainly not going to create more houses, interest rates are going to be higher, down payments are going to be higher, as far as I can see the only thing that will be any higher, and with our approval, will be the smell which surrounds it.

Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Government is attempting to make the banks the hatchetmen for the Dominion Government, because they know the people of this country cannot maintain such a housing plan, they know it will likely never come into force, to start with, much less be carried out, but if carried out, they are careful to have the banks foreclose, not the Dominion Government. So I say, Mr. Speaker, every single purpose which should be encompassed in a housing bill is missing from the housing bill now before the Banking Committee and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) is really sincere, his best and quickest step will be immediately out of this door, onto a train and before that Housing Committee, to whom he should tell that heart-rending story that he told us the other day.

Quite apart from what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, Mr.

Speaker, did he come into this House and say to this government or any hon. member of it: "I have an alternative plan."? No. Did he say where they have gone wrong? No. Did he have even the suggestion of an alternative plan? No. Did he even have, as the French say, a *soupçon* of a suggestion of an alternative plan? No.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to one point and one only, and that is in relation to the Department of Highways. The hon. Leader of the Opposition went considerably out of his way to criticize the Provincial Government and the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), presumably, in relation to its investigation concerning the Highway Department's so-called "scandals" in Northern Ontario. Lest he has been misled in any way, may I tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition everyone in this House wants justice done in this case. Everyone in this House wants the axe to fall where it may, everyone in this House wants the culprits—the persons who have stolen, the persons who have cheated—for they have cheated not only the government, they have cheated the people of this country—all brought to book. There is no doubt about that, we all believe in that, but what I think is so despicable is for the hon. Leader of the Opposition to stand there and say: "We want a Royal Commission." He had no criticism to offer, apparently, of the Federal Government when it called in Currie & Co., but we called in Wood, Gordon & Co. He says that is wrong. Did the Federal Government call in a Royal Commission? No. So we do not call in one, and he says that is wrong. The Federal Government sent the matter to a House Committee and that is o.k. We sent it to a House Committee and that is all wrong. I want to know why the hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to suck and whistle in the same breath.

I merely say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that his policy on these matters—and I have touched on only a very few of them—is a vacuum, it is a hiccough on the breath of progress. May I point out to him that it is a great

deal easier to fight for one's own principles than to live up to them, but this government, with the trust which has been put in it by the people of this province, is doing its level best to live up to that trust, so help it God.

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to avail myself of the opportunity of participating in this debate this afternoon and following the words of my hon. colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay). There are some things which he has mentioned which I may reiterate in part, but in the main I wish to deal with the operation of government as a whole.

In the first place I wish to bring before the attention of the House that the government this year, as heretofore, in spite of the advancement of the programme for the benefit of the people of this province, does not anticipate any increase in taxes nor any new taxes. That is something of which we as hon. members of this Legislature can rightfully be very proud, especially when we take into consideration the fact that in adjacent and other provinces in this Dominion there is a multiplicity of other taxes, personal taxes, nuisance taxes, which one meets with almost every time one goes into those provinces.

Initially I should like to say a word relative to education. Earlier this afternoon we heard reference made to the operation of business colleges and trade schools in this province. I wish to draw to the attention of the House that business schools and trade schools, even though they may be privately operated, are not operated separately and apart from supervision of the Department of Education of this province. On the contrary they are subject to review and inspection in many avenues. Some criticism has been offered in regard to business colleges to the effect that they are in business for profit. Personally, I find no quarrel with that statement, I think it is a fact and I think those who operate business colleges think it is a fact, because after all is said and done, a business college is a business, it is a business which is operated by those who

have charge of that business just the same as you and I operate our own several businesses, and if they were not in the operation of a business college for profit, I do not know what else they would be in that type of business for, and I say "more power to them."

On the other hand there is this to be said in regard to business colleges, they fill a need and a vacancy in the operation of our educational system as we know it today in that they do provide for those persons who desire to have a business college education or a trade school education which though perhaps of the same type as provided in our vocational schools is on a different basis of day time or evening attendance and also with a shorter period of attendance in classes. We know for example that in our vocational classes in education, it is necessary for example that a student should start at the beginning of the school term in September and carry through until the end of the school term in the following May or June. A business college on the other hand will take a student who may start at any time. He can start on the 1st of December or the 1st of March or any other date that he wishes and the business colleges do provide individual instruction on a much greater scale and a more particular plane than is possible to provide on the educational basis of our school system as we have it in the Province of Ontario today. For that service those persons who attend those schools rightfully pay and are required to pay additional fees. The teachers who are teaching in those trade schools and business colleges in themselves are likewise subject to the inspection of the Department of Education. It is necessary, for example, that a teacher in a business college should have business experience or business training and a teacher who does not have the qualifications which the department demands to meet those teaching standards, of necessity will not be permitted to carry on much longer.

The matter of education generally in the province is also worthy of note. Education today is the major municipal expenditure on everybody's tax bill. It

is the major expenditure and consequently it is of great and particular importance to every individual in this Province of Ontario. We are all anxious to know what we get for our tax dollar relative to education.

The Department of Education last year paid out in grants just under \$55 million. That is a great deal of money. Where did it go? It went into an educational system in this province which undoubtedly will bring back manyfold the original investment in better educating the children of this province in years to come and in qualifying them to take their places in not only their own local communities but in the various positions of public life to which they may aspire from time to time.

Last year and again this year—and indeed it is a sort of forecast for the next 10 years at least—there will have to be provision made for an additional 53,000 pupils in our school system in this province. It will take a great deal of accommodation in school buildings and in providing of teachers to take care of those students. It will require many text books to be handed out and to be provided. But all in all, it is a very justifiable expenditure when one considers, as I have indicated, that it is for the benefit of the young people of this province in years to come.

Recently we have also had come into our midst many new Canadians, and many of those new Canadians have desired on their own to acquire a knowledge of the English language and to become accustomed with our manner of living, and with some of our culture here in Canada, because in some respects it is different from that to which they have been accustomed in Europe. Let us consider as well the fact that many of these people have gone through torture and even hell while living in concentration camps, and that in the freedom they have found since coming to Canada it is very gratifying indeed to realize that we in this grand old Province of Ontario can participate in some small measure in making life a little more happy for these persons who have had such sad experiences in years gone by.

It is not all young people who are coming to this country as new Canadians. There are many people who are past 40 who are coming here and “starting from scratch” to provide a living for themselves and for their families in this grand land of opportunity. In the metropolitan area of Toronto in the Province of Ontario, we find that there is an expanding influx of population aggregating about 10,000 people per month. That is a large increase in population when one stops to think about it in those terms, but not only is it an influx in population, it additionally requires services to be provided by the municipalities wherein these people come to live and to participate in their daily work.

So we find that the municipalities in the area have an additional burden today that they did not have a decade ago. There is much to be provided in the way of normal municipal services, police and fire protection, garbage collection and all the other incidentals to which we are so accustomed from a municipal standpoint. The question is, where is the cost of these additional charges to come from? What has happened over the years is that in many of the older sections of Metropolitan Toronto where a house used to house one family of 4 or 5 people, we find there are many people living in one house. But the taxes on that particular property have not increased to the extent that it would satisfy the increase in cost in providing all of those municipal services which have been necessary to take care of the increase in population.

Consequently we have found over the years that the municipalities, not only in the metropolitan area but generally at large, have found themselves in a position where their costs have been increasing, but they have not had anything with which to take care of those increases in costs, save and except a normal increase on real estate taxation. As we all know, insofar as municipalities are concerned the normal tax comes from real estate, and what does not come from real estate comes from business tax and there has been much discussion and observation

in recent months and in recent years on the part of industrial and commercial enterprise to re-allocate the various and several categories into which businesses have been allocated under the Assessment Act for business assessment purposes.

It has been felt, for example, that a grocery store of years ago no longer is a grocery store, because, like a drug store, for example, you can walk into a modern grocery store which may be chain-operated, and you can buy a mop, you can buy a can of wax, you can buy almost anything. They are little department stores in effect, and maybe at the back one may find a warehouse storing huge quantities not only of groceries but of hardware and other allied and associated goods. So that as I say, the type of grocery store with which we are acquainted today is so vastly different from what it was 10 years ago that it would appear high time that some consideration should be given to a revision of the Assessment Act in order that various re-allocations of different types of industry might be given some consideration.

Now in the matter of municipal affairs I would like to say a word in regard to legislation enacted last year in this House relative to Metropolitan Toronto. I do not propose to go into all the details and ramifications but merely to mention one or two aspects. What has happened during the past 12 months? Prior to the legislation being enacted last year there had been much consideration given as to whether there should be or should not be amalgamation of the suburban areas with the City of Toronto. The government came up with a new type of co-ordination between the City of Toronto and the suburban municipalities, with the result that there is not an amalgamation, but rather each of the municipalities operates and continues to operate in its own right on a co-operative basis and during the past 12 months that legislation has proven its worth, has proven that it can and will work, and that it will undoubtedly, in my view, solve many of the problems that have been associated with this great metropolitan area over past years.

It has been said in some quarters that the metropolitan council has come up with vast figures of proposed expenditure. It is true that as one reads the press occasionally, one reads that for a particular project the expenditure of many millions of dollars is contemplated and that for another project so many more millions are envisaged. And the poor taxpayer finally comes to the point where he adds it all up and says "Here is a total of X million dollars to be spent on the metropolitan area—it is going to increase our taxes very considerably, and what are we going to get for it?"

The answer is that all of us should realize that this programming of the Metropolitan Council is not an immediate programming. It could not be. It is a programme spread over many years—8, 10, perhaps 15 years. This is so of necessity because if all of the programming were to be enforced in 1 year it would be found that we did not have the manpower, the machinery or the wherewithal to incorporate all these things in a short period of time, but on a long range view it undoubtedly will work.

Of course such expenditures will be debentured and paid off in 10 or 15 years or whatever the terms of those debentures might be. In addition we can also bear in mind another piece of legislation brought down in this House last year which has helped all the municipalities in Ontario as well as Metropolitan Toronto, and that is the unconditional grants legislation. Prior to last year, legislation already enacted, provided for grants to municipalities which qualified under the Police Act and the Fire Department Act. These could avail themselves of such grants. But legislation brought down last year dissolved all of those grants applicable to police departments and fire departments as such and we found the municipalities entitled to unconditional grants.

In the case of Metropolitan Toronto, what does that mean in dollars and cents? It means that into the treasury by way of an annual grant there is going a grant of \$5 million provided by the Ontario Government. \$5 million is a lot of money and it will undoubtedly

provide the wherewithal for Metropolitan Toronto to get on its feet and provide some of the initial services that are so urgent at the present time.

We must also remind ourselves that last year this government took care of the needs of Metropolitan Toronto in its organizational stage and that undoubtedly was a great boon to Toronto. It has been said in some quarters, particularly in the rural areas, that Metropolitan Toronto was enjoying the big gifts of this government. That is not so. As was mentioned by the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) in his speech the other day, the fact of the matter is that the rural townships are getting by far the greatest amount by way of grants under the Unconditional Grants Act. These would run all the way from \$1.50 per capita up to a maximum of \$4.00 in a municipality such as Metropolitan Toronto. We must also bear in mind that the larger the municipality the larger the expenditure which the municipal council is called on to provide and so, as I say, in the case of townships which are in large rural areas, \$1.50 was provided per capita. On a percentage basis this would work out at roughly 10 per cent., which was the benefit in the rural municipalities and townships, down to 6 per cent., which was the percentage benefit which Metropolitan Toronto obtained.

Here again is another instance of the way this government is providing adequate and proper assistance to the municipalities of this province.

One other aspect of municipal administration which I would like to bring to the attention of this House has to do with the Department of Welfare and it is something in regard to which municipalities over the years have had much to do. I refer to Children's Aid, or the provision of ward care of children taken care of through Children's Aid Societies. Before 1947, the grant provided by the Province of Ontario to the very best type of Children's Aid Society was \$1,500. That was the amount of money provided by way of grant to the Children's Aid Society in the County of York. Ultimately these grants were in-

creased in 1947, with the result that the Children's Aid Societies, through their respective municipal councils, benefitted greatly on a much higher basis through the good auspices of this government.

But Children's Aids cost of administration are still skyrocketing and that is on account of the influx of population into the Province of Ontario and particularly into our largely populated areas where there have been mothers and children to be taken care of.

The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) this afternoon mentioned something apropos of this particular piece of legislation and he indicated, I believe, a case with which he had to deal relative to his own constituency. There are instances when it would almost appear that municipal authorities throw away their better judgment for a poor return of finance and I would like to relate to this House an instance that came within my own experience, where that happened.

There was a chap who came to the City of Toronto who had separated from his wife in Northern Ontario. The wife had 3 or 4 children to look after. He came to Toronto and obtained for himself employment in the city and, as my hon. friend the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) mentioned this afternoon, the services of the Ontario Provincial Police were used to find him in Toronto. When they found him, what happened? They rushed him into jail. The provincial police officer came all the way down here from one of our northern municipalities and took him back. He was tried before a magistrate and he was sent down for one year. You may say "that is all right," but what underlies the situation? Here was a chap who had a job in the City of Toronto. He was earning very well and he was willing to provide for his wife and family in Northern Ontario; but the officials of this particular municipality decided they would rather see him in jail than providing for his family, with the net result that not only did the people of this province have an opportunity of paying for the keep of this chap while he was in jail, but the municipality also had the privilege of

keeping his wife and family for 12 months.

For me a situation such as that does not make reason or common sense, and I think in all of these matters of adjudication relevant to such questions, municipal officials and judges and magistrates as well should look at the practical aspects of such things before they decide that every culprit should go to jail. In some cases jail may be the proper answer, but it does not meet all cases. Also on this matter of Children's Aid I should like to say that up to the present time municipalities have found by reason of the increase in population that their Children's Aid and welfare cases have been fast increasing, I would like to suggest that some time in the future the government might consider assuming a larger burden of Children's Aid costs even to the extent of 75 per cent. But I would also say: "Leave something for the municipalities to pay," because it is only through paying something that the body concerned will have some effective supervision over operations. I think something could be done along these lines which could be of very real benefit.

With regard to the Department of Highways, the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) mentioned this afternoon something about the problem that has arisen in Northern Ontario. While we are all very sorry that something has occurred there—we know not what at the moment—may I simply remind him of this fact, that anything and everything that has been brought out relative to the Department of Highways administration in Ontario has been brought out by this government and brought out departmentally as well as through the auditing staff of this province. The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) said something about having auditors travel around as banks do. That is a fine suggestion; but may I say that today if a defalcation were to occur in the banks it would not be the first time although bankers over the years have had travelling auditors to drop in periodically and make inspections. There have been instances in the past where businesses have been subject

to defalcation on the part of employees and where men have succeeded in robbing their employers. I do not care whether it is big business or small business. You cannot prevent things of that nature from happening. One thing that can be done is this: when it is discovered, appropriate and adequate means for its remedy can be applied and I am sure that will be done in this case. My hon. friend wants to be furnished with all the details relevant to it. He knows, as I do, that this particular matter at the present time is sub judice. Certain persons have been arrested and certain charges have been laid. The matter is still under investigation. Ultimately there will be a court hearing with the various interested persons having the opportunity of presenting a defence after having heard the evidence for the prosecution presented. At this stage all I say is this: In due course all of the evidence will come before a court and will be made public, and be public information, and that is the policy of this government. It is laying its cards on the table and letting every citizen of this province know exactly what happens. The Department of Highways has had a budget of \$153 million this past year. That is a great deal of money but there has undoubtedly been a tremendous amount of highway development. All you have to do is to travel around the bypass around this City of Toronto to see what has been done to assist traffic in this area.

But all the money has not been spent in Toronto. Practically on every highway you may travel you will find improvements being made, re-allocations of traffic routes, or cloverleaves or what have you, for the benefit of the people of this province.

I do not suppose any motorist in Ontario begrudges paying 11 cents per gallon gasoline tax when he knows that the money is being used for the improvement of highways and the improvement of the economy of the Province of Ontario, as has been the case.

Relative to the Department of Highways, I have some further observations to make. The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) would like to see

a central registry system for the registration of motor vehicles and of any liens or chattel mortgage contracts. I wish to endorse that particular suggestion because I think it would be of great benefit to the people of this province for the reasons which he indicated. Not infrequently do we find groups of individuals who get into the car thieving business. Who suffers through purchasing cars obtained by such methods? It is the individual purchasing members of the public. It is quite true, undoubtedly, that some of these fellows are put behind bars ultimately, but it is the innocent purchaser who loses money and finds himself without recourse against individuals who are for all practical purposes men of straw and without substance. If such a central registry existed and each individual car owner had a title certificate which he could pass over to the new owner of the vehicle, on which there was a public record of any mortgage or lien, there would not be the opportunity for fraud that there has been in the past.

One further comment on highway matters. In my opinion there should be two types of examinations at least every 3 years. In the case of individuals I think there should be an examination at least every 3 years irrespective as to what physical condition the driver may be in today. No one can be sure a driver is going to be 100 per cent. fit for the next 50 or 60 years. Consequently an individual should be subject to a fresh examination by a duly authorized examiner at least once in 3 years.

Our physical make-up is such that many of us can and do suffer various types of illnesses, about some of which we know, and about others we do not know until it is too late to effect a cure. A regular check-up of the physical condition of drivers is something which, to my mind, should be paramount.

Not long ago we read in the press of an unfortunate accident which happened near Morrisburg, where an individual left his parked vehicle on the highway, and as a result of leaving it on the highway without lights, a bus carrying passengers came along the highway,

struck the vehicle, and ended up in the canal which runs along the side of the highway, and resulted in a great loss of life.

According to the evidence which appeared in the press, following that particular incident, it was learned that the driver of this vehicle which had been parked, had been turned down by an examiner in his own locality for a permit, but apparently had gone to another area, where an examiner had given him a licence to drive a vehicle.

That is something which I think we should consider very carefully. I think the examinations of drivers should be required to be made within the area in which the applicants reside, so that a situation of the kind I have just mentioned, could not occur again.

Recently, too, we have been reading in the news—in fact, it is almost a weekly occurrence—in regard to motor vehicles and railroad trains coming into collision at level crossings. On the outskirts of the City of Toronto, there is an intersection at Royal York Road and the Dundas Highway, which is fast becoming known as one of the most dangerous level crossings in the Province of Ontario. There have been several accidents there, some of them fatal.

The situation there is that not only is there a right-angled four-lane intersection, but within a matter of 200 feet of that intersection, on two of those highways, there are two railroad level crossings.

The line-up of traffic on Dundas Street, and also on Royal York Road, especially in the rush hours, is such that it is more than just heavy—it is extremely heavy.

At times the drivers of vehicles find themselves stopped on the railroad track at the crossing, and we are told that some 72 trains pass every 24 hours along that railway, which is a tremendous amount of railway traffic.

That is one place, if there ever was one, where there should be a subway, or something done to eliminate the highway level crossings.

Last year the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) indicated that it was the policy of his department to eliminate level crossings in the Province of Ontario, and he is to be commended for that policy, but, as we all know, there are other authoritative bodies with which his department has to co-operate before these level crossings can be eliminated.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in any event, we should keep this in mind—and I suggest it as a policy—that we should eliminate all these railway crossings as quickly as possible, because they constitute one of the greatest sources of injury and even death to the motoring public.

In connection with the particular crossing to which I have just referred, I might give you one illustration.

In the lineup of traffic on Dundas Street, not very long ago, a car had stopped owing to the flickering of the red lights indicating a train was approaching. A commercial vehicle coming behind the car, ran into the back of it and shunted it across the tracks, due to the fact that the airbrakes on the commercial vehicle had failed. Fortunately the passenger vehicle which had been pushed across the tracks was not hit by the train, but the commercial vehicle was, which indicates that it is not always the fault of a driver of a car himself, who is trying to prevent accidents at level crossings, who through some circumstance finds himself in a dangerous position.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to say a word or two in regard to labour. During the past year we have had industrially several strikes. We had strikes in Northern Ontario in the mining areas; in Southern Ontario relative to the truck drivers, which affected the area west of Hamilton; we also had a milk strike in the City of Toronto. Just the other day we read in the papers where there is a possibility of a strike amongst the engineers in the Metropolitan Area, those who control the operation of the water supply and sewage disposal for the Metropolitan Area.

Over the years, I daresay all hon.

members will agree the standard of living in this province has become better and better, and a great deal of the improvement in that standard has been due to the operations of trade unions, and labour unions, from their efforts to improve the living conditions of the workmen, members of those unions.

But there are one or two observations I would like to make relative to the matter of strikes, insofar as the general public is concerned.

Back in January, 1952, the City of Toronto endured a street railway strike, by reason of which many of the citizens of this city were very badly inconvenienced. What happened? It was soon found that the citizens pooled their resources in regards to cars, and eventually reached a point where they were able to provide their own transportation facilities.

But let us imagine what the result would be if we have a strike in a public utility, such as a hydro project, or a filtration plant, or a sewage-disposal plant in a large, urban centre such as the Greater Toronto Metropolitan Area. If a strike were to be called whereby the public would be deprived of its water supply, or sanitary conveniences, not only would the public be inconvenienced, but the health of those living in the entire area would be in danger, and indeed the health of the citizens of this entire province might well be endangered.

I know that all hon. members appreciate the fact that labour has had, and should have, the right to strike. That is one of the basic principles which we have had with us for many, many years. But should we not consider this factor, Mr. Speaker, that labour should also appreciate the fact that as need arises, it must co-operate with industry and with management? I think, insofar as labour is concerned, it is anxious to co-operate with industry and management; it is anxious to see that its workers are given the greatest possible benefits, and we can have no quarrel with that. But I do feel at times that perhaps legislation, such as we have in regard to the Police Act and the Fire

Department Act, where arbitration is required, might be well enacted in regard to other public utilities, the cessation of the functions of which might endanger the health of the public at large, and that this legislation should require arbitration, rather than the right to strike.

All down through the years there have been many applications for arbitration, both by police departments and fire departments, and after the arbitration proceedings have been had, the differences have been resolved, and satisfactorily dealt with, and everybody has gone away happy, without anybody being inconvenienced, and there have always been fire and police services. Could not something of a similar nature be provided in cases such as I have indicated, which may affect vital public utilities, for the benefit of the public at large?

Mr. Speaker, the situation, as far as labour is concerned, resolves itself into this; co-operation between management and labour will produce an increased variety of products, will provide more ready markets for our goods, increase our commodity production, and increase employment.

Today we are faced with great increases in the population in Ontario, and Ontario is going ahead—in fact, it is bound to go ahead. Ontario is progressive in its character, and in its

economy, and in regard to what is good for all, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if we co-operate together, there is no doubt that Ontario will be the best province in this fair Dominion, and there will also be a grand opportunity provided for this government to continue to give the good government for the people of this province, it has always provided in days gone by.

—Mr. Acting Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

—Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister indicate the programme for tomorrow? Are we going on with this debate?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we shall go on with the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne tomorrow, and probably consider some bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.33 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Wednesday, February 24, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 24, 1954.

Motion to add names of Messrs. Allan, Allen, Cathcart, Janes and Parry to Standing Committee on Mining, Mr. Frost, agreed to	197
Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Cowling, Mr. Wren ..	202
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wardrope, agreed to	221
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	221

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Chief Election Officer and laid upon the table a certificate of the result of a by-election held since the last session of the House.

Electoral District of Simcoe East.

Mr. Lloyd Letherby.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg your permission to leave the Chamber accompanied by the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch) to escort the member elect for the riding of Simcoe East to the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present Mr. Lloyd Letherby, the member elect for the riding of Simcoe East. He has taken the oaths, signed the roll and now claims his right to a seat in this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the names of Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Allen (Middlesex South), Cathcart, Janes and Parry be added to the Standing Committee on Mining.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: I might as well present this motion now with relation to our Friday procedure.

HON. MR. FROST moves that commencing Friday, February 26th, and thereafter on each Friday of the present session of the Assembly, this House shall meet at 2.00 of the clock in the afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they apply to this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The Annual Report of the Department of Reform Institutions for the Province of Ontario for the year ending March 31st, 1953.

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I wish to make reference to certain remarks made in this House yesterday by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) who referred to the Cachia case.

That, as the hon. members will recall from the remarks of the hon. member, involved a young man who was convicted on his first trial of some offence connected with armed robbery, or an offence of a similar kind. After that conviction some further information was brought to light and brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice at Ottawa, who ordered a new trial.

The second trial was held and he was convicted again, but further investigations were proceeded with. I must give credit to the hon. member for Riverdale for the part he took in getting these investigations into motion. As a result of these investigations made by the Criminal Investigations Branch of the provincial police, a further witness was found whose evidence in some respects corroborated the alibi put forward by Cachia at the first two trials.

The first two trials, I might say, were tried each one by a different County Court Judge with a jury. At the last trial apparently the accused elected to be tried by a County Court Judge without a jury, and when the evidence was heard in the third trial, with the additional evidence which was produced on that occasion, the County Court Judge acquitted this accused.

I might say at the outset that the remarks of the hon. member were, in some respects, a serious reflection upon some of the officials concerned, and I immediately asked for a complete investigation and information about this case. I have not yet, perhaps, complete information on all aspects of it. I am obtaining copies of the evidence adduced at the first two trials. In the third trial the evidence was not transcribed. I hope to have as complete evidence as possible as to what did happen shortly. However, at the present time, there is certain information which I have which I think I should present to the House to clarify, at least in part, the situation.

The hon. member said that at the first trial an attempt was made to gain a conviction by "back door methods," a conviction based upon a confession which was made by this accused. Mr. Speaker, the information I have is to the effect that at the first trial, or prior to the first trial, a confession was made by the accused to two members of the Toronto police force which, of course, came into the possession of the Crown Attorney who was handling this case, one of the most experienced Crown Attorneys we have in the Toronto courts. This Crown Attorney denies that he went to the judge in his

chambers and disclosed the contents of the confession to him. As far as I can find out at the present time, there does not appear to be any basis for the suggestion that there was any attempt to influence the judge's mind on this particular point.

MR. OLIVER: It was really more than a suggestion, was it not?

HON. MR. PORTER: It was a suggestion. That was one side of the case. I am giving the other side.

I might further say in view of the fact this was a case to be tried by a judge and a jury, the judge had no power to convict. It was the jury which had the responsibility of deciding upon the guilt or innocence of this accused. So that, unless the confession were placed before the jury, the confession could have no part at all in the outcome of the case. As the case proceeded, the Crown decided to have the issues tried on the evidence of the witnesses available, and he decided not to introduce this confession at all.

So, in the first case, the man was convicted upon the evidence of witnesses, rightly or wrongly; nevertheless, it was sworn evidence of witnesses in open court subject to cross-examination before a Senior County Court Judge of the County of York, and twelve jurors who heard the evidence.

Apparently, in that case the jurors did not believe the evidence of the accused and the evidence of the witnesses who attempted to substantiate his alibi.

Whether they were right, or whether they were wrong, that is the information of what happened at the first trial.

During the second trial, there were a different Crown Attorney and a different judge, and I have not yet been able to get in touch with the persons involved to see whether there was any presentation of this confession to the judge at that trial. However, the hon. member indicated the first trial yesterday and that may or may not be so. At the second trial, again before a judge and a jury, the Crown decided not to present the confession as part of the Crown's case. I may say, it is not a

The third point was this—and it arises from the second—that it was completely indigestible. The complication of government and administration, and the varying degrees of the development of all these municipalities made the impact overwhelming. Amalgamation would not work.

Those were the reasons the bill was introduced about a year ago today. That was the position then. I think this article raises the point: "What do I think now, what do those associated with me think?" I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the answer: That confederation—if I can put it that way—was right a year ago, that everything that has happened since that time has borne out the opinion I have expressed as the reasons I gave you against amalgamation.

We are certain of this, that on February 24th, 1954, the metropolitan principle is positively right today, that there has been shown to be no alternative to what was done for the future. It is my belief today, and I think the belief of my colleagues, that this form of government is the right form of government for this great area in the future. I do not come here and say there may be no changes. I do not say there may not be alterations in this—it would be almost inevitable, almost unbelievable that such would not be the case, but it is an amazing thing to be able to come before you today on the anniversary of the introduction of this bill and say that there are no amendments to the bill in 1954 unless they are comparatively minor amendments—I would not say there would not be, but there is nothing fundamental.

I think the principle of this bill carries out this idea. In a great area such as this, Mr. Speaker, there are varying degrees of conditions. There are going to be varying degrees in the future and that a form of government that leads to the centralization of the essentials and to a decentralization of those things that are capable of being handled by the constituent parts of the area, is the right form of government. I

may say, Mr. Speaker, if I had any doubts about it a year ago—and I did not because I felt that with the care we had taken we were right—they are dispelled.

May I say something about the Council? The chairman of the Metropolitan Board is in the House today. I would not want the Metropolitan Board to think their efforts are not appreciated. I would not want them to think that this is an expedient to do something else and that what they do today may be undone tomorrow. That, sir, is not the view of the government. I want to express my appreciation to the members of the Boards, both the Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan School Board, for the very broad way they have taken hold of this problem. I want to express the appreciation of all the people for this. The late Mr. Shannon did not share the view that was taken in Bill 80 at the outset, but afterwards there was no more loyal person in co-operating in carrying out the intent of that bill than Louis Shannon. That is true of all the members.

Of course, there are different points of view expressed. Of course, some of the members take the view of their local municipalities. But I ask hon. members of this House whether the same thing does not happen in relation to hon. members' own ridings. It is a right thing to do provided we take in this House a broad view of the general betterment of Ontario and her people. I think the matter that we have some local pride and some balance towards the communities from which we come is all part and parcel of serving, not only this area, but all Ontario.

So I want to dispel from the minds of the people of Metropolitan Toronto the idea that we have any feelings here whatever other than that this method of doing this great task is the only method which could have been devised and the method which could work, and we are satisfied that the representatives of this great community, from Scarboro on the east to Etobicoke on the west will all do their very best for the great community they represent.

HON. MR. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I would like to refer to the last paragraphs in the *Globe and Mail* article:

The key to provincial thinking probably lies in amendments to the Municipal Act recently laid before the Ontario Legislature.

One amendment provides authority to be given for an application to dissolve the Board of Management established for an interurban area, under section 22 of the present Act. This is the section of the Act on which the bill creating the Metropolitan area was based.

The hon. members know that that was not based on that section at all. This interurban section was placed on the Statute Book 65 years ago. One municipality has taken advantage of it, that is, Burlington and Nelson Township. It has not worked out well and when Mimico made application to the board to apply that, the board could not agree, and turned it down, stating the disadvantages of this interurban area.

I am not going to bore you with what the board said, but they would not recommend it and said it was not worthwhile. They went further and they said to our department they felt it was not workable and should be taken off the Statute Books and I said while one municipality was endeavouring to make it work we should leave it there. They did not have the power to dissolve that interurban board. They had the power over several other boards but not the interurban board and that is why the amendment provided for the dissolving of all boards by the Municipal Board, to give them that power. If the Town of Burlington and the Township of Nelson so desired, they could apply to the Municipal Board which has power to dissolve that municipality. That is all that legislation means.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to take the opportunity to welcome to the Assembly today students of the Orde Street School and Ryerson Public School. I am happy to welcome the students of the various schools and

colleges, in order that they may gain, I hope, considerable inspiration and enthusiasm for the way in which the government of the province carries on its various duties and obligations.

HON. MR. FROST: Before the Orders of the day I also want to say again at this time something about *Hansard*. My attention has been drawn to page 128 of the *Hansard* of February 19. I see on that page that at the bottom of the right-hand column it says:

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two corrections I have. In reading over the report yesterday evening I noticed points which I thought we should have discussed at the time.

Now sir, I was not in the House at the time. As a matter of fact I had to leave. I did not have the privilege of hearing the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett). I believe, he said that. That is on the bottom of page 128 where it says "Mr. Frost."

I think perhaps what the hon. member said was quite correct. I would not question that, but I know that he would not want to have attributed to me things that he said. I also notice on page 130 that "Mr. Frost" comes into it again. That was Mr. Porter. It was not "Mr. Frost" because he was not in the House at the time.

I just make these points for the benefit of the House. I do not disagree with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). It is just that I have strong views in that connection. I do not disagree with what the hon. member opposite said either, but I just point this out to the hon. members who have for so long pressed me to have *Hansard* printed. Again this raises in my mind a thought as to the desirability of this particular institution. I just say that because we ought to be more careful about these matters.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, the other day the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) said something about "health

insurance" and the need for it in this province and I would like to make a few comments on that matter, if I may.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the time has arrived when we should have any form of health insurance in the Province of Ontario. As you know, these schemes are in effect in the Provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan and there is a partial scheme in Alberta and Newfoundland. I have some interesting figures here in which I think the hon. members of the House would be intensely interested.

Health insurance is something which has been talked about for quite some time, and it has been tried in many lands, but I do not believe the time has yet come to consider it here in Ontario. It is a well-known wish of the three national Parties, the Progressive Conservatives, the Liberals and the CCF to bring on a health scheme of some kind, and I am not going to say whether the Federal Government is in a position to go ahead with it or not. That is entirely up to them. I am going to confine my remarks to what we should or should not do in the Province of Ontario. But it does seem when we talk about health insurance or insurance of any kind, our socialistic group is interested in taking over insurance. I have not found out just why, other than that they might think that people in the insurance business, or insurance companies have all the money today, but if they think that I can assure them that a great many of us do not.

It is a great thing to have free choice. I am a great supporter of free enterprise. I believe that people should be able to choose the things they want. That is what we stand for in Canada. That is our way of life, to be able to choose those things which we think are best suited to our needs or requirements. As soon as the government steps into the picture, we have compulsion and anything that smacks of compulsion I am opposed to, and I think our government is opposed to it. I know we can point the finger at the Ontario Hydro and at our TTC here in Toronto and some other organizations that are doing a wonderful job and could be considered

under control of a government, either municipal or provincial, but I am not going to argue that one way or the other. I would like to confine my remarks strictly to insurance.

These health schemes cost the taxpayers a great deal of money and, Mr. Speaker, I do not think at this time our government should assume or consider assuming a large and unpredictable expense which would be incurred through a health scheme, to say nothing concerning the lack of hospitals, doctors, nurses and so on.

I do not want you to feel, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to some sort of investigations being carried out or to a committee being appointed to investigate all phases of a health set-up. I think it is all right that we should be studying and looking to the future, but at the present time we are not in a position to do it.

I have got some figures, which will make rather interesting reading in *Hansard*. For example, approximately 52 per cent. of the cost of hospital plans—and I am speaking now of the Saskatchewan hospital plan—is being paid from general revenue. In all these state health plans one hears about the low cost of premiums as compared with premiums charged by private insurance companies. But if you stop to consider that any deficit is simply taken out of the general revenue, or the Consolidated Revenue Fund—whatever you choose to call it—then you can appreciate the fact that indirectly the taxpayer is paying finally for them. Even though the premiums may be low, the deficits are high. The steadily growing increase in the number of people participating in private-insurance schemes is an indication that private insurance is doing the job up to now—that they are providing a type of health coverage the majority of Canadians want. In a recent survey, I think it was in the year 1952, there were 5,500,000 people in Canada covered by private health insurance. Out of a population of 15,000,000 I would say that was a pretty good percentage. Here in Ontario we have by far the largest percentage. It is almost,

from the last records, 65 per cent. of the people of Ontario who are insured by private insurance companies under health schemes.

When we are comparing Ontario with other provinces, we must think of population. In Ontario we have 5,000,000 people. In British Columbia they have about 1,000,000. In Saskatchewan they have 700,000 or 800,000—not nearly as many as the population of Metropolitan Toronto. Newfoundland has considerably less. So that in comparing provinces and considering health schemes, we must consider population and fitness. That is very important to me. As a matter of fact, I recall that during the last provincial election, there was a great deal of talk of automobile insurance, and the great job that is being done by the Saskatchewan CCF Government.

Mr. Speaker, there again they are talking about a low-population area. There are more cars in greater Toronto than in the whole of the Province of Saskatchewan and naturally the risk is greater, the number of accidents is greatly increased and you cannot put the premium on the same basis as you can in those rural areas.

In 1952, the Saskatchewan provincial health plan premiums brought in approximately \$6 million and the actual cost of the provincial insurance scheme was \$15 million, so approximately \$9 million came out of general revenue. Even in the face of that I noticed in the paper the other day that insurance premiums had been increased again in that province, so they are steadily rising as the cost of living goes up. In British Columbia, the maximum premium was \$40.00, the actual cost to the subscriber was \$100.00 through indirect taxation.

In Ontario a comprehensive health plan would cost about \$47.40, roughly. A voluntary coverage would cost \$47.40, and the compulsory health insurance would cost about \$100.00 in British Columbia. In British Columbia, the premium amounts to \$39.00 plus \$1.00 a day paid by the patient for each day in hospital, and in 1952, actual premiums collected amounted to some \$15 million,

but the actual cost of the health scheme was over \$17 million. So, Mr. Speaker, before we get "het up" about a health plan, I think we should take into consideration the unpredictable cost it would involve. I have nothing against taking care of the needy in the event of sickness. That must be paid for. I think that is the duty of the government. But taking the whole population, by and large, as of now, I think the average resident of Ontario would prefer to select the scheme or the plan of his choice and pay the premium that he wishes.

I have some other figures which may be interesting. I was talking to some people the other day and they told me that a recent survey in the United States showed that 85 per cent. of the people in the United States did not have any outstanding hospital or medical plan. Thirteen per cent. of the people in the United States had some and 2 per cent. had very heavy hospital or medical bills. Applying that percentage here to Canada, I think you can see that the general public are being well served by private insurers, that the majority of the people have the type of coverage they wish to buy, and at the present time I would be opposed to any form of compulsory health insurance.

What I wanted to speak about today particularly, Mr. Speaker, was on the subject of conservation. Before I begin, I would like to extend my personal hearty welcome to the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley). We have been associated in many projects together. Today, sitting on my right, is my good friend, the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby). I congratulate these two members on their election and on coming into the House. At the same time, I would like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister, because by being head of our government, Mr. Speaker, he just makes it that much easier for any of us to be elected.

Conservation is a very controversial subject. I have had the opportunity of going through the report of the Conservation Committee of 1950, and I would like to congratulate them, Mr. Speaker.

They have done a very excellent job. In 1946, the Ontario Government passed the Conservation Authorities Act, and conservation authorities have been very active since that time. They do cover a variety of subjects. They cover such things as flood control, pollution control, reforestation, land use and so on.

I would like to confine my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, particularly to land use and parks and recreational areas, and things of that kind.

There are 15 conservation authorities now in the Province of Ontario. They cover a total land area of some 10,505 acres, and a membership of 256 municipalities. I think you are all familiar with the various authorities and where they are located. I think one very important point to remember is that I know very definitely that large employers seeking a place to establish themselves in Canada, either from the United States or Great Britain, always consider the recreational facilities in a given area, before they decide to build a plant and hire employees. They want their employees to be well and to be happy, and they want them to have some recreation close at hand.

I cannot help thinking of our lake-front area in Toronto which has been polluted definitely for years, and even today, Mr. Speaker, you cannot swim in our beautiful lake near Toronto. Even as recently as last summer, I was down there, and found thousands of people on a hot summer's day, but very few of them in the water. Those who go in the water are taking a chance, because according to the Medical Officer of Health for Toronto, the water in front of the city is not just right for swimming.

I would also like to congratulate the *Globe and Mail*. They have been receiving a great many congratulations lately, but they have been very much in the forefront in this matter of conservation, and have had some excellent editorials in their paper in the last several years which I have found most interesting and helpful, and I think they are showing leadership in this great problem.

Coming close to home again, Mr. Speaker, we had a little "to-do" a little while ago about some parkettes in front of our Parliament Buildings in connection with parking for the civil servants. I wonder if we should not have some rather long-range programme for providing parking for these people. We cannot tell them not to bring their cars down, so let us provide some parking which will not take away from this beautiful park area around our own beautiful Parliament Buildings. There is very little of it left, and I think we should be very keen to see it is left as it is. Let us provide parking, underground, overground, or in garages or somewhere. Let us preserve the beautiful grounds around Queen's Park.

Getting back to the matter of Conservation Authorities. I think I should tell you about a trip I had the pleasure of making last September, together with members of the Humber Valley Conservation Authority. We went to the city of Detroit. Although I do not like making comparisons between Canada and the United States, because, quite frankly, I do not think there is any comparison—we are away out in front—but there are some things where they seem to be making some headway. They have a scheme in Detroit called the "Huron Clinton Conservation Authority" which is really something to see. It is within an hour's drive from downtown Detroit, and it is very easy to drive out there on a summer afternoon and enjoy the facilities.

They have parking there for 6,000 automobiles, and last year, they entertained more than 700,000 people. They have a beautiful lake which covers about 1,200 acres. They have fishing, boating, swimming and all those things that we do not have here. I could not help but think of that hot spell we had last summer in Toronto and other places.

We decided to go on a picnic one afternoon and we just could not find anywhere in this entire metropolitan area a place to have a picnic without being on private property. There is not a place on Lake Simcoe where you can picnic for the day.

The time is overdue for some definite programme to be arranged to provide this much-needed park ground and recreational area around all large centres.

I know on our way back from visiting the Huron-Clinton Authority, we stopped at the new dam up there on the Thames River. That is a very wonderful structure, and, as so many people have remarked lately, it has been the means of keeping the flood waters out of the City of London. That was a joint project financed 37½ per cent. by the Federal Government, 37½ per cent. by the Provincial Government, and the other 25 per cent. as assessed to the municipalities that would benefit by that project. They have the dam which has made a nice lake, and I can see in the very near future. Mr. Speaker, because it is within 10 or 15 minutes of downtown London, they will have the same asset as the recreational set-up has in Detroit. Everything is there to be done; all the land is ready for use, and it just takes a little initiative and action to go ahead.

Incidentally I would point out that the City of Detroit which, of course, has a very large population in that area, makes most of the financial contribution—I think the same thing should hold good here in Toronto. I think in the new Metropolitan Toronto, the Metropolitan Council should be prepared to provide most of the money for the conservation authorities of this area.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking as a city member and I would like to congratulate the many hon. members from the farms and rural districts of this great province of ours, because I believe they are taking the lead and showing us something about conservation about which we do not hear in my own city. I feel that if we will come up to the standards of those people concerned with the rural way of life, shall we say—as the hon. Attorney-General refers to them—that between us we can eventually have the kind of conservation areas we all want.

I think one of the important things to remember, Mr. Speaker, is education. We need to be educated in the matter

of conservation. I often think that the word itself is a very difficult thing to understand. It is a very dry, dull word, "conservation". I think if we can brighten it up and give it a new name, we would interest a great many people. It has such ramifications and covers such a wide area, it is difficult for the man on the street to tell you what conservation is. If we can brighten it up, call it by a new name and turn it over to the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity, he could do something with it.

At any rate, conservation is something we must all begin to understand. I checked with the hon. Minister of Education in connection with it and he gave me a note which I have here and which I think is worth repeating. He says, officials of the Department of Education tell him that conservation is taught in our schools in geography, elementary science, history, English as well as other subjects. As a matter of fact, the general atmosphere of our schools is one of conservation. I think that is all very well, but at the same time in order to encourage teachers to discuss this problem of conservation and teach it in the schools, my thought is that the hon. Minister of Education might consider offering a special course for teachers, giving them a special diploma which would qualify them in the teaching of conservation in schools. It would give them something toward which to aim, so they would not lose conservation in the hurly-burly of teaching other subjects. They would be qualified; they would have the diploma stating they are qualified to teach conservation.

I think in that way, Mr. Speaker, we can give the young people of today more to think about, because after all if the young people of today have an understanding of conservation and what is being done about it, it will make our province the grand province which we hope it will be in the future.

There has been considerable in the papers lately about the "green belt" about Toronto, and around Ottawa, London, Windsor, Sarnia and so many other places in the province. As a matter

of fact I have a note here about some of the places where they have green belts. In the British Isles, they have them in London, Manchester, Glasgow. In the United States, they have them in Washington, D.C., New York, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit and so on. Ottawa is a good example here in our own country.

Those are words, Mr. Speaker, which are difficult to define—"green belt." The average man on the street thinks "green belt" is something you wear around your waist. A green belt could be called, for instance, a "park land". We are going to have an area around a large urban centre separating the factories, houses and so on from the country areas. It would be a series of parks. That is actually what it is. It might be a golf course, a park, or anything of that nature. Let us change the term, "green belt" to "park lands". I think it would be much more specific and much easier for the average person to understand.

I am in favour of the green belt idea, and I think the sooner we proceed with getting green belts and paying for them, the sooner we will have the type of recreational area we want.

I want to make some mention here of the "pinery," which I understand is near Sarnia. There is a great area there and they have asked for certain funds to get it started, and as soon as it is "O.K.'d" by the Municipal Board, they will have a beautiful area to develop for recreation.

The province is taking the lead. The province up to date has done a good job. I think possibly in some cases, Mr. Speaker, they could do more. They could help out financially.

We had a meeting this morning of the Standing Committee on Conservation, and I heard some ideas from some of the rural members who have had much longer experience than I have had in matters of conservation. The point was raised that in the smaller centres, a number of small municipalities just do not have the finances to start a conservation authority, and there is no way they can go ahead.

It was suggested possibly the province should consider making special grants to those areas where they cannot raise sufficient money to get the thing started. I think they contribute on a dollar-for-dollar basis, and that gives the local municipality something to think about, but we could stretch a point and assist some of the smaller areas, to get started.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should also give some consideration to water. The water supply in this great province of ours is not unending, and if something is not done to clear up the water situation, and we do something about pollution, we will not have clear water. I had the pleasure of attending a university extension lecture on conservation with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) who spoke there. Also present was Mr. John Fisher, who is an outstanding authority on almost anything you care to mention. At this particular time he was talking about water and among other things he said that in Los Angeles they are concerned about fresh water. They have set up there a plant to transform salt water to fresh water but it is not enough. They are running out of water and the situation is so bad that they are endeavouring to get water back out of the sewers to be used again. I do not prophesy that things are going to get that bad here in Ontario by any means, but now is the time to be doing something about it. On the outskirts of our larger urban centres garbage is actually dumped into our streams and rivers. You can go up the Humber, the Thames, any of these rivers and find this is so. People do not think enough of conservation: they keep dumping in this refuse. You cannot go into any of these lakes or rivers near centres of population because of this. Why cannot something be done about pollution?

I think, too, in some of these projects we could have greater assistance from the Federal Government because they have an interest in conservation and in the welfare of the people generally. I think if we have proper co-ordination between the federal and provincial governments, and then with the municipal authorities, we will secure the kind

of conservation work we need in Ontario.

We have 13 parks. In the State of New York they have 9. I was very pleased, as I know, Mr. Speaker, other hon. members of the House will also be, to read in the Speech from the Throne that something is going to be done about park areas and we are going to have an extension of them.

Speaking of water; I read an interesting piece the other day referring to water running down and taking good land and top soil away.

Beefsteak, potatoes and bread and butter with jam on it are being washed down our rivers each year in the form of good rich top soil.

That is what is going on in our lakes and rivers today. I would like to speak about the Humber Valley Conservation Authority. I attended a meeting of that authority the other night. They have a new picture. It is entitled *Our Valley* taken in technicolor and they have already made hundreds of showings of that picture throughout Toronto, and they are going to continue to do that great job of public relations—a great job in getting the public interested in conservation.

For the record I would like to tell you how the legislation works for establishing parks and park areas. In the first place there is the Ontario provincial legislation. There are The Local Improvement Act, The Provincial Parks Act, The Public Parks Act, The Municipal Act, The Niagara Parks Act. The Planning Act, and there is also the Conservation Authorities Act.

The reason I am mentioning these, Mr. Speaker, is that in the matter of conservation I think we have it spread possibly among too many departments. We have a Department of Planning and Development which is doing an excellent job; we have a Department of Agriculture and a Department of Public Works, a Department of Education and a Department of Travel and Publicity and it is my feeling that eventually it may be deemed advisable to set up a Department, with a Minister, directly respon-

sible for conservation in all its many phases, and that may be the eventual answer to this thing.

Now, getting back to Toronto, we have the Don Valley Authority and the Humber Valley Service Authority and it is my firm conviction these authorities should be joined into one large conservation authority to cover this whole Metropolitan area. I think that by doing that they can eliminate a great deal of the difficulty they are experiencing now. I know that, as far as the City of Toronto is concerned, they are prepared to pay their share and it is quite a large share. I was very pleased to note the other day that the City Council of Toronto is prepared to turn over the Island to the Metropolitan Council. In my own view, Mr. Speaker, that is a great move, and I can foresee some day when our Toronto Island will be turned into a great recreational area and park land for use of everybody, and all the houses and temporary buildings there will be removed.

I was attending a Dominion Day regatta on the Island last July. We had contestants there from all parts of Ontario, from the United States and from other parts of Canada. They had rowing and canoe races, and so on, at a place called "Long Pond." This Long Pond is less than the regular size for Olympic races, and may I say that perhaps if this is going to be an area to serve all the people of Ontario, it may be the government would consider doing something to assist in that project. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we hope—and we are now seeking—to have the 1960 Olympics take place in the City of Toronto and everything that can be done is being done toward that end.

I would like to say a word about High Park and Riverdale Park. Here in Toronto as you drive through our beautiful High Park on a summer evening, you cannot find a place to park. If we had the necessary park and recreational areas within an hour's drive of downtown Toronto we could end that situation and provide the people with the necessary outlets for recreational purposes. Mr. Speaker, I cannot

help but speak on this subject, because I think it is one which needs urgent attention. There is a great urgency for getting down to this matter of conservation. It is a misunderstood subject; it is something which has gone along through the years, and I think the time has come now when we should try to make conservation what it should be. In going over the report of the committee I noticed some of their recommendations. Some are good, and many have been implemented already. There is one mention here of recreation: "The government is formulating a policy in respect to Crown land for recreational purposes." I imagine the remarks in the Speech from the Throne cover that. I see that greater emphasis is to be given to the teaching of conservation in elementary and secondary schools, both rural and urban. I believe we are going to make a success of conservation through the conservation authorities. Large areas in this Province of Ontario must be prepared to assume a substantial part of the financial support of conservation authorities. We have the population. People say: "The people in the outskirts should pay their share, or more than their share because after all they live in the area." The point is, Mr. Speaker, that by far the majority of people using park facilities come directly from the city. So I think that we are compelled to act on this idea of conservation, if we take it up. If the province will give the necessary leadership, and if we can count on the support, financial and otherwise, of the provincial government, if we continue to do something about the various recommendations made by the Select Committee on Conservation, I feel, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get some place. I am very happy to be a member of the Standing Committee on Conservation, and I am sure that it will bring forward some very useful recommendations to the House.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): At the outset I would like to express on behalf of the community in which I live a word of thanks to the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Dunlop) for his splendid assistance and for his keen personal

interest in the erection of the new continuation school in that community, something that was seriously needed and something which the financial state of the municipality would have made difficult without his co-operation. We are indeed pleased as a community and I am pleased and proud.

Yesterday the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) made some remarks to this House, some of which were discussed before the Orders of the day, but they were not dealt with quite adequately by the hon. members today. Some of his remarks concerning the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and concerning the Liberal Party generally made one wonder if we sometimes spend too much money on education.

Speaking of the "spanking of the electoral bottom" which the hon. Leader of the Opposition is supposed to have received in 1951, I was wondering when the hon. member (Mr. Macaulay) was speaking yesterday if he recalled whose "electoral bottom" was the more red on the evening of August 10th last, and I wondered too if the hon. Mr. Drew might now bring out the gold-plated piano he played up and down Ontario and perhaps play on it the "Fort William Symphony." Yes, and have it drawn by some of the alleged horses from Petawawa, horses which the Conservative opposition at Ottawa never discussed in the report before the committee.

I know at the end too, the last government speaker said that he as well as the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) is opposed to provincial hospital insurance at this time. In that connection and along with the condemnation made yesterday of the Federal Government's proposed housing financial arrangements, I am led to wonder whether this Party is, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says, actually Progressive-Conservative, because it does seem to smack somewhat of the Tory thinking by which they used to take the four steps about anything which was of a progressive nature in Canada. Firstly, they used to say it

was unconstitutional; next, they would say it cannot be done because it would bankrupt us; then they would say it won't work anyways—but five years later they usually were found saying: "Why, we knew that all the time."

One of the things which I believe is important to the people of Ontario in these times, Mr. Speaker, is something we have discussed in this House before, not at any great length, but we have referred to it, and that is the strength of the opposition ranks in the House. Some criticism has been directed at times to the opposition ranks, to the effect that perhaps they are not doing as much as they should in criticizing the activities of the government. I wonder how many people realize that we have 20 departments to examine, and we do not have very many hon. members in opposition ranks. That was the reason the other day I took exception to the remarks of the hon. the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) as being ridiculous, when he referred to the help we have in our office. We do need, in our office, economists of the highest type, because there are things taking place in this province of very far-reaching effect, and hon. members of our Party in the House certainly cannot devote time to the necessary research, and still have the time to attend to all the necessary duties which the hon. members of this House are called upon to fulfill.

MR. KERR (Dovercourt): You are just making excuses.

MR. WREN: I do not require any excuses—and I do not think anyone in the Party does—and if the hon. member three seats to my right would contribute a little more himself to the activities of the province and of this House, we might be more enlightened.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to public attention lately that in the month of April the Ontario Liberal Party will meet again to select a new leader following the resignation of Mr. Thompson. I can assure this House, and I can assure the province, that the Party representatives in this House, and its members right across the province, are

certainly keenly interested in developing the Party, and I think a strengthening of the opposition will make for better government all around, and certainly better government, when the Party subsequently takes over the government, three or four years hence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three or four?

MR. WREN: Well, we might have an election this summer. I rather expect we will.

One thing which seems to have become a trend since the opening of this session and of course following the practice of others, is this parade of praise, and somehow or other we can never get an admission, despite this parade, that these conditions we are enjoying today are not so much the work of genius as they are the inspired offspring of time. But the government members of this House seem rather to spring from one delirium of attitude to another in order to maintain themselves at a very perilous height. May I admonish them to be careful that they do not get themselves in the position of an ostrich and bury their heads in the sand, because it is not only a blinding position to be in, it is also very vulnerable.

In speaking to this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the part of Ontario I come from, along with my three colleagues from that part of Ontario, namely Northwestern Ontario. I think it is generally recognized and is becoming more recognized as time passes, that Northwestern Ontario is indeed not only an important section of the province, it is certainly the crossroads of Canada, because no matter what takes place in Canada in the transfer of material from east to west or vice versa and the travel of people back and forth across our nation, they all must pass through our part of this province. I think as time goes on it will be generally realized that Northwestern Ontario is actually the head and shoulders of this province, both in the physical sense when you look at the map of the province, where it contains almost 60 per cent. of the total land

area, and you will note too that in it we have potentialities and now actualities of a great empire within our own province.

The area, Mr. Speaker, is actually one unit interdependent district by district for progress. We have our common economy and we have our common problems and whenever we of Northwestern Ontario are talking about it, you will find that each of us, in discussing our particular problem, is actually posing a problem which is common, usually, to all others.

May I briefly remind you, sir, of some of the important developments which are and have been taking place in that great part of Ontario. You will note the continued expansion of the Steep Rock Iron Mines and attendant areas, the sustained and expanding pulp and paper industry, the gold mining areas of Red Lake—and Red Lake does contribute much to the gold mining activity of the province—and recently you have noticed the sensational developments in the Manitouwadge District in the area represented by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope). In that connection I have noticed some remarks in the mining press to the effect that the Noranda people are interested in obtaining control of sections in that area for the purpose of enlarging production at their smelters in Quebec. I wish to remind the government that we in Northwestern Ontario are most anxious that if smelters become necessary to reduce the products of that mine, that those smelters be erected in Northwestern Ontario and operated there.

In the area of the northwestern part of my own riding, we have significant nickel and copper discoveries and the Quebec Nickel and many other companies are doing important work now in the area northwest of the Town of Kenora. Attendant upon that, in the mid-area of my own riding we have under way now upwards of a \$15 million expenditure on a development by the Hydro of the Manitou Falls power project. That is going to add a great deal to our power supply in that

part of the country and we look forward to that important addition to our economy.

As the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) reminded you the other day, Mr. Speaker, we must never lose sight of the wealth we have in that part of the country, in our timber, in our water power, in our game and in our fish.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to raise one point also which I think is important, certainly very important to our part of Ontario. The tourist industry is becoming indeed a very important one. It employs a large number of people, it creates a great buying power and it generally has given a great spurt to the economy of the area. One of the great difficulties encountered in that particular industry is that of tourist operators who find difficulty in the capital financing of their operations. Inasmuch as it is a direct—or indirect as you may look at it—development of our natural resources in the entertainment and direction of tourists coming into this country, I think it would be wise if we could work out a workable scheme which would provide these people with capital from government sources along the lines available to junior and senior farmers and others. I think that for this reason, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that many of our younger men and women have gone into this business in Northwestern Ontario, the difficulty in expanding capital has brought about a situation where gradually American interests are assuming control of those camps and we are finding that in some sections of the northwest now the camp owners and operators in the majority are American citizens. I have no objection to Americans investing money in this country, but I do not see any reason why we cannot find some means to assist our own young people in establishing themselves in an industry which is, after all, part and parcel of the development of our natural resources.

Another important problem in that area is still one of transportation and access roads. I am not referring to any

difficulties about bridges, I mean the transportation and access situation generally. I must admit quite freely we have now developed a quite good, in fact I would say a very good, system of main highways across Northwestern Ontario. There are sections yet which need improvement on the Trans-Canada Highway system, but when I think back to 1932 and 1933 and the kind of roads we had at that time and look at them now, I recognize that we have come a long way. However, we do have a situation of difficulty of access for large segments of our population and it affects not only the personal lives of people in some of these communities, but it definitely affects the development of the area generally. Somehow there seems to be the thinking that if they have to build a road for us or want to build a road for us, then it has to cost a lot of money. Now that may be true in the Trans-Canada sense or in the main trunk roads, but I know, as was repeated in the Mining Committee the other day, that many sections of the northwestern part of the province would be perfectly content, and many have been content, with roads that would get them in and out of the places in which they live and connect them with main highways. I refer, for example, to one place in my riding, the important tourist and recreation centre of Minaki. There is a large number of people there in the summer months and in the winter there is quite a good-sized sustaining population, but they only have rail access to the outside, and it would not be an expensive undertaking to provide that community with an outlet. The same holds true with the community of Macintosh, another important tourist centre in the summer and again an area with a sustaining winter population of winter residents, Indian school staffs and so on. That too, and particularly since there are already lumber company access roads in the area, could be quickly and cheaply developed.

In this matter of mining access roads, the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) is to be complimented on the initiative he has displayed in developing mining roads in the sense that he seems to be

one of those persons who can make his dollars go quite a long way. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the development of these mining access roads is an item of ever-increasing importance in the budgets of the Department of Mines, and certainly the \$1,000,000 appropriation which has been the case in the last year or two could well be increased and could certainly be put to good use and have a good effect.

Another problem we have in that section, to which I referred to last year, and to which I now refer again, is the matter of hospital services and the need for zoning those hospital services into zones of influence, in other words creating hospital districts around the hospitals which serve a given area. The reason for that is that in the north we do not have the same situation you would have in Southern Ontario. Here you naturally have your county system, and particularly in the more settled areas you have an area served by a hospital, sometimes, as was mentioned the other day in Private Bills Committee, one hospital serving 7 or 8 municipalities in a fairly close radius. In the north we do not have that. The large area served is usually an unorganized section of the territory. It would be a great advantage if we could set up hospital districts and find some means of taxing or assessing those people in the unorganized sections who have just as ready use of the institutions as do the citizens of a particular community, but under present conditions are not liable directly for any capital costs or for any deficits which might occur, and usually do occur, in the operation of these hospitals.

Another problem in that connection, and certainly related to it, is that of the indigent patients, and again those indigent patients from unorganized territories. For the last few days I have been going through the financial statements of several hospitals up there, the Kenora General, the Dryden General, the Sioux Lookout General Hospital and one in the Thunder Bay District and generally the pattern is about the same. You will find an average cost per patient per day about \$11.40 upwards.

and the losses, through caring for indigent patients both from organized and unorganized territories—but the unorganized certainly predominate—are resulting in deficits to those institutions which run from \$9,000 upwards. Now I did note in the press the other day where the Department of Health had indicated that from this year on it might be possible that the share of indigent costs to municipalities or other responsible institutions might be reduced to a point where they would only be left with about one-sixth of the cost. That, Mr. Speaker, would be a decided improvement, indeed. Nevertheless, it is still a fact that there should not be the extra charge upon a municipality or upon any company or group that is operating a hospital for these people.

I will give you some examples of that, Mr. Speaker. For example, we had a patient in our hospital last year who is a particularly glaring case, but he happened to be an old-age pensioner who came in on what is known as a Form 176, as a provincial indigent patient, for which the hospital received \$3.00 per day. The man had some disease which required special drugs. I am not too familiar with the diagnosis, but it was a type which is difficult to handle and the drugs in that particular case alone were \$20.00 a day. The hospital was receiving \$3.00 for his care and spending \$20.00 for the cost of these drugs. None of that amount is recoverable and of course the man could not be turned away, for humanitarian reasons and others. If the treatment was required it had to be given to him.

That, of course, is a rather general situation in those cases; it is not often that the drug cost will reach \$20.00 a day, but drug costs from \$5.00 to \$10.00 a day are quite common, and in addition to the fact that the hospital is losing the revenue represented by the difference between the indigent rate and the actual cost, it is having to pay the cost of the drugs and the dressings and so on which might be added to it.

With that I will leave the general discussion in Northwestern Ontario and go on to some other matters of govern-

ment in which we are all interested. One thing I have been thinking about and, in fact, have been doing a little talking about lately, is the liquor problem in Ontario. Somehow or other this question continues to arise, and I think it is time we made some further study of these matters, because I think some of these problems in liquor distribution are self-created. One of course is that common problem which was referred to I believe by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) last year, that of the continued use of the extra amount of water in whiskey. That of course is a problem we are well aware of, but no one seems to do much about it. However, on the administrative side of the liquor question, one thing I think we should consider, and consider soon, is the elimination of the use of liquor permits. I think we have advanced to the stage now where it should not be necessary, as adult men and women, to have to go through this rigmarole in going to one of our liquor stores to make a purchase. I do not know why we cannot go in there as ordinary adult human beings when we want to make a purchase, make our needs known to the clerk on duty and pay the appropriate amount of money. Some people will suggest that the province earns a great revenue from the sale of these permits. I doubt very much whether the revenue received from the sale of permits, when compared to the extra cost of handling traffic and handling orders and so on, amounts to a great deal. However, supposing there is a balance to be gained by continuing the use of these permits, if necessary, there is no reason why another few cents could not be put on the purchase price of the product and this general nuisance eliminated.

Another thing which I think would bear more study and in which a good many people are interested is the problem of the suppliers of beer. There are many people who do not have the inclination to enter beverage rooms. There are other people who do not like the inconvenience and size of the purchases which might be necessary in the usual beer retailers. I can see no reason why in this day and age we should not put

our beer in the grocery store, as is done in the Province of Quebec and in a good many states of the Union. I do not know why it would not work; I do not know why it would not have a good effect actually on temperance across the province. I do not know why a family could not make their purchases in two or three units at a time if they so wish, along with their grocery order.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Is that personal to the hon. member (Mr. Wren)? Is that his own view?

MR. WREN: That is my own view I am expressing. May I say a few words now, Mr. Speaker, about the matter of health and hospitalization? As I said at the outset, I notice there seems to be some opposition in government ranks to developing a health insurance scheme at this time. Perhaps it was simply an oversight, I do not know, but it seemed significant to me that while the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) made direct reference to the health insurance scheme, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in replying to his remarks made no reference to it. However, Mr. Speaker, it is an opinion shared by thousands and thousands of people in all walks of life, including those in the medical profession, those in the business of administering hospitals and many others, that some solution should be found to the cost of health and hospitalization in this province. The previous speaker made some reference to, and quoted some likely statistics about, plans in other provinces and about the cost of plans in this province and what the average costs were to private insurance companies. I do not think anyone with any common sense, Mr. Speaker, has any idea that we can chase the private insurance companies out of business or make way for any costly or unwieldy system of health insurance, but I do not know why, in a province as wealthy as this one is and as wealthy as it will continue to be, we cannot work out some scheme which will take care of these extreme costs on the average family and assure the

proper care for those who have not the means even to subscribe to a Blue Cross or private insurance scheme, as the case may be.

I can say, without reservation, Mr. Speaker, that one thing which has been popular with the people of Saskatchewan, and one thing which I think is to the credit of the CCF Government in Saskatchewan, is their hospital plan. It is not the best plan in the world; it is not the worst. I think one of the common weaknesses of that plan is the fact that Saskatchewan does not enjoy the industrial wealth we enjoy in a province like this, and so its scope of activities is somewhat limited. However, it is a government plan. I am not too "sold" on the idea that the government should institute this plan, but I am "sold" on the idea that the government should make provision for many of the people who find it necessary to go to hospital, and for the disaster which follows incidents of that kind.

Along this line, may I suggest that in the interval between sessions, the government might give serious consideration to the appointment of a Select Committee of this House to investigate health insurance in Ontario, and a health plan; study the plans in British Columbia and Saskatchewan, and the limited plans in effect in Newfoundland and elsewhere, and bring back to this House and this government recommendations which will be workable, and sensible. An hon. member mentions elections. I am not so interested in elections as I am in the health and welfare of some of our people. I happen to know, first-hand, the personal tragedies which come from extensive illnesses, which have fallen upon people through no fault of their own.

I would suggest, too, Mr. Speaker, that actually the ones who are the worst off when this kind of trouble takes place, are not those who are entirely indigent, but the wage-earners, who are earning marginal incomes, and find that their \$50.00 or \$60.00 a week is stretched to the limit to feed and clothe their families. They are the ones who find it very difficult to go to hospitals, because they simply cannot pay bills, except in

very small amounts per month, and it makes it very hard for their wives and families to have to find the extra few dollars each month to enable them to go to a hospital, with their already overstrained weekly income. They are the people who suffer the most.

I presume most hon. members—as I do myself—belong to some scheme. I have belonged to one for some years, and we find that with advancing years, participation in these schemes usually brings increasing benefits, and that is why so many people are afraid they might lose something by joining any government-sponsored scheme. I do not think that would necessarily happen. I think a broad plan could be worked out, and could be made to work very successfully.

The other day the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gennell) introduced his White Paper on lands and forests. We have not had the opportunity of studying this document as yet, but I understand we are going to start on it in committee tomorrow morning.

There is one feature from a cursory reading of the report to which I would strenuously object, as I think a good many people in Ontario will, and that is the suggestion contained in the appendix to this report that a \$1.00 fishing licence be charged to residents. I do not think that is a good idea at all. As far as I am personally concerned—and I do not know what the attitude is of my Party—I would strenuously object to the imposition of a licence of that kind. There are very few things left to us these days which we can enjoy without having to pay a fee, or fill out a form, or see some civil servant, and I think the right of a man to take his fishing line and drop it into a lake and catch a fish, without having a \$1.00 price tag attached to it, should be maintained.

I could couple this remark with reference to a licence up until recently charged by the Federal Government. I refer to the radio licences. We were even charged for the air over which the sound travelled.

The Federal Government realized it

was a difficult licence to collect, and it was a sort of a "nuisance licence," and eventually abolished it. I think imposing a fishing licence upon the residents of Ontario would be a similar nuisance, and cause a great deal of grief to a large number of people.

Another matter which has been in the public attention for some time, and continues to be, is the highway scandals at Fort William. This, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious matter indeed. A person is somewhat at a loss to know what might best be done in these matters because so far there has been no attempt by the government to explain what has happened in the Department of Highways, and as far as I know, there has been no attempt on the part of the Provincial Auditor—who is, as I understand, responsible, not to the government, but to this Legislature—to bring a report before this House. The only information we have of an official, or semi-official nature, is the news items we have seen in the press from time to time.

In the press, there has been quite a sequence of reports. The first significant report was in the *Globe and Mail* of October 8th, 1953, when there was a report of irregularities and suspended clerks driving \$6,000 cars.

Then in the *Telegram* of January 16th, 1954, there was a report about the firing of a number of employees and proceeding to lay charges.

On February 18th, the *Telegram* carried a further report which added to the general material, detailing the non-existence of trucks and truckers being carried on the payrolls.

On January 21st, the *Telegram* carried a story referring to the scandal about 14 or 15 contracts in the area.

On January 22nd, more information was made available in the *Telegram*. And so on down the line.

We were assured by the hon. Prime Minister the other day there would be no delay in setting up the Public Accounts Committee, to enable this House to examine this question in committee. There is no reason, I submit,

Mr. Speaker, why this committee should not be called at the earliest possible moment. There is a great deal of work to be done in that committee, and a great deal of information which the government is bound, by its own statements to provide to this House and to the public, before the opposition begins their sequence of examination of any information which is made available.

There is one thing which compounds the seriousness of this situation in the northwest—and, indeed, in other parts of the province—and which I think is undermining the public confidence in public activities generally. This whole thing, Mr. Speaker, has become a reflection upon everything and everybody who has anything to do with public life, and I regret to have to state in this House that until the situation is satisfactorily explained in committee, or in this House, there is in the minds of the public of this province, some definite association between the Progressive Conservative Party and the operations of the Department of Highways.

It might be unfair to suggest the government should be held responsible for the actions of a provincial Party organization. Nevertheless, the activities of this Party organization in Northwestern Ontario—and if it is true there, it must be true, in like manner, in other parts of Ontario—are indeed worthy of close examination by the public.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker,—and again, without the authority from an examination of the Public Accounts—that the activities of the government in Northwestern Ontario produce for the Progressive Conservative Party a major portion of its campaign funds. Certainly the patronage practices in the northwest are exercised to the full in that part of Ontario, and it is a fact—not a rumour—that anything which might produce a profit with the expenditure of a minimum amount of energy, goes to someone who has taken the pledge of loyalty to the Progressive Conservative Party.

These things can have and do have the most serious ramifications. They invade not only the principle of what is

right and what is wrong, but they even invade the innermost aspects of the administration of justice in this province.

The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) made some remarks yesterday about the administration of justice, and the taking of evidence, which were serious in their import, and serious in their applications.

We have in Northwestern Ontario, a matter which is of very serious concern to the general public. It is not something which the Provincial Auditor does not know, and I do not think the government can suggest it does not know of the situation I am about to relate in connection with this matter.

Last summer, the Provincial Auditor made an investigation in our country on another matter, which has to do with the administration of public affairs, and as a result of his investigation I do not know whether the person concerned resigned or whether he was dismissed—I was not provided with that information—but, in any event, the Crown Attorney in the District of Kenora left the employment of the government.

Subsequently, during the fall months, according to a notice published in the *Ontario Weekly Notes*, the Law Society of Upper Canada published this notice of disbarment:

The Discipline Committee of the Law Society of Upper Canada found, after due enquiry, that Mr. Bernard Arnold Russell Taylor, of the Town of Kenora, in the District of Kenora, was guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a barrister and solicitor, in that he appropriated to his own use, certain sums of money and in connection therewith, forged the names of certain persons.

It goes on to say:

The Benchers of the Law Society adopted the committee's report and ordered that the said Bernard Arnold Russell Taylor be disbarred, and resolved that he is unworthy to practice as a solicitor; subsequently an order was made by the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Ontario, under

function of the Crown to obtain a conviction unless the Crown feels that there is sufficient evidence to justify it. So far as I know in these particular cases, the Crown Attorneys who handled these trials are men of great experience, and it is not their practice to attempt to get convictions at all costs. Their purpose is to get convictions if the evidence warrants it, and to fight the case as hard as it may be necessary, if the evidence warrants it, and if there are any extenuating circumstances or evidence in favour of the accused, it is their duty to make sure that is also fairly brought before the court.

But it was decided at the second trial not to introduce the confession. However, in the course of the evidence, for some reason which may be difficult to understand, the defence introduced the confession, and the accused made a statement that he made the confession before two police officers because they used a rubber hose or some instrument of that kind in order to force this confession from him. Then the two police officers were called as witnesses. My recollection is, I think, they were called by the defence, but that does not really make any difference, because they were called, they gave their evidence, they were subject to cross-examination, and both of these police officers swore under oath—both reputable members of the Toronto police force—that they did not use any rubber hose, that they had no rubber hose to use, and that they used no method of intimidation to obtain the confession that was made.

Whether true or not, that is the evidence with regard to the second trial.

In the third case, again the Crown Attorney decided not to use the confession but to rely on the evidence of the witnesses available, at which time the defence had an additional witness, and the judge decided that, with this additional evidence, the case for the Crown could not succeed.

Now Mr. Speaker, I intend to peruse the evidence when I have it available, and if there is any other aspect that might be of interest to this House, I will bring it forward in due course.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Would the Attorney-General care to utilize this occasion to reply to a rather important point raised by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) yesterday? I refer to his statement that this wrongly convicted person was in no way compensated for the loss of time which he served so unnecessarily.

MR. PORTER: Of course that is true of all criminal cases. I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) suggests there should be some policy providing compensation to every person who is acquitted. I do not know where that would take us or where one could draw the line, and there is always this to be considered, that when a man is acquitted, in some cases it is because there is not enough evidence to convict him. Very often he may be a guilty man but the Crown's evidence is not sufficient for a conviction. The benefit of the doubt is always, and rightly, in favour of the accused.

If the government must take the responsibility for compensating in all cases where an accused person is acquitted, I do not know just where that would lead. There has never been any such policy and I cannot say that there is any such policy contemplated at the present time.

MR. SALSBERG: That is too bad. There should be.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): I think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and other members of the House will see the difficulty. The judiciary is properly appointed by both Federal and Provincial Governments. Juries are a cross-section of the public chosen from the public. Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable that appointed officials, judges and magistrates, and juries of the people may make mistakes. Every effort is made to correct any mistake and prevent miscarriages of justice and I think the most meticulous care should be taken in that regard. That is one of the things that makes me fearful about capital punishment, which is irrevocable. But the

point is that it is the people, that is, the great public, the appointed officials and juries, who do these things. I do not know of any country in the Commonwealth, or any other place, where there is a policy whereby if there is a mistake in judgment of that sort, either criminal or civil, there is compensation for it. I think there are cases on record where perhaps there has been something done to lighten the effect of such a mistake. I may say that my experience in law was largely confined—I mean in criminal matters—to being a defence counsel. I had one case where a man was wrongly convicted in good faith by the magistrate and afterwards was exonerated. But, sir, I think the essence of this is good faith, and the fact that this is done really by the people themselves. I have never heard of any method of compensating for any mistakes that may happen in either criminal or civil cases. I suppose there is many a person who has been assessed damages by a jury, when another jury might have taken a different view, but, inevitably, this seems to be the only way we can handle these matters.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): The two things that concern me relative to this matter are the two rather definite charges the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) made yesterday in the course of his remarks. I think the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Porter) will agree with me they should either be substantiated or declared without any vestige of reasonable foundation in fact.

The two charges were, in the first place, as I recall them, as follows: The hon. member said that a rubber hose had been used in order to obtain a confession. That is a very, very serious charge and we should not leave this House without having in our possession evidence that will either substantiate or contradict that very definite charge.

The other charge was that the Crown Attorney was more interested in securing a conviction than in seeing that justice was done. That is another serious charge. The hon. member also said this conviction was based on evi-

dence not submitted in court but "sneaked in the back door." I suggest to this House that, if any Crown Attorney in this province is guilty of the practices that my hon. friend suggested yesterday, he should no longer be a Crown Attorney.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to another matter before the Orders of the day. My attention was drawn to an article in the *Globe and Mail* of this date, February 24th, headed "Is Metro A Matter For Laughs?" May I say, first of all, in answer to that headline, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is not a matter for laughs. The answer is "No."

Mr. Speaker, the tenor of the article was this: "Was this bill devised as a method of bringing about within a period of 3, 4 or 5 years a total amalgamation?" I want to state to the House, as I have stated before, those of us who have had to deal with this very complicated matter went through varying degrees of thought. There were varieties of opinion during the past 3 or 4 years as we became deeply engaged in these matters I could not hope to name all of them because a great number of persons were consulted, but the principal ones, I would say, were Mr. Cumming, Chairman of the Municipal Board, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and his Deputy, Mr. Orr, the hon. Attorney-General and a large number of advisers. We unanimously came to the decision—by various processes of thinking and various courses—that we were against amalgamation for these reasons: First, it was too late. Annexations may have been carried out over a period of about 35 years, but we came to this conclusion that amalgamations—that means annexation—of these areas by the City of Toronto could not now be undertaken because it was far too late. Moreover, in the second place, the area was too big, the problem was too big and filled with too many complications and there was nothing in our history or experience which could lead us to believe that anything but chaos would result from a complete amalgamation of this area.

Section 48 of the Law Society Act, striking his name off the rolls of the court.

It says that this man was disbarred from practice for appropriating to his own use funds which were provincial government funds.

HON. MR. PORTER: It does not say that.

MR. WREN: The Benchers of the Law Society are men who are well learned, and are not given to publishing accusations, unless they have good grounds to believe they are true.

HON. MR. PORTER: My recollection is that this matter had something to do with some other matters. I would like to find out to what the hon. member (Mr. Wren) is referring.

MR. WREN: As far as I can learn, there has never been a prosecution of this man, but I am not so much interested in that, because it has dragged on for some time, and I am not one who wants to persecute anyone. What I am concerned with is the principle involved, which is also the concern of every person in that part of the country. How are they to be assured that when an official in a very high place can be adjudged guilty, as the Law Society alleges, and not be brought to task, that anyone employed in the Department of Highways, or any other department of government, under similar circumstances, will not be brought before the courts, and public attention given to their transactions, and rightful justice meted out? It is not the right of the hon. Attorney-General or any other person, to determine whether or not a person has done something which is right or wrong. That is a matter for the courts. Our courts are established for that very purpose.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Wren) has known about this for some time. Why does he not lay a charge? He is a citizen in that part of the country.

MR. WREN: Has the hon. Attorney-General the temerity to suggest that while his department knows about these things, which were laid by his officials before him for his attention, that I should be the person to lay the charge?

HON. MR. PORTER: As a citizen, if you think the Attorney-General should lay a charge, but has not, and you know the facts, it is up to the hon. member to lay the charge, if he wants to do the right thing. All I can say is that the advice I received from the officials, after they had investigated the whole matter, was there was no basis for a criminal charge. The man was asked to resign, and he resigned. There was no loss of money—

MR. WREN: Is the hon. Attorney-General saying the Law Society dealt unfairly with this man?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know whether the Law Society did deal with him while he was the Crown Attorney, or after he had resigned. There had been some mention made about "forgery," but I do not think it had anything to do with the time when he was in our employ.

MR. WREN: The hon. Attorney-General says there was no loss of money.

HON. MR. PORTER: There were some irregularities in his accounts—

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): That is not the same thing. I suppose?

HON. MR. PORTER: It did not amount to a great deal in money, and there was restitution of whatever he did get.

MR. WREN: That is not good enough.

HON. MR. PORTER: The advice received was there was not evidence upon which any criminal charge could be laid in that case. The hon. member (Mr. Wren) thought there was.

He lives up there and apparently

knows all about it, yet he did not bring it to anybody's attention, and say, "As a citizen, I think this man should be charged. Up in my community they are all talking about it."

MR. WREN: The statement made by the hon. Attorney-General is not quite correct, Mr. Speaker.

I want to add, Mr. Speaker, there were other professional people—

HON. MR. PORTER: It was the same thing with a magistrate up in your part of the country.

MR. WREN: That was at Fort William.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. He was appointed by the Hepburn Government. Are you going to take responsibility for the whole province? The magistrate in Fort William was also found guilty of irregularities, using certain funds which should have been in a trust account, but he did not keep them in a trust account, and was told he would have to. He finally got the money into the trust account, but he was asked to resign.

MR. WREN: I do not know anything about the incident to which the hon. Attorney-General refers.

HON. MR. PORTER: You know all about the Kenora man, and you say there should have been a prosecution.

MR. WREN: I do not know all about it. I would like to know. I would like to have some evidence as to what was done.

HON. MR. PORTER: In any case, if the hon. member has any information or any evidence he thinks we should have—

MR. WREN: May I ask the hon. Attorney-General if he will table the evidence which he has, in this House?

HON. MR. PORTER: I think I can find it.

MR. WREN: Will the hon. Attorney-General table it?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, of course we will table it.

MR. WREN: Then it is a matter of making restitution? A senior Cabinet Minister of this government says that if restitution is made, all is well. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, how far that policy will be extended? If anyone in the employ of the Department of Highways should be charged, and makes restitution, is the matter completely over? Is that the policy of the government?

HON. MR. PORTER: It all depends on circumstances.

MR. WREN: The circumstances are such that all of these things should properly be the business of the Legislature of this province, and these matters should not have to be brought to light by publishing the cause and effects of misdeeds in a publication which is available to anybody who wants to read it.

HON. MR. PORTER: As I say, the misdeeds mentioned—well, I will have to investigate this.

MR. WREN: I think you should.

HON. MR. PORTER: As far as I know, some of these have nothing to do with this man's activities while he was the Crown Attorney. However, I will look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask there be no expressions from the galleries at all.

MR. WREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude that portion of my remarks by saying the people in Northwestern Ontario are very apprehensive of what might be done with people who are found to have been misappropriating government funds, or misbehaving in some other manner. They are very reluctant to believe there will be any sincerity shown in other departments when irregularities are found.

There was another example of what has taken place, where another professional group—which has nothing to

do with the legal profession—found itself in difficulties. This very same man came to Toronto and was given instructions here to prosecute, and to paraphrase, he went back and literally “threw the book at him.” But when the Crown official himself—a man who should be an example in public service, an example to everyone connected with the administration of justice, or with government affairs of this province—does the same thing, the hon. Attorney-General says that “restitution has been made, and we do not think—we do not know—but we do not think there is any cause for a prosecution.”

I am not interested in persecuting any of these people. The man has suffered a serious loss by the loss of his certificate to practice law. But I do want to be assured, the Liberal Party wants to be assured, and I think the people of Ontario want to be assured—that this will not become the regular practice in this government.

The other day, the hon. Prime Minister, in referring to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, stated that it was quite ridiculous to expect that any losses in the Department of Highways over the past few years in the north country, could even approach \$5 million or \$7 million because they just did not spend that kind of money up there; there was not that much money spent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit that the 1952-53 Public Accounts will show that in the divisions of Blind River, Fort William and Kenora, in a period extending over some 5 years, a sum in excess of \$69,500,000 was spent, and that does not include the expenditures by the Municipal Roads Branch by way of subsidies to the municipalities.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that contained in those expenditures, from 1946 to 1952, there is every possibility of there being \$5 million or \$7 million which has been misspent, or in some way misused amongst those three divisions, and certainly added to that, will be expenditures which have been made in other divisions in Ontario, and we find a very unhappy situation indeed.

For that reason, again I emphasize,

Mr. Speaker, that this House should be told by way of a special report, even in a secret session. I do not know how; I am not too interested in how the hon. members get the information, but it is my opinion that each one of the 90 hon. members of this House should be given a detailed report in some way and in some manner, by the Auditor of the Province of Ontario, and until we have that report, and until something is done with the report by way of discussion, and by way of explanation, we are all going to be in darkness, as is the public of Ontario.

We do not know how long these trials are going to last in Fort William. The preliminary hearings will take place within the next few days I understand from the press, but they are only preliminary hearings. If the magistrate decides the cases should be referred, they will naturally go to the next assizes, and that could be several months hence. The trials themselves could be lengthy, and there may be appeals, which will take some additional time. Meanwhile, there is nothing to indicate to us that steps are to be taken to correct a very unhealthy situation.

We have consistently stated that there should be a judicial enquiry into this situation, and I repeat it is my firm conviction—as I think it is the conviction of a large majority of people in the Province of Ontario—that this should be done, for the very simple reason that a judicial enquiry would be conducted in public, the public would have knowledge of the state of the investigation, and would be able themselves, if they wished, to contribute information to that body.

As it stands now we have a firm hired by the department to investigate its own employees, and if they are smart they will bend to the will of the employer, and there can and will be no confidence that this firm will give the kind of a report which is necessary for the public interest in the Province of Ontario.

As I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would repeat again that the veil of secrecy in this whole situation should be lifted. We are in possession

of some information which is of vital interest to this investigation, and of vital interest to matters connected with the Department of Highways, and some other departments, but until we know what the government is going to do about these things, and what they are going to give us in the way of information, are we going to be held up for another session—

HON. MR. PORTER: May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Wren) if his information might aid the prosecution?

MR. WREN: Some months ago I contacted the Provincial Auditor, and I asked him if he could find it possible to investigate certain matters in that part of the country, and his reply was, "Mr. Wren, I will be glad to check on those things. We know some of them are quite serious, but I just have not the time nor the staff to do it."

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member says he has information which we have not.

MR. WREN: Call the committee together, Mr. Attorney-General.

HON. MR. PORTER: Would the information be of assistance to the Crown Prosecutors engaged in prosecuting these matters?

MR. WREN: I do not know. I am not a legal authority.

HON. MR. PORTER: The proper thing to do is to lay any information which the hon. member may have, before the Crown.

MR. WREN: If the committee may be called, that information can be placed before it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Not the committee. If the information will assist in the success of these cases, I say the Crown is entitled to have that information.

MR. WREN: We do not know of any crimes having been committed. The government has not told us.

HON. MR. PORTER: You have secret information, and are holding it back?

MR. WREN: We are not holding back any information. We are waiting for this committee.

HON. MR. PORTER: You are in the Legislature now. You can tell us.

MR. WREN: We do not come down here 1,100 miles or more, to speak in circles. Let the committee be called. We are prepared to lay this information before the committee at any time.

HON. MR. PORTER: You will not give the information to the Crown officials?

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Has not the government some secret information, at the same time?

MR. WREN: Yes, I think so. And may I say that everyone is interested in what that secret information is.

Yesterday there was some mention made in regard to the handling of tenders, and I think one suggestion made by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) was a good one. That was, that all tenders should be dealt with and opened in public, and all information in and about those tenders should be made available immediately to the public.

There is too much secrecy altogether in the handling of government contracts and tenders. It will be interesting in the committee to see just how these contracts with the Department of Highways have been handled in the North-western part of the province, and it will be interesting to see how some of the other departments handle their different dealings with people who work for them, along these same lines.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in conclusion that I appreciate your tolerance very much, and I want to say to you that it is a pleasure indeed to serve in this House under you, and I want to convey to you my personal thanks for your advice and assistance as the months pass by.

HON. MR. FROST: May I ask the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) to adjourn the debate?

MR. WARDROPE moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I asked for the adjournment at this time due to the fact this is the date of your dinner, and I understand that the representatives of the press are to be present at the dinner. If we work through until

6 o'clock, it makes it difficult for them to be there at 10 minutes to 7, the hour set by your Honour. I asked the hon. member to adjourn the debate for that reason, and I now move the adjournment of the House.

Tomorrow, we will proceed with addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.30 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, February 25, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 25, 1954.

Reading and Receiving Petitions	225
Reports by Committees	225
Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Wardrope, Mr. Beech, Mr. Salsberg	226
Motion to Adjourn debate, Mr. Salsberg, agreed to	254
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	254

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: May I, on behalf of the Legislature, welcome today students from the Claremont School, Jesse Ketchum Public School, the Queensway Public School with the hon. member for Dovercourt as the instructor in charge, the Jefferson Public School, and the students from St. Michael's College, who are assembled this afternoon.

As I have said in the past, we more than welcome the students from the province to these sessions. Our hope is that they will go back to be better and more enthusiastic citizens of this splendid province of which we are all so proud.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Corporation of The Ross Memorial Hospital praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership of the Board of Governors to 17 members; and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Oakville praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Council of the Corporation to issue local improvement debentures; and for other purposes.

THE SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. NICKLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Nickle from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the committee's Second Report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with amendment:

Bill No. 29, An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 1, An Act respecting The Frontenac High School District.

Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, and on Bill No. 29, An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

THE SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I desire to table answers to questions 2, 4, 6, 12 and 21.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: The first Order, Resuming the Adjourned Debate on the amendment to the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

MR. GEO. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, naturally it is very pleasing to me to have this reception afforded me when I rise to speak in this House, because I always consider it a great honour to be privileged to address remarks to this Assembly which represents a province of 5,000,000 people.

First, may I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the fairness with which you act as referee in these debates and disputes. Your fairness is only exceeded by your ability as a very generous and gracious host, an example of which it has been my privilege to enjoy during the last few days.

I want to express pleasure, too, at the return of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) a young man whom we were very, very sorry to hear suffered a very serious physical setback. When he stood on his feet the other day and presented the White Paper on Forestry in such an able manner, it proved to me that he had had a complete return to health, and, naturally, with all hon. members in this House, I rejoice at his physical recovery. It is a pleasure to see him back.

It is also a pleasure to see in this House two new hon. members, because coming from Fort William, Mr. Speaker, I have been a bit timorous of the results of the by-elections, in Simcoe East and Niagara Falls. But today we see two hon. members who are not only brilliant in debate, but who are very pleasant in appearance, in the persons of the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) and the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby). I know they are going to add greatly to the legislative debates and they will, without question, ably represent the citizens in their respective ridings. I welcome them, congratulate them on their elections, and assure them they will have my full co-

operation as hon. members of this House.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be remiss on my part, coming from the constituency of Port Arthur-East Thunder Bay, if I were not to make some mention of the highways investigation which has been banded about this province during the past few months, probably not always in a way that is, shall I say, to the benefit of the district which I represent. I would like to bring to the attention of the House, that the highways investigation was instituted by this government in the first place. There was no question, once irregularities were found, as to what the ultimate decision would be.

The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) when he found there were irregularities, suspended some 17 men. Today, 5 of those former employees are under arrest. I think the hon. Minister of Highways will correct me if I am wrong, but no contractor who had any part in the building of highways in that district has been paid one cent of public funds during the last 6 months. It has been an unfortunate experience for our wholesalers, and so on, but at the same time the hon. Minister has felt that public funds cannot be paid out when there is any question that they have not been rightly earned. That has always been the policy of this government, and I think in the final analysis will redound to its benefit when it is seen it will investigate this thing, regardless of who, big or small, is to blame.

Yesterday, we had criticism of this government in regard to highways investigations, and other comments have been brought to its attention which the public may think are not quite right.

This government has a history of absolute honesty, Mr. Speaker. That has been proven since 1943, and is evidenced by the confidence the voters place in it, as proven in the Simcoe East and Niagara Falls elections.

I would like to say this about the highways investigation: there is no doubt in anyone's mind in my constituency that anyone found guilty of irregularities in connection with this

investigation will be immediately dealt with.

Upon discovery of irregularities, as I said, 17 men were dismissed, 5 arrested, and all contractors' monies have been held up since the investigation was commenced. An independent firm of engineers is investigating and checking everything in connection with the building of our highways. When it is completed, Mr. Speaker, a full report will be given to the public. What more can be done?

Let me bring in this point, Mr. Speaker, the men in my district have been crucified by the metropolitan press before they have had an opportunity to be judged in the courts. Tragedy has been occasioned in homes. The men and their wives have feared to walk out in the public eye, because of the stories which have been bandied about and rolled up to colossal heights in the press and by those who seek political advantage for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I fought in two wars to defend that flag which hangs over your head, because I believed it represented truth, justice and fair play. I still believe it stands for that, but some of the things that have been done politically, and otherwise, recently in connection with the highways investigation in our area and others, leads me to believe that forces in this country do not live up to fair play and British justice as we know it in this country. I decry that attitude, Mr. Speaker.

We pay lip-service to our civil service in this House. The other day I heard our forestry officials were the finest in the world, that our civil servants were giving service all the time to the public, and yet in our civil service today, we have men and women fearful for even their very homes and lives because of this tremendous political advertising which has been given to a few irregularities. These little people should be protected. I am not trying to protect the big man, who has made millions. He can look after himself. Today we find men in the civil service who simply have jobs, half of whom are under-paid, their names, their private lives, and

their so-called "irregularities" dragged through the metropolitan press, through this House and through the country.

The other day in Montreal I went through a wax museum. They have a picture of the catacombs where years ago they used to throw human beings to the lions as sacrifices. I could not help but think that for political aggrandizement and for power, we were sacrificing these little people who in the final analysis will be proved innocent.

I do not condone any irregularities. Certainly does this government, but we certainly like to see fair play, and British justice done. When in the first trial in the courts in the City of Fort William, a lawyer for one of the accused suggested contempt of court proceedings against one of the metropolitan dailies, the magistrate agreed with him, and the reporters were recalled.

Mr. Speaker, that was a gracious thing for these men who are now standing before the bar of justice and whose future is so jeopardized and prejudiced by these accusations, and innuendoes and chicanery—circumlocution if you will. Yesterday the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) spoke about the money which has been spent in our area. I think I am correct, he said \$69,000. I took the trouble to check on this and I find he was only 30 per cent. out, which he is in most of his statements. I agree he has to make those statements because he is trying to attain a higher office. If that is correct, I do not agree with him, but that is his business. The money which has been spent from Blind River to the Manitoba boundary in the last 5 years is \$54 million or \$11 million in each of the districts concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we saw in the press where these vicious accusations against these civil servants had placed the figure as high as \$7 million. How could we have the roads we have in our country today if out of an expenditure of \$11 million, \$7 million had been pilfered? Do not forget that in the final analysis the last word in o.k.'ing these payments was with the Federal Government's engineer. He was the man, in the final analysis, to pay all these accounts. Let

us not forget that when the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) accuses us of irregularities. Why did not their man who was in sole charge not correct these things? It was left to our government to find out there were irregularities.

We built the Atikokan road, and residents of the City of Fort William know what a wonderful highway it is; we built the Marathon highway, we paved the Trans-Canada for some 70 miles, and we built secondary roads. Never in the history of our district have we had more or better highways than have been built during the last 5 years under the Frost administration. They could not have been built if this money had been stolen, or if the money had never gone into our roads. Many hon. members, both in opposition and supporting the government, have been in our area; they have driven over those roads; they have seen the improvements; they know that money must have gone into the highways. At a conference which my hon. friend the member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) attended last fall, this resolution was passed. It was again reiterated by the president of this organization which represents all the municipalities of our area, in the hon. Prime Minister's office yesterday morning.

Here is the resolution which was passed to the hon. Minister of Highways:

Resolved that an expression of thanks be sent to the Minister of Highways for the work done on the highways and municipal roads by the local officials of the Department of Highways in Northwestern Ontario.

The hon. member for Kenora attended that conference. That resolution was passed unanimously. He was a party to it. Yet he says that due to irregularities, the money which should have gone into these highways was stolen by these same officials.

MR. WREN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not make any statement . . .

MR. WARDROPE: Mr. Speaker, I gather that \$7 million is alleged to have been stolen, when only \$11 million was spent. That is too ridiculous to comment on. Where did our good roads come from—the Atikokan road, the Marathon road, the paving of the Trans-Canada and many other roads, the many other roads which have been built, which have pleased our people so greatly? There is only one point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, and this criticism tends to make me think it may happen. The public is not responsible for any irregularities in the Highway Department; it cannot be held responsible for them, so there must be no restricting or holding back highway development in Northern Ontario. Fortunately, I do not think this is going to happen. I have an assurance from the hon. Minister of Highways and from the hon. Prime Minister that it will not happen. We want more roads in our territory. We need them, and we will be proud of them.

Mr. Speaker, I think many hon. members in this House will know Senator Norman Patterson. Senator Patterson is one of the outstanding men in this country. Head of Patterson Steamship Lines, he is a senator at Ottawa, appointed by the Liberal Government, a very fine man, a great friend of mine and a great booster for Northern Ontario.

Two weeks ago he was at the Lakehead and here are his remarks as contained in the press, the *News-Chronicle* and the *Times-Journal*: "Senator Patterson, who was leaving the Lakehead today, following a two-day visit to us, expressed continuing faith in the future of the Twin Cities and despite what he called 'recent regrettable publicity'." "Senator Patterson in an interview in Fort William said the necessity of a probe into the affairs of the Fort William Highways Department Crown office was most unfortunate, but said he was confident the provincial government . . ." and mark this; he is a Liberal senator, and says the provincial government will do the right thing. He said the government is to be congratulated

on the highways programme regarding the Lakehead. That by a Liberal senator. He said:

He did not think the highways investigation will have any unfavourable influence in the next provincial election.

The hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby) and the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) are fully convinced of that.

Senator Patterson said his confidence in the future of this area was in a large measure based on a conference he held with officials in the Steep Rock Company and the Caland Steel Company who in turn praised the highways in their area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we should listen to a lot of this folderol bandied about in this House about investigations and irregularities and what has been done in connection with the highways. I have been at the Royal York Hotel for the last two days. Our hon. Minister has been there speaking to 2,000 gentlemen at a dinner. I heard that the other night there was expressed the greatest praise for the way he has handled this investigation, for the work done in this province and for his staff. I am not a bit afraid of what the public will say in its verdict if, as and when the next election is called.

We in our area believe we have been well served by the Department of Highways. We only regret the tragedy which has befallen the lives of these little people, who have been used as a means for the political aggrandizement of other folks.

Mining, Mr. Speaker, is something that is much to the fore in our area. At the present time you hear about Manitouwadge Lake, one of the greatest things that has happened in Canada. Manitouwadge Lake is a copper, zinc, silver area where today there are over 6,000 claims staked covering an area over 50 miles long by 9 miles wide and we believe there will be the town at Manitouwadge Lake with a population of some 10,000 people within two years.

In the Department of Mines, during 1953, more claims were staked than in any year in the history of this province. More bullion was produced, in dollar value, than has ever been produced in this province and I want to pay full tribute to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly)—who has just taken his seat—and to his very able staff, for the way in which they handled these things. They came up when Manitouwadge Lake was discovered. Incidentally, it was discovered by personal friends of mine, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately I did not benefit financially from it. I am always foolish anyways. But Mr. Parker, Mr. Forrester and Mr. Dividowitch discovered that great property. About 6 weeks after it was discovered they came and asked me if I could take them up to interview the Minister of Mines. What they wanted was to see if there could be a winter road built into that property which lies equidistant between Highway 11 and Highway 17. We went in to see the Minister of Mines and his Deputy, Doctor Rica, one of the great mining men of this province, and within one hour we had their assurance that a winter road would be bulldozed immediately to take in their equipment, men and machines, and we also had the assurance that the engineers in the Mining Department would be in there the first thing in the spring to survey a road to serve this area.

Then the hon. Minister of Planning and Development from Hamilton (Mr. Warrender)—I do not like the town very well, but I like him—assured me that they will plan and develop that town which, I say, will have a population of some 10,000 people within the next few years. I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, because it shows the speed with which our government acts when they see these great things happening. These men are alert to progress in our province and they, in their turn, do everything they can to help develop these things.

May I read you a couple of extracts from our local paper, the *News-Chronicle*, of recent dates, as follows:

The first is headed :

May Be Town Of 10,000 People
At Manitouwadge.

Accepting as reasonably accurate the estimates of those who should know, and in view of the willingness of others to invest millions on the prospects, it would appear that a town of perhaps 10,000 or even more is to be brought into being at Manitouwadge as fast as men can go in to do the work.

There will even be some construction in advance of the connecting roads from north and south which will be under way as soon as the ground conditions permit.

Early in January the mining and financial press agreed on an estimate of 10,000 tons of good commercial grade ore for the main, or original, copper-zinc property. Drilling has since extended this to at least 16,000 tons per vertical foot.

There are at least two other nearby properties with mine-making possibilities. For them an estimate of 5,000 tons per vertical foot may be conservative.

Only thing lacking is proof of depth beyond the 500 or so feet already reached by the drills.

Geologists agree that there is no reason why it should not go much further.

The 16,000 tons per vertical foot of ore would justify a mill of at least 10,000 tons. To be conservative, let it go at 5,000 tons. The other two known ore bodies seem to justify, say, 3,000 tons.

As a copper mining enterprise means a mill, in addition to the mining these operations would provide employment for some 2,000 men.

That number of men employed would mean a town of at least 10,000.

And the second is headed :

Town Planning For Manitouwadge

When, in the early days of Little Long Lac, it became apparent that a new town was to be built thereabouts,

the chosen location was on the Canadian National Railway at its nearest point to the gold mine. It was a case largely of necessity, because the railway was there first.

It so happened that the ground was low, flat and not altogether favourable for the construction of business blocks, homes and streets. A good job has been done by enterprising people but it has not been without difficulty.

As regards the prospective town to come into being at Manitouwadge, the conditions are different. If there is to be a railway, it will have to be located for the convenience of the industries and the town, which will have first choice of location. Those who have been there say there are opportunities for selection of an excellent town site.

The Progressive Conservative riding association has named a committee to consider the matter and advise the government in the matter of town building. Under the general conditions it would appear that the opportunity affords to bring into being what might be regarded as a model mining town, different from some that in the past which, like Topsy in Uncle Tom's Cabin, "just grew," without plan or pattern.

The government now has a planning department which is expected to give supervision to such things. It has full opportunity to choose a site, to prepare a street plan with provision for schools, hospitals, business districts, residential areas and the other things that go to make up a residential and business community.

After the town site has been chosen, the motor roads and the railways can be located to suit it and not vice versa as in so many other instances.

It is an opportunity for the government to show what it can do in this respect.

I think the assurance from the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Warrender) that his experts will be there first thing in the spring to see

that this is done, is another indication of what this government does in its dealings with us.

Speaking of mining again, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that in this province we know how much timber we have, we know how many fish can be produced from our lakes, we know what game we have. The great imponderable in this province is minerals. We discover them every day. Manitouwadge is an example, discovered last August. There are many more areas of that kind, and the surface has only been scratched. What we need in our area are roads to serve these regions to ensure further discoveries being made.

In a moment I shall be speaking further on the roads because that is something very dear to our hearts in the north. I mentioned that I was very impressed with the White Paper on forestry the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) presented the other day, and I want to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister of this province on that White Paper. Do not forget the large paper companies have many things which concern them, our milling people have many things which concern them, and this is nothing which can be concluded in a day, Mr. Speaker. Our hon. Prime Minister and our hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and our Cabinet and others in the government, and in private industry, have been working for years trying to work out some successful conclusion to see that everybody is supplied with timber in perpetuity. In my area we have some \$250 million invested in plant, employing thousands of men. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram), the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), and the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren). I must include them because they have millions and millions of feet of timber and the great thing to do is to see that their mills are supplied with timber in perpetuity, to see that fires are kept out of our forests, and that insects do not destroy them. This is a great study. It is one of the great tasks our Prime Minister has today.

He asked me the other night, as a

member of the Lands and Forests Committee, together with the other members, to give it the best thought we could. And I want no one to believe that this government has not in the past, nor is not at present, nor will not in the future, try to see that this works out to the benefit of everybody. They mentioned Dean Sisam and Major-General Kennedy, men of that acknowledged rating, together with the Minister, Mr. MacDougall, Mr. Sharpe—men with whom I have worked very closely for many years because I ran a saw-mill company.

Yes, I thought I knew something about the timber industry, but the methods used today are so far ahead of the time when I was in the industry that it makes me ashamed to think of the stuff we wasted. That White Paper is the prelude to a great programme this government is going to bring in for the preservation of our forests, and to see that this great industry is maintained in perpetuity. When the hon. Prime Minister spoke to me I started to think I had a great responsibility in that regard. Like the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) I have not yet had time to digest the White Paper. In fairness to the hon. member for Kenora I know he, too, is deeply concerned about these things because they affect his district very greatly.

I mentioned we had the great pulp and paper companies in our district, the Abitibi, Provincial, Marathon and Terrace Bay Paper Companies, the St. Lawrence Corporation and I heard it said the other day that the sales of our pulp were being reduced. We have a \$25 million expansion programme going on by the St. Lawrence Corporation of Red Rock right now.

These great mills are supplying work to thousands of men and many more thousands of men in the woods. Is it not, then, the responsibility of this government to bring in this White Paper and see what we can do to preserve this great natural resource, to see that these mills are kept going in perpetuity, and I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the great pulp mills, with their vast

capital expenditure, and the thousands of men they employ, should come first.

We also have great firms which have been exporting from our area for years. These firms have been giving employment in our area for years, people have built homes, raised families depending on the continuity of their positions with these firms. If this government would say "you cut out exports tomorrow," what would it mean to the economic situation in my riding? Mr. Speaker, it cannot be done that way. I agree that over a period of years thought should be given to the lessening of exports and the manufacture in its entirety of what we produce in this country. But you cannot do that overnight. These firms have millions of dollars invested and thousands of employees dependent upon their continued operation. I noticed the other day in the hon. Minister's remarks he said something about schools for reforestation to teach game and fish improvements; to teach timber preservation and so on. But one thing that struck me, when he spoke about the resources of timber, fish, game—all these things are in the west and north of this province in abundance but in the next breath the hon. Minister tells us that the schools for forestry, game wardens, research and reforestation are all down around Toronto.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that our people in the north ask why. Surely this is a paradox that time must correct and many of these schools should be placed where these natural resources are. We feel that they should be in our area. The natural resources are there, yet all of these schools to teach silviculture are within a few miles of Toronto. I would just pass that on to the Minister to see what he can do.

The hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) mentioned a matter with which I am in agreement. The Timber Dues on jack pine are too high. That is something I would like the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) to look into, because this is a wood that grows in great abundance. It is now coming into its own, but dues on it are so high that the margin of profit you can get is too small.

Freight rates on wood products are too high, the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) said, and I agree with him. We have one operator in our area who employs 900 men. He cannot operate this winter because the freight rates on his material are too high. What we would like to see is a truck road in that area so that he could freight his materials and carry on and give employment to these 900 men.

The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) knows the situation regarding freight rates. I could name a company which a short time ago was forced to petition to operate a railway of their own from the CNR to the CPR. The minute that bill came into the public press the chairman of the CNR, Mr. Gordon, who is not a friend of mine I might say, said that he would appear in Fort Frances, and I think he did, and I think they got some alleviation in freight rates which made it possible to carry on their business.

This freight rate matter is something that should be looked into. It is a dominion matter, I know, but the Dominion Government is guided by the governments of the provinces. The present position of freight rates is something that is economically unsound and it is something that should be attended to.

Somebody mentioned the other day that the staff of our Department of Lands and Forests is the finest in the world. I think of men like our Deputy Minister, Mr. MacDougall; the head of our Timber Management Department, Mr. Sharpe; Mr. MacMillan, and other men of that kind. I have known them for years as have the other hon. members in our area, the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram). They have been brought up in the forest industry. They have done a great job for the Province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker. It is quite true that they are the finest in the world.

We are progressively improving our methods in harvesting forest, fish and game, and minerals. We have our school

set-up to teach new methods. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if any hon. members present have seen the new methods of logging. I have in mind the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) and the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), men who logged in the old days the same as I did. I wonder if they have been in the forests today and seen these up-to-date methods of harvesting logs by mechanical logging. These forestry officials of ours and the companies have gone a tremendously long way in seeing that we harvest our products to the utmost benefit of our citizens.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, there is a point I would like to take up with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) if it applies to him. Our forestry employees are working on a casual basis and I have found they are not covered by unemployment insurance. Many forestry employees suffer from a lack of this coverage and I would like to see it corrected to include them. These are the casual workers who go on in the summertime and perhaps part-time in the winter, and who are never covered by unemployment insurance. I would like to see that done, because I think they richly deserve it. After all, they work practically year-round with layoffs at certain times.

I have noticed where the CCF leader of this province, who has a good Scotch name, has been going around my area and other areas in this province, making remarks about nothing having been done in my district by this government in the last few years. Who was it, Mr. Speaker, who mentioned an ostrich having his head in the sand? I believe it was the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren). That remark appears to me to apply to the leader of the CCF. He is not in touch with the situation as it exists at all, and it makes me laugh when the CCF leaders come out of university with a degree and they are all in favour of the workers, whereas the Conservatives are described as "the swashbuckling barons of Bay Street." Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell you how many years I swung an axe in the bush,

and if the leader of the CCF ever swung an axe in the bush, I will give him \$10.00.

So these fellows are the friends of labour. I am not criticizing that Party's leader in the House (Mr. Grummett), but I hear these fellows going through the country, the friends of labour. Not one of them ever did anything but lift a pen in their lives and they are talking about the Progressive-Conservatives, who have swung axes, and you, Mr. Acting Speaker, used a shovel in the barn. Every one of the hon. members of this Party is a worker and a friend of labour, and do not let anybody tell you differently.

The hon. members from the north are here, the whole forum. Ask them what they did, and they will tell you they did everything from oiling an engine on the railroad to cutting pine. That is a fact, and do not let anyone tell you that the Progressive-Conservative Party is not a Party of labourers. It is the labour Party. When this man goes through the country and says there has been nothing done in my district under this government, I wonder if he knows about this \$25 million programme in Red Rock. I wonder if he knows about the Terrace Bay development and that great pulp and paper mill there employing thousands; the Great Pulp Mill and Town of Marathon, the Marathon highway that has been built east of Port Arthur; the Atikokan highway that has been built; the paving of the Trans-Canada highway which has been carried out; the Dorian Fish Hatchery road that is now a development road; the Morgan road in my own Township of McIntyre; the Jackfish Bay road which has been built, the Leach Gold Mine, the new road to Onaman Lake; the Ontario Hospital to house 1,200 patients in my area and which cost \$8 million to bring my fellow-citizens who have been unfortunate enough to have mental illness back to their own territory out of the eastern hospitals; the new OPP barracks all through the district; the new registry office in Port Arthur.

The building figures in the City of Port Arthur were the greatest last year

they have ever been, the population is up some 2,500 a year; the deep waterways—one of the greatest undertakings this province has ever known—will not go to Lindsay, sir, but they will be digging in the harbour outside Port Arthur next spring. Then we have the hydro developments, Pine Portage, Aquasabon and now Manitou Falls, the greatest developments that district has ever known, supplying hydro-electric power to both rural and urban citizens. When I get home at night in my own district, I see lights in every house as I go along the country roads. I know they have got inside toilets, I know they have got telephones now, I know they have got electric stoves and electric irons. Their wives are happy, Mr. Speaker, due to the great improvement in hydro that has been made under this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I decry this constant crying of wolf by the opposition.

I wish to thank the government for the wonderful improvements they have made, and have assisted private industry to make, in my own district. I shall close with another invitation to all hon. members. This is the third one, and it is to visit our district. I am extending this invitation on behalf of the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram) and myself. Two years ago the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) planned a trip to the north. It would have been a wonderful trip, but last year the election intervened and, of course, the trip could not be made. However, we will welcome you, our citizens will welcome you and I know I speak with the full co-operation and knowledge of my friends the hon. members for Fort William, Rainy River and Kenora, in extending this invitation. We will show you some of the greatest natural resources in the world and some of the greatest industrial plants in the world. We will also provide you with good, healthy recreation so that you will return to your homes in the south and, like us, sing the praises of those great rich

areas of Canada and the wonderful, kindly people who are developing them.

I am almost through, Mr. Speaker. That should be the occasion for great applause, but before I close may I say we have been talking in the last few days about being subservient to the United States of America. I do not think we are, I think that we wish to keep their friendship, but we are growing up, we are getting to be of a mature age now and we cannot let them call the turn for us. Last night at our dinner I had a talk with a very charming gentleman who is the United States Commissioner here and he agreed with me that Canada is getting to be a big country. I cannot help but close with an epilogue that was given at a dinner by the president of the Abitibi Power and Paper Company, I think it is so true that I just want to recite it to the House:

We Canadians can do great things in the next half-century, but if we are able to do them we must throw away some of our habits of thought. We must become accustomed to our newly-won status as a nation. We must regard our neighbours and our parents as a wise young married man just starting out in life regards his. He indulges his parents, he watches his neighbours with a wary eye and he keeps on good terms with both.

In our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I think we have a man, Mr. Speaker, who, if he has one asset, it is that he is a great creator of good public relations. All through my district—and I am not saying this in order to get anything, I am just saying it because I believe it sincerely—he is respected by the people. With respect to the highway investigation, I have had them say to me: "As long as Mr. Frost is there, we don't worry, we know it will be honestly dealt with and everybody will get a fair deal." That is a great tribute, Mr. Speaker, and when you have such a man heading your government, a man who has that respect from the population of Ontario, it gives you a warm feeling in your heart to know that you are a member of that government. I

know him very well, and I tell people that under that benevolent exterior there is steel inside. They say: "That's a good thing, too, because a man in that position has to make decisions on occasion." I think he embodies to them those things, Mr. Speaker, and I pay him that tribute because he is always so kind and considerate with delegations that we bring down. And when we bring delegations down, Mr. Speaker, it means a considerable expense. They have to come 1,000 miles. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the heads of departments are courtesy itself. They put themselves out and put aside other things in order to see those delegations, which makes for very good public relations for our whole area and makes for a lot of good feeling for myself in the constituency. I know it does for the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram).

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): And it makes quite a few Tories.

MR. WARDROPE: That is a fact. I would say, sir, that 80 per cent.—well, perhaps I should not go that far, Mr. Speaker—about 80 per cent. of hon. members of this House owe a great debt of gratitude for being here, to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

Mr. Speaker, thank you for listening to me and for giving me such kind attention.

MR. W. G. BEECH (York South): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) said that during this session and last year there was nothing but a continual flow of praise coming from the government side of the House. After the speech which has just been delivered, I want to know why we should not praise and why we should not boast. We have something to boast about and certainly we cannot expect the hon. members of the opposition to praise us. So we shall have to do it ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of publicly thanking the

members of the government from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) down for their very courteous and kindly attention to my problems, the solution of which has enabled me to carry out my duties as a representative of York South. Many hon. members will know that York South is feeling growing pains. It is growing up and one vast section of the riding, in the Township of York, a new municipality with over 100,000 people, has decided that it no longer wants to be called the "township." It wants to be called a city. Therefore, it has now filed an application to be created from a township into a city.

I think that application is justifiable, because here we have a well-balanced municipality with all kinds of people from the richest to the lowest. Yet in this vast municipality we have not even such a thing as a post office; we have not even such a thing as an Unemployment Insurance office. If people want to do business with the Federal Government they have to go to the neighbouring municipality to do so. We feel it is about time that York was created into the City of York and thus preserve that grand old name. With the coming of Metropolitan Toronto that name is apt to be forgotten.

The Township of York and the Village of Forest Hill have assumed places as members of the Metropolitan Government and are doing their best to work with the other municipalities in this great area in carrying out the requirements of Bill 80. Much has been said in the press recently about the opposition of York Township to some of the things that the Metropolitan Council wants to do, particularly in the matter of the Spadina Road extension. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members of this House that when this route was first mooted it could have been produced and completed for about \$1,500,000. Now, however, due to the vast growth in the area, to complete that highway would cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$15 million. The people in our riding suggest that there is an alternative route, the Barrie Highway, which has already

been approved by our Department of Highways and which we feel would at least provide for a great part of the need. All we have asked—not in opposition—in the matter of economy is that this other route be completed and be given a trial before we involve ourselves in the expenditure of \$15 million which may prove to be unnecessary.

I say again that our riding is playing its part in the development of Metropolitan Toronto. I feel that it is going to be a success. We are facing problems out there, but I believe most of the problems are ones between personalities. For instance, it has been suggested that the chairman is a dictator. Well Mr. Speaker, the chairman is only one man and if the other 24 let him push them around, then they deserve all they get. We have an able chairman and I am sure in the long run this council will get down to business and do what the bill enables it to do.

In the application for creation into a city by the Township of York, they have given us as one of the reasons that they should be entitled to greater membership on the Metropolitan Council. After all I do not think that has anything to do with their application because certainly if they get their desire, it still will not give them that right. That right can only come from the Metropolitan Council and I think I am safe in saying that whatever happens in Metropolitan Toronto now is in the hands of the Metropolitan Council.

One of the reasons I thought so highly of the bill is its flexibility and the possibility of the council members deciding for themselves what is going to be best for the interests of the people in this great metropolitan area.

Along with the other problems, which we have in these great municipalities, is the question of rent control. I have attended many meetings and I have heard many discussions on this matter. I have yet to attend a meeting or listen to any discussion which has not had to do with rent control as it existed in this province when the Federal Government had it and no one has said that rent control was not an evil thing. There

were phases of it which certainly were not good for our community and certainly were not doing what it was intended to do in the first place. So I feel that it is a good thing that the province has dropped rent control. On the other hand, I do feel that in some municipalities and some localities there must be some sort of control to take care of the transitory period until such time as we are able to take care of the people who are going to be affected.

We must not forget that when other controls were lifted from steel and other materials, they were only taken off when those materials were in good supply. Rent control is being taken off at a time when there is still a great shortage of houses. Rents are bound to be increased, some of them very extensively, because there are many landlords who have had their properties controlled at ridiculously low rates when one considers what other people are getting. So it is conceivable that the rates will increase anywhere from \$40 to \$50 a month. What we are afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is this: rents in our area run anywhere, particularly if there is a family, from \$70 or \$80 to \$100 a month. In our municipality, and I am speaking of the Township of York, we have a great preponderance of working people. It is a well-known fact that 50 per cent. of the wage-earners earn less than \$2,500 a year. When we apply the old formula that no one should pay more than 25 per cent. of salary for rent, it will easily be seen that those people who are getting less than \$2,500, and even less than \$2,000, will be unable to pay rents running into such figures as \$60, \$70 or \$80 a month. Therefore, the thing that is concerning us is that when these other rents are increased, we are wondering what we are going to do with the people who are going to be evicted. I have vivid recollections, when I was Reeve of the township, of a family there being evicted one afternoon. When I got home from business, I found the family parked on my veranda. It was a serious matter because we had no emergency housing, and we had to place these people in a hotel. We are still in that position. We

have no emergency housing and provision will have to be made for them. We feel—and the township has so ruled—that some sort of control will be enacted to enable landlords and tenants to get together so there will not be the danger of wholesale evictions.

That brings us, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of housing. There has been a lot said about housing during the past few months, particularly since the introduction of the new Bill 102 by the Federal Government. Frankly I can see very little merit in that bill, except that it does increase the number of people who will be able to build homes: those who are getting a salary of \$3,800 down to those who are getting a salary now of \$3,400. However, I feel that in that income range there is not any lack of homes. If you have the money to pay for the homes there are plenty of homes to be had. The people we are concerned about, of course, are those in the lower income brackets. When one looks at and studies the legislation now provided, it will be seen that there is ample provision made for the production of low-rental and low-cost units.

I feel sometimes that we have been spending too much time writing the government and asking for legislation, and not studying the legislation which is presently on the books. For instance, here in the Province of Ontario this government has made great steps towards providing housing and at each turn it has met with obstacles. I do not think there can be any doubt one of the chief requirements for low-rental, low-cost housing is low-cost land. Yet when this government attempted to acquire land for that purpose, and had to take the only means available, by expropriation. Immediately a great hue-and-cry went up across this area and the government was called "dictators" and a lot of other names not quite so nice.

Mr. Speaker, these people who, through no fault of their own but due to economic conditions, cannot afford to pay the high price of housing, have got to be helped. It is the duty of all the people of this country, not only of governments but of all the people themselves to assist in providing homes, and

those homes can be provided without subsidization. We have a fine example of that, Mr. Speaker, in the development of the elderly people's homes in York Township. There you have a perfect example of what can be done with the co-operation of people and the government. Those homes have been in operation now for well over a year and the financial statement brought down shows they are operated at a slight profit with a reasonable and substantial amount set aside for depreciation purposes. They are a credit to this government because, as the hon. members will recall, this government does provide a grant of up to \$500 per unit for furnishing and helping to put these apartments in condition.

When we first opened that project, Mr. Speaker, we thought there would be a rapid turnover in the number of people who were tenants there. I might say some of the people were up to 94 years of age, so it was naturally to be expected there would be a rapid turnover. Since the operation commenced, only 4 people have passed away from those homes. You would be surprised at the feeling of security and happiness which pervades those people out there, because they have a sense of security, contentment and happiness, and, as a matter of fact, the citizens out there all "chipped in" and built a recreation hall for the old folks to gather together and pass the time of day. And tonight the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) courteously promised to come up and assist us to open that community hall in the very near future, and when the date is set I shall be very glad if hon. members of the House would accompany the hon. Prime Minister and come and see what can be done in the way of low-cost housing.

Mr. Speaker, it does set an example, and if we can build low-cost homes for the old folk, we can build low-cost homes for the people in the low-income brackets. It is provided for in legislation, and I believe last year an amendment was passed here to enable organizations to take advantage of that legislation. I can tell you the Canadian Legion will use its money to provide

such homes. In fact, we have three projects in mind now. We are going to use our money to provide these homes, and there is no reason why other organizations cannot do the same thing.

The labour people put nearly a page in the *Globe and Mail* yesterday morning in regard to the government's lack of providing homes. For a few thousand dollars, they can build homes for their members. The Federal Government is asking, "Where is the money coming from to build these homes?" There is a reservoir, Mr. Speaker, which has not yet been touched.

This, of course, may be none of our business, but I understand that labour spent \$2 million in connection with the strike at Timmins, for which amount they could have built some 500 units for the elderly working people. Surely these funds are available, and we ought to use them to the best advantage.

There is one matter, I think, in which the government might help and that is the matter of co-operatives. We have 10 young men in our municipality who acquired a parcel of land, and pitched in with their money, and started to build. They built a \$14,000 home for about \$7,500 or \$8,000. The unfortunate part of it is that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will not lend them money and they have had to go into the open market and pay the high interest rates, up to, I believe, 7 per cent. This had the tendency to completely nullify the hard work these young men have put into this project. I feel this government might well consider giving assistance to that type of thing, and help the people who are willing to help themselves.

The Canadian Legion suggested a proposal to the Federal Government, and we have great hopes of it being accepted, whereby anyone with an \$800-equity in a piece of land, will be able to go to the provisions of the Veterans Land Act. They will provide the money to buy the material, and they will stay with them until such time as the house is completed, at which time the Central Mortgage and Housing will take over the mortgage.

So here we have people who are working 35 and 40 hours per week, and have a great deal of time on their hands, and this provides a glorious opportunity for them to use their spare time, and at the same time save anywhere from \$2,000 to \$3,000 in the costs of the erection of their own homes.

I think this should be encouraged. This is the type of thing we want, and if something on this order can be followed, we will obtain much better results than simply sitting down, doing nothing, and blaming the government for not doing a number of things which they really are doing.

One of the bad features about rent control, which has affected our area to a great extent, is the fact that it removed the restrictions on single dwellings. Because of the high cost of these homes, many men have found it necessary for their wives to work in order to help pay the rent, and it is creating a terrific pressure. I have had a delegation in to see me from the packing house, complaining bitterly that married women were working in the packing plant, and were depriving men who had to work to keep up their homes. So, until we get busy and get some low-cost housing, I am afraid we will be in trouble right along.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in which each of us must assume some responsibility.

Some mention was made of the poor workmanship in buildings in Scarborough—in fact, not only in Scarborough but in the west end—not very long ago. The people there are blaming the officials of the National Housing Act, because they failed to do certain things, and it is a combination of things, because builders and others, who work on those buildings, have been allowed to "get away" with very "shoddy" workmanship. When people are paying the top prices, and even blood money, to buy these homes, I think those who have been putting in poor workmanship should be heavily penalized.

This reminds me of a time not so long ago when the Veterans' Land Act was in trouble, and it was eventually

necessary to bring down the hon. Minister of Veterans' Affairs. After a great deal of discussion, restitution was finally made, and we find the Veterans' Land Act today, because of criticisms made at that time, probably the best producer of low-cost, well-built homes in any part of the country. Perhaps it is time we did something in connection with these other organizations, along similar lines.

I want to be sure I am right, but yesterday I understood there was something said about "undermining public confidence in the government." I think at the time the hon. member was speaking about the highway troubles in the northwest. If I recall rightly, the inference was that this government was connected with it, because it granted contracts to people because of their political leanings.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything which tends to undermine public confidence, it is statements like that, made by hon. members in the House, who are present here, and know what it is all about. There are enough people outside who think that politicians are "grafters" and "crooks," without hon. members inside this House adding fuel to the fire. I, for one, certainly deplore that sort of thing.

We have another example where Mr. Park, a former member of this House, accused the hon. Prime Minister in these words:

He declared that the incident showed "to what extent the Prime Minister has debased his office to that of chore boy for millionaire Bay St. mine operators, who contribute heavily to the Conservative Party's campaign funds."

Mr. Speaker, we have not gone so far as to suggest we might have the compulsory check-off system, to make sure they get these funds.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that statements like that are doing a disservice to people in public life in this country of ours, and I think there should be some way to stop it.

When hon. members and others have

to resort to making vicious attacks of that kind, they have not much idea of the proprieties.

There are many things this government does for which it does not get enough credit. At a meeting of our Library Board last night, we were struggling with the Budget, and we were pleased to hear we were receiving a substantial grant from the Department of Education to assist us in carrying on the work in the library. It would be interesting to know the progress the libraries in this province have made because of these grants given by the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I say we are very deeply appreciative to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) for the grant made to the Northwestern General Hospital. It is true, it could have been a little more, but it certainly was acceptable, and we feel we are getting our share, and this all helps to create good feeling.

There is one little matter in which the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) can assist me—unfortunately, I see he is not in his place in the House at the moment. I mentioned this last year, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it.

We have a cemetery in our bailiwick which has given us a great deal of trouble. It is one of the old cemeteries, practically surrounded by homes, and at the rear of the cemetery is vacant land, which has become weed-strewn and is an eye-sore to the neighbours. Some people, not knowing the true facts, built some very decent homes on one side, and a bakery has been erected on the other. Lo and behold, we found one morning when we awakened, there was a fence built around this whole lot, and we found that it is a continuation of this old cemetery, and the people of the neighbourhood are up in arms because they feel this should not be allowed to go on, added to the fact of this bakery being located there. The cemetery is on high ground, and the water will run down to the bakery, and I do not know whether we will have unleavened bread or not as a result of that water flow.

I want to thank the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) for his kind co-operation in regard to the roads in our township. We have a number of roads passing through there, and he has been of great assistance to us.

Among other improvements, is the Barrie highway, and we are looking to that to take a big load off some of our streets. We do appreciate what has been done.

I should have mentioned that one of the features of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is the fact they tie up their legislation with what we think is a great deal of "red tape." The legislation and regulations which have been brought down, just means they are trying to do everything they can to keep the price of the homes up.

As an example: one regulation calls for tongue-and-grooved sheathing on the roofs, and the sub-flooring. Anyone who has ever worked around the building of homes knows the sub-flooring is exposed to moisture and weather generally, and if you put tongue-and-grooved flooring there, the first thing you know it will buckle, besides being very expensive. This all adds to the expense, without improving the quality of the homes.

They also require five inches of top soil around the building. That may be all right in virgin land, if you take up the top soil, and, after building, put it back, but the regulation provides that the top soil must be of a specific kind; it must be tested, and shown to be the right kind, to be placed around the homes.

In our area, Mr. Speaker, we have a great deal of land which was formerly sand and gravel pits, which is now being graded to provide sites for homes. This means the contractors have to go miles into the country to bring in the top soil, and you can easily see how this will increase the cost of the home building.

I do wish someone with authority over the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation would get after them, and see that they do not continue to have so many regulations. We have had over

100,000 homes built in the last year, 40,000 of which were built under the National Housing Act, for the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the rest being built by private industry. I think we should encourage private industry to go ahead and build, and keep building, and not be tied up by all this "red tape."

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said about all I want to say at the moment. I would like to say, however, that I am happy at what is going on. I am pleased at the co-operation we are getting. I am sure, under the leadership of our good Prime Minister, we will not be complacent as suggested by hon. members on the other side of the House, but continue to give to the people of this province good legislation.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, my turn has come to contribute a few remarks on the motion which is before the House, and, as is customary—and, I assure you, most desirable on my part—I want to commence my remarks by an expression of sincere appreciation for your manner of conducting the duties of your office. I know I sometimes try your patience. I always do so with the best intentions. If I have erred, I apologize, and I promise not to err too frequently, and I pray for your continued consideration and indulgence, which you have always shown to me in the past.

I want to say a word about the civil service. I say this annually, and I want to repeat it today. In my opinion, the attitude of the government toward the civil servants is not a satisfactory one. During the session, I shall have occasion to be more specific, but I do want to repeat to the civil servants today—all of them—that until such time as they see the light, and join a trade union centre—any one they wish—they will have occasion for complaint and for a feeling of neglect.

I hold up as an example to them, the municipal employees of this city of ours, who have made great progress ever since they joined the legitimate trade union movement, and became part of what is known as the "organized

working class." Their conditions, Mr. Speaker, are now better than those of our civil servants.

May I say a word to the press, Mr. Speaker? I do not do this very often, not that I underestimate the importance of the press. If I say a word now, it is not because I shall expect headlines tomorrow, as I am inclined to think that I shall not say anything which will make for headlines. In fact, I will be satisfied if what I say stands up in the days to come as having been sound, constructive and worthy of implementation.

The gentlemen who grace our press gallery are, I believe, among the outstanding men in their profession. We do not always appreciate that. They are hard-working men. This year, I want to pay tribute to their interest in and attention to matters affecting the procedure of the House. I welcome the interest they have shown in the rules of the House, and their reminders to us about observing those rules. I think they are performing a service in doing so, and I, for one, hope they will continue to be on the alert.

Now, a word about the address delivered by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay). I was very much impressed by it. I do not want to pour oil on the fire, nor am I interested in stoking the fire, and whatever fire the speech may have kindled will, I am sure, in the fullness of time, burn itself out, and no one will be the worse.

For myself, I think that speech should not be too critically approached, as I seemed to sense in certain sections of this House, and that, Mr. Speaker, includes more than the hon. members of one Party.

I disagree with the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) on many of the political points he raised, but he did convey a tone of sincerity and well-meaning, which, to me, is very important. I suggest we do not snuff out such sentiments when brought forward by hon. members of the House.

I think by the way, Mr. Speaker, some of the points he makes will help considerably in averting, in the future, certain practices which are, unfortu-

nately, resorted to all too frequently by certain members of our police forces, all of them. That does not mean that all are practicing the methods to which he referred, nor that all are too ready and too quick to use a fist on a prisoner, but, unfortunately, it is true that some do that altogether too quickly, and I think his speech certainly has its place.

Of course, I am not in a position to discuss, or even pass a comment, on the manner in which it was done, whether certain accepted procedure was resorted to prior to having made the confession or not. I am keeping out of that, but I do say that we should be more hesitant than some hon. members are in critically approaching that speech.

An interesting and resounding speech by the hon. member for Port Arthur was given today. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think the government should resist any longer. I think the hon. Prime Minister knows he must find room in the Cabinet for a representative from the great northwest, if only because the opposition is criticizing him for failure to give representation to that great area. Mr. Speaker, we are threatened with secession from that part of our great province. There is a name for it, "Aurora," and I am sure we do not want to lose that great area. I admire it, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister will find it difficult to resist the attributes displayed here today by the hon. member for Port Arthur, and will invite him over, as the government has been about to do for some time.

I am just guessing or surmising, Mr. Speaker, so I am not revealing any inside secret, and I am not privy to inside information, but I do believe he is willing. I think the government needs representation and could do worse than inviting the hon. member to cross the floor, and I may be able to look at him across the floor as long as I am here.

The other hon. members from the northwest area, I am sure, will not begrudge such an invitation. I think they will welcome it and will undoubtedly join in supporting my nomination and my suggestion.

I want to extend my felicitations to the mover and seconder of the motion which we are now discussing. The seconder, the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) is no newcomer. We all respect him, and his speech has certainly not diminished the respect we hold for him.

I am interested primarily in the new hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley). May I say, Mr. Speaker, I predicted a few weeks ahead of the election that he would be elected, and that the Liberals would lose the seat. I predicted that after a visit to Niagara Falls, where I was delivering a speech for the candidate of the Labour Progressive Party, who, unfortunately, was not elected. It is not in the cards—yet.

I came back and said, "The Liberals are losing the seat and the Tories will win it." I said it was bad, but it looked as if I was right. His election and the election of the hon. member for Simcoe East, who I see in the House, is significant. I suggest to the Official Opposition to take it to heart.

We have had a few experiences. We had Dominion election on August 10th, then we had two provincial by-elections. If anything, they have proven what? That you cannot ride into power only on the backs of Petawawa horses, nor can you slide into power on the slopes of imaginary hills which are allegedly removed from nowhere, although we paid for the removal. Mind you, a Petawawa horse would help, as would a non-existent hill which was removed, but that is not enough. The "Tories" learned that, I am sure, after the August 10th election, and I think the Liberals will have learned it after the last two by-elections in Ontario.

MR. CHARTRAND: How about the Communists?

MR. SALSBERG: As far as the Communists are concerned, they learn from all your mistakes and try not to make them themselves.

What is wrong? The answer is that you need a programme to meet the problems and the needs of the people. If you have that, then a Petawawa

horse can help, and a slope from a non-existing hill might also help, but without a programme you just do not get anywhere.

I am obliged to say that the spokesman for the Official Opposition in this House has not yet convinced me they have a programme for the people of Ontario, and I, as a friend, advise him that Fort William alone is not enough. The Leader of the Opposition made a number of laudable proposals with which I agreed. He spoke about housing and other matters, but the heart and essence of his speech is epitomized in the amendment referring to "Fort William." That is not a programme any more than the August method of campaigning around Petawawa was a programme. It just was not.

I am not denying the Fort William matter should receive our attention. I will speak about it. However, it is not enough to just speak about it. The hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), who is also, as I understand it, confronted with the need of presenting a programme since he is a candidate for leadership, has made good speeches. I am glad they were made, but again, he has no programme.

Unearthing, discovering, revealing, prodding, are all very good. But where is the programme? That was not made apparent.

An hon. member to my right says, "It will be given." I am sure that I and all of the people of the province will be looking forward to that.

I want to say a few words before I proceed about matters upon which, I am sorry to say, none of the other spokesmen of the opposition touched, concerning things which happened during the last year for which I think the government should be lashed. Lashing in parliamentary language is, I suppose, severely criticized.

One of these matters is the question of rent control. I am glad the hon. member for York South (Mr. Beech) mentioned it. He, being a supporter of the government, naturally, had to skate around it a bit, but, representing as he does York South, he did indicate the problem.

I think this government has committed a serious offence against the interests of the section of the people who need help mostly, when they dropped rent control and threw the matter into the laps of the municipal councils. The result will be that in some localities rent controls will be dropped; in others, a temporary patchwork will be adopted in order to escape gradually from it, but the result will be, Mr. Speaker, that thousands of families who can ill afford to pay the maximum rentals now being charged, will suffer enormously.

I agree with the last speaker, the hon. member for York South. Rents are determined, like most other items, on the basis of "how much it can fetch," or what maximum price and profit can be made out of it. When there is such a severe housing shortage as we experience in areas like Toronto, it stands to reason that once the rent controls are lifted, landlords will try to get the maximum, and that will mean that others will have to deny themselves and their dependents the necessities of life. The government should not have done that until it helped solve the housing shortage, which it has not done.

Secondly, I want to use this occasion to criticize the government severely for its role in the strikes which took place during the last year. Those strikes revealed that the government was behaving in a manner which helped the anti-union groups of employers. In some cases, it amounted to outright "scabbery" by the government, as was the case when the Ontario Northland Railway, through its leading officers, broke through the picket line in front of Noranda. Railway workers honoured the picket line, but the chief officers of the Ontario Northland Railway were, I believe, coerced into this unpleasant task of trying to pull the engine through the picket line.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member that the Railway Unions afterwards withdrew their objection and confirmed what was done was proper and instructed their men to put cars in on the siding

which belongs to the railway. I do not know whether the hon. member is up-to-date on that matter, but that is the correct situation.

MR. SALSBERG: All I know is that up to the time the officers of the railroad came to pull the train through, the engineer and other personnel honoured the picket line and refused to go through.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, but afterwards the Railway Unions recognized that was an error. The picket lines should never have been there.

MR. SALSBERG: I have here the official publication of the union, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that is not correct.

MR. SALSBERG: They have pictures of the picket line being pierced by the engine, Mr. Speaker, with the officers of the railroad in front.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member that afterwards, when the true facts were given to them, the Railway Union instructed its men to take the cars into the siding. The siding belonged to the railway. It was not on the property of the Noranda Mines at all. It was property owned and controlled by the railway. Taxes are paid by the railway, and the Railway Unions quite properly instructed their men to place the cars on the siding, and that was done after that incident.

MR. SALSBERG: Not only in that instance, but generally. I sent wires to the hon. Prime Minister. I am sorry to say he did not answer. He was not obliged to, that is true. I sent letters to the hon. members of the Legislature, urging a special session of the Legislature to deal with the strike. Unfortunately, no such session was called. If you look at the picture of the people attending the signing of the contract, you will see a shocking contrast.

On the one hand, our hon. Minister

of Labour is smiling jovially, as if he really accomplished something, in the signing of the so-called "settlement." On the other hand, you have the picture of Mr. Millard whose face certainly reveals, I think, the full understanding and feeling of the meaning of that signing. It was nothing to be happy about, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. DALEY: He was not happy at all.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, there was nothing to be happy about, because the role of the government enabled a few men to dominate the mining fields of Northern Ontario and Quebec to deprive the men and women of the north of the minimum to which they are entitled. It is a fact that a few men, only a handful, maybe two, really decide policy for the whole north.

I say this government should have come out fully for the north, for the miners' families, and not be bound by a couple of men who manage to control vast corporations in the north.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that is just what the government did do, come out for the men and get the thing settled, and not at the mine operators' price either, but at a higher price. The men got more money.

MR. SALSBERG: True, the men did not lose their strike. They fought very heroically, and admirably. There are few strikes which can compare in heroism to the one just concluded. However, I think the same union is perfectly right in its advertisement this morning when it says, "The Issues Remain." That is true.

The issues in the north remain. They were not solved. Miners are still paid less than workers in industry in the south. Their life is still more endangered than any other group of workers. Their hourly rate is lower and their hours of work are longer. I am obliged to say this government pursued a policy which made it possible for those few dominant forces to rob the miners.

HON. MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member he must understand the economics of the mining situation. I think it would be a good thing if the hon. member would get down and study the basic problem.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and myself realized this was a serious problem, and you may be assured that throughout we did our best to obtain settlements which were good for the men and good for the communities and the people. The major difficulty is that the gold mining industry is a greatly depressed industry, which is really being kept alive by government subsidy.

Substantially, this industry is being kept together because of a subsidy on the part of the Federal Government and assistance we are giving to the mining municipalities.

Those facts must be recognized. There is a vast difference between conditions in Sudbury, for instance, and those in the Timmins and Kirkland Lake area. The industries are different and hence the conditions are entirely different. I would point out to the hon. member that he should look into that.

MR. SALSBERG: I appreciate the facts to which the hon. Prime Minister draws attention, and I want to assure him that I am not unaware of those facts.

HON. MR. FROST: But you did not say that.

MR. SALSBERG: But also, I am sorry to say, the hon. Prime Minister is not prepared to say, that while it is true we have a problem in the gold mining area, we cannot allow that problem to be borne by the miners and their families, while the government subsidy from Ottawa goes primarily to guarantee the payment of dividends.

HON. MR. FROST: That is quite incorrect.

MR. SALSBERG: It is true we are taking it out of the pockets of the miners and their families.

However, Mr. Speaker, we may return to this question again during the session. I felt, however, that these few points had to be mentioned. After all, Mr. Speaker, one opposition speaker is followed by three or four government speakers, due to the imbalance that exists in the House with so many "Tories." Certainly these things may sound unpleasant to the ears of the government; nevertheless, they have to be said.

I want to return to the question that was made the central issue here by the Official Opposition and by others. The question was raised about the highway situation, and perhaps the hon. Leader of the CCF group (Mr. Grummett), who just came into the House, I am glad to say, expressed it more than most other hon. members when he stood in his place, and looking across to the government, in a tone of pain, said, "What happened to our Department of Highways?" Well, let me say, I do not know what happened, excepting this, that something had obviously happened and I would be inclined to say that it is worse than bad. If what the press reported is substantially correct then I would say what happened is "highway robbery 1954 style." And I say this while quite prepared to acknowledge that in my opinion the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is an honest man. My confidence in my own judgment will be terribly undermined if I find that I am wrong. That is my reaction to the hon. Minister of Highways. But what happened can unfortunately be labelled only as "highway robbery."

I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, that it is correct to continue to say that the government discovered it and is doing all that is necessary. If my memory serves me well I think the government did not discover it but a disgruntled employee who felt that he was not getting his "rake-off" or his share of what was obviously "loot" began to talk. I think that is correct and if it is, then let us for the sake of accuracy, not repeat that the government found it out. A man "squealed" and the rest of those who were involved with him were

exposed when the government stepped in. I think that is correct. It is a great pity, Mr. Speaker, to find that money in large amounts was obviously diverted to private use at a time when the citizens of Geraldton through their Chamber of Commerce were going around collecting private contributions for the completion of a piece of highway from Geraldton to Nakina. A fraction of the money which was misappropriated would have sufficed to have built this road, yet our citizens went around with a cup asking their neighbours for money to complete a piece of highway when money in quantities such as are now spoken of, was being misused.

Why did it happen? I do not know, except to offer this opinion. First, I think it happened because I think the system under which we live corrupts people. It has, I believe, a corrupting influence. In a profiteering inflationary period people just become frantic to make, and make as much as they can. That is the nature of the beast. That is the system. That is true, and the people who otherwise would be making enough are obviously not satisfied and they want the maximum out of it. The example set for them is, of course, not conducive to better behaviour.

Secondly I think that another reason why these things happen is because of the gathering of enormous election funds by the Parties. Let us face that fact. When the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) stands up as he did yesterday and says as reported in the heading of one paper "Claims Highways Work Aids P.C. Party," I am obliged to say to him—"My hon. friend, from where do you get the money?" I mean your Party.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. members that in connection with so-called "Party funds," no contracts, no work or no employment is given by this government conditional upon any contribution to Party funds. Mr. Speaker, if such conditions were disclosed, I would regard it with the utmost seriousness. I will, as long as I am head of the government, tolerate no political check-off of any kind. That

has been the condition in this government as long as I have been here, also as long as my predecessor (Mr. Drew) was here. I can assure the hon. members that no one has to come to this government or to any branch of this government and make a contribution to anybody in order to get a contract with, or employment by this government.

MR. SALSBERG: I am glad the hon. Prime Minister made that statement and I believe again that the hon. Prime Minister is an honest man but the hon. Prime Minister is not the treasurer of his Party, he is only the treasurer of this province, and I would be bold to suggest that if the treasurers of the Liberals and the Conservatives were to stand up in the House and tell us exactly where they got the money for the last election they contested, we would be closer to finding the answer to the Fort William incident than we otherwise would.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to hon. members that the situation in Fort William has absolutely nothing whatever to do, even remotely, with any Party contributions. I may tell hon. members that is the situation and that is the case. I again repeat, no contract, no work of any kind, is given to anybody conditional upon any promise, expressed or implied, in any way that there will be any contribution to anyone or anything. It is conditional upon the ability to give service and a good return to the people of Ontario. That is what they are paid for doing, and it is our job to see that is done honestly.

MR. SALSBERG: With all due regard and respect for the integrity of the hon. Prime Minister, I, sir, as an individual must say that I am prepared to challenge both Parties to tell us where the money came from for their campaign.

HON. MR. FROST: Would the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) be good enough to tell us where the money comes from to run his Party?

MR. SALSBERG: I accept the challenge and I agree to come here and bring

receipts for, and explanations of, every penny in my campaign and what I ask is that the Conservatives and Liberals do the same. In the last federal election the Liberal Party had so much money they did not know what to do with it. Is that not true? The Conservatives were on the starvation end of that campaign. When it comes to the provincial elections the Liberals are the ones who are starved, and all the money goes to the "Tories." It has been going on like this since 1943. Members of the Conservative Party are the chosen boys, while the Liberals only get the odd handout. But in the federal election of August and in the provincial election of 1951, a great deal of money was spent, and I have in my hand a clipping from a Toronto newspaper which reports that the Labour Council of Toronto said, and here is the heading:

"Tories Spent Million in 1951
Ontario Vote; Who Gave It?"
—Labour

HON. MR. FROST: May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) who said that?

MR. SALSBERG: This is the heading from an article in the *Toronto Star* of January 12th, 1954, which is pretty close to the situation. It is a report of a meeting of the Toronto and Lakeshore Labour Council. One of the delegates asked the question, "Who gave it?"

You see, Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberals have a great deal of money. All this "stuff" costs an awful lot of money and I have only some of the samples. On the other hand, the Conservatives, in the last federal election, issued some very fancy pieces, too. The gold-plated piano is really a masterpiece of printing and was distributed lavishly—it did not help. The case of the spring-filled dance floor; excellent printing costs a lot of money nowadays. Take the case of the autocratic Cabinet and so on. This money comes from somewhere.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there is a saying by a great comedian whose name I will not mention here

today, but who said that every good citizen ought to give to his Church, and to his political Party. After all, that is not such bad advice. I want to say that money which is given to the Party I lead is conditioned on nothing except that it will be good for the country. It is not conditioned upon contracts or employment or anything of the sort.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I want the government to understand that everything I say is directed to the Official Opposition just as much as it is to it. That may make it easier for the hon. Prime Minister to bear it.

HON. MR. FROST: I would not want to be included with them.

MR. SALSBERG: Being in the position the hon. Prime Minister is, why should he? He is among the high and mighty. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand, an article written by Mr. Blair Fraser, published in *Maclean's Magazine*, and entitled, "Our Illegal Federal Election." The date is April 15th, 1953, and it is extremely interesting. I am not going to burden the House, I shall read only a few lines. It will make you laugh, although you will not enjoy the laughter, I am sure. Mr. Fraser says that the money comes from a number of sources, and one of them is:

A considerable fraction of it, probably more than half, comes from big corporations which may have little or no direct business connection with the government. These are the chartered banks, the insurance companies, the steel companies, the mining, the pulp and paper, the automobile, the oil companies, and so on.

How much they give to each Party is a well-kept secret, for they don't like to show favouritism. Some years ago, a Montreal Liberal called on one of the banks and got a sealed envelope. He was delighted to find it contained \$50,000, twice as much as he'd expected. Later, he got a frantic telephone call from the banker:

"You will have to bring that back. I gave you the wrong envelope."

"You go to Hell," said the Liberal, and hung up.

That is how it is done. Mr. Fraser, a very reputable journalist, then goes on to say:

At the second level of contributors, are the contractors, the people who actually get government business. These are the heart and soul and spinal column of provincial party funds.

Mr. Speaker, it has reached a stage where contractors have now applied to Ottawa for consideration against income tax charges because of what they contribute to the election funds, and the *Telegram* of April 23rd, 1953, has the following to say, of which I quote just two paragraphs:

OTTAWA: The Department of National Revenue which collects Canada's income tax recognizes that in some cases political contributions are a necessary expense of doing business. Some contractors, especially those on roads in one or two provinces, have told the department quite openly that they cannot stay in business unless they make political contributions.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out this is not one of the provinces.

MR. SALSBERG: I should be happy to feel that way.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) had better feel that way.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that as far as the Department of Highways is concerned, there has never been mention of campaign funds in any shape or form, and, regardless of the Party they belong to, they get work. I have never heard a contractor discuss—and I would never discuss with him—any such thing. Nor have they even suggested it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I too, feel that the hon. Minister of

Highways (Mr. Doucett) would not discuss such things. I agree with him. But I quote from very responsible sources, and what is written, cannot be unwritten, you know, and I do not question the correctness of the statements, both by Mr. Fraser and in the *Telegram*.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, I do.

MR. SALSBERG: Let me come now to the opposition, just to give the supporters of the government a breather. The opposition should not be so self-righteous about this; and I am one of the opposition. I think that all of us, especially of course, the Official Opposition, should feel some responsibility, because we did not try hard enough to find out what is going on. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes get on the nerves of the government supporters, because I speak too much, and sometimes I suppose I do, but of course, I think it is always necessary, otherwise, I would not do it.

However, sometimes I confess to be somewhat frustrated by government disapproval and I figure, well, "let the thing go, I have done my share." One such instance comes to my mind which I feel I should repeat as a lesson to all of us. The Estimates for the Department of Highways came up in this House a couple of years ago and I believe the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) will recall that I told him I thought I had spoken more than my share, and besides, I was not an expert on highways, and I thought I would sit it out. Mr. Speaker, I think it took 6 minutes for the Estimates of the Department of Highways amounting to over \$100 million to go through this House. That is poor business. That is not good work on the part of the opposition. When it was over, I walked over to the hon. Minister of Highways—he is here, and will say whether I am right or wrong—and I said to him, "Are you satisfied? You put your Estimates through in six minutes." He answered, "No, I am not satisfied. What do you expect me to do, go to the opposition and tell them to get up and ask questions?" I think opposition members

should remember that. Let us all remember it. We did not do enough. We did not probe enough, and it is our duty to probe and probe and probe, and ask, even though it may be disliked by some hon. members of the House. That is our job in the opposition.

I want to conclude on this matter by saying that it will undoubtedly come up before the House during the session again. By the way, I hope the Committee on Public Accounts will be called together quite soon, and may I suggest that it would also help matters if the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) were prepared to make a speech there. It is the least we can expect. I do not say he is hiding anything from us, but I do say he should speak to the House, and take the House into confidence as much as he thinks he can at this stage. I say with all due regard and respect to him that hon. members of the House expect it. I think he should do that. I also would suggest, while I am at it, that we do at least know what Ottawa is doing—although they have a long way to go to assure no further Petawawas. They print, at least, long lists of contracts, and I think we should do that. We should periodically give to hon. members a list of all contracts amounting to, say, more than \$1,000 issued by any department, and let everybody know. For instance, on the last Ottawa list which appeared in the press on February 6th, I see "Pembroke"—that is from Ottawa, of course—"Public building, to complete, re-vote \$225,000; total \$600,000." Then "Petawawa," see, here it is, "Forest research, \$150,000." I suggest we should do something like that here.

Now may I say that I have no vendetta with the Ontario Hydro—no vendetta at all. I am not in a political battle with them, and I have no reason to seek any personal kudos from them, and have nothing to gain. It has done nothing harmful to me. I took the chairman's, Mr. Saunders', place in Toronto City Council when he stepped up to the Board of Control, I never had any quarrel with him, and I want to say

I have no "goods" on the hydro, and I am not going around seeking any.

However, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, that we should as quickly as possible, make a thorough study, if you do not want to call it "investigation" of the operations of hydro. Because here is an agency of the government spending now about \$1 billion in works. The Provincial Auditor does not audit the books, and repeating, Mr. Speaker, that I have no secrets and I have nothing against anyone in the hydro administration, I say that we are not doing our duty in the face of such vast expenditures and such large contracts, if we do not go into the most minute examination of the methods and work of hydro. If any are angry because I say this, let them be angry.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this government, in that regard, has done what no other government ever did, and that is appoint a Committee on Government Commissions. The House has never had that before. No government has ever done that. We are most anxious to give the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) or any other hon. member, the opportunity to enquire into government commissions. Nobody in history ever had the Liquor Control Board here nor the Liquor Licence Board here, as happened the other day, and hon. members will have the same opportunity with the Hydro Commission. Cross-examine them. Go ahead. May I say also, that we appoint the auditors who are Messrs. Clarkson, Gordon & Dilworth. They are appointed and they have their team of auditors in there constantly.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the improvement by the establishment of the Committee on Commissions. That is an improvement, but that can hardly be the agency, nor the medium for the kind of study of which I am speaking. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that last year when I entered the "Holy of Holies", the Committee on Commissions, to ask some questions and before I was unceremon-

iously ushered out for asking too many—a very bad occurrence, a very bad occurrence indeed—I said at the time if I were the Chairman of Hydro, I would ask for such an investigating committee. I said the government would do a good thing—that is, if it had a committee appointed. Everything may be, and I hope everything is all right, but everyone in this House is aware of rumours that circulate throughout the province. You talk of "slush" funds. It is no secret that the common gossip is, rightly or wrongly, that hydro provides one of the main sources of government election funds because of the enormous contracts it hands out and the amount of money involved.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, if I may just say a word. The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) said that he was ushered unceremoniously out of the committee last year. The only reason for that was he would not keep quiet when the chairman asked him to do so. He would have had an opportunity to ask his questions. We welcome questions from everybody, as the hon. Prime Minister has just said. But they come in our time, not when he wishes to ask them. He just did not co-operate along that line, and we found it necessary to put him off until a later date.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that because I was asking questions I was asked to leave. I do not question that. If I had not asked questions, there would have been no issue, and I could have sat there. But I did ask, and then followed up with another question. Then some people found I was offending the "Holiest of the Holy" by daring to question. Well, why shouldn't I? Why shouldn't any hon. member? Why can I not ask "Bob" Saunders? I have known "Bob" for a long time.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons I arranged to have the committee called much earlier this year, to give the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) and any other hon. member who wants to ask questions, a full opportunity to do so.

MR. SALSBERG: Anyway, I want to conclude this by saying that I propose to the government, the appointment of a Select Committee to study all the operations of hydro. Investigate it, and let us not wait. I hope it never will happen, but let us not wait for that lid to blow, and then all rush in, as was the case with this Fort William business, and it will not be necessary for any hon. member of this House—I was going to say the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett)—to ask "What happened to hydro?" just as he asked what happened to the Department of Highways. I think it will be good business in the interests of the people and in the interest of hydro to appoint such a committee.

As for myself, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind telling you that I would like to be on the committee. But I assure you it is not for the money. I undertake right now to agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) what institution should get the money. And I assure you also, sir, that I have no desire to concoct anything. I would like to be on that committee, and I think I would be perhaps the most impartial and objective member on the committee. Just remember that, Mr. Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Select Committees, I think the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) will see the problem. This morning, I had a deputation in to see me from Sault Ste. Marie, talking about unemployment, and about public works. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that The Hydro-Electric Power Commission and, indeed, the Department of Highways, are doing an enormous job in the province today. I sat on a Select Committee many years ago—I think with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon)—in connection with an investigation into hydro, which I am sure he well remembers. It was back in 1938 and the father of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) also sat on that committee. In that Select Committee, sir, I think we had all the principal hydro engineers from Doctor Hogg, in those days, down to other

engineers. I do not think those engineers did any business for about three months.

I would like the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to get those proceedings and read them carefully, and see what came out of it. I do not know really myself. It was an interesting matter, and to me it was an education, but it must have been very expensive from a standpoint of taking up the time of highly-placed and highly-priced personnel at that committee.

I say our job today is to carry on business, to do it efficiently, and to bring in better methods wherever they may be needed. In this way we keep the business going, and to do the things which are necessary in these days to streamline it, and, at the same time, provide employment for tens of thousands of our citizens.

That is the job, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member's (Mr. Salsberg) view were accepted, the Hydro Commission would be disrupted for a period of several months, while he had a good deal of fun, and contributed his per diem allowance to some charity or something of the sort. As a result, we would not get ahead with the people's business, which I assure you, is very pressing.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the hon. Prime Minister. The people's business, in my opinion, demands that Members of Parliament, who are responsible to the people for everything done, should be familiarized, should be fully informed, on what is going on in such an important agency. Mr. Speaker, I say they are not so informed.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) attend regularly the meetings of the Committee on Government Commissions. They are going to be held day after day. Let him attend, and ask questions. I can assure him that it will not be hurried. Plenty of opportunity will be afforded, even if it is necessary to call night sessions, for committees to meet. If the hon. member (Mr. Sals-

berg) wants night sessions for committees, he can have them any time he wants them.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): The hon. Prime Minister should put him on the committee.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, I should be glad to put him on the committee. I will make the necessary motion later.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, that is another thing, Mr. Speaker. That is the second best thing, but we will try to do with it. Having finished with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that important as those items are I think they are not the biggest scandal about this government, neither Fort William or other places. They are important, but this province will go on even if some bad things took place, if they are straightened out. The biggest scandal, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, about this government, is its failure to come to grips with the basic problems that challenge the people of this province at this time. That is a far more serious scandal than even highways.

I have in mind the failure of the government, in my opinion, to come to grips with such issues as unemployment, the Canadian seaway, the natural gas pipe line and the question of markets for our agricultural and industrial products. I know that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can stand up, as he has and as he will, and relate exactly what he has done in each of these fields. But I will show him. If he wants me to go on tonight, or if he wants me to move adjournment to be fresh tomorrow, I will move adjournment and give it to him when he is fresh and more responsive. But if he wants me to go on, I will. I will show that he did fail in these matters. I enumerated four although there are more than that.

With respect to the problem of unemployment, the question is: Are we or are we not in the midst of a developing economic crisis? That is a serious question, because much of government policy and action depends upon the estimation and conclusion we come to

on this essential question. I am beginning to wonder sometimes whether there is a dual policy, a conflicting policy in the Conservative Party as between the policy pursued by this government and the policy advanced by the national leadership of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Liberals in this House being silent about this, because even if they think otherwise, Party loyalties prevent them. Their people are running the country, and if their people in Ottawa say, "There is no crisis: there is no unemployment," they will not challenge it.

MR. OLIVER: You would not understand Party loyalty.

MR. SALSBERG: I think I do. Everyone in this House is bound to uphold his Party, but I am quite prepared and capable of speaking about those loyalties that are displayed by the people here and in Ottawa, whether they affect the Leader of the Opposition or otherwise. It is quite an interesting story. We will return to it if they want to, but I say they are quiet because their Party is in power. Their Party says, "Everything is all right. There is no trouble. There is no depression."

A very fine Canadian writer, a person who is responsible for quite a few people buying the *Telegram*, who otherwise would not, Judith Robinson, has culled a few interesting quotations from Ottawa. She quotes the hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Abbott, as saying:

I would not say the situation is serious. I would say it is unpleasant. She quotes the Minister of Labour in Ottawa, as saying:

One approach that may assist us to place the situation in better perspective is to try and break down those who are unemployed in two or three broad categories.

She quotes the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. C. D. Howe, as saying:

We have not panicked.

That is the attitude of the government in Ottawa, but that does not reflect the

situation in the country. The fact is, as pointed out by the organized workers of this country by the two trade union congresses which recently appeared before Ottawa—and it is a unique occasion when they get together—when they said the following, and I am quoting from their Brief to the Ottawa Government:

Present unemployment is far beyond "frictional" or "seasonal." It is neither localized in particular industries nor in particular geographical areas. Whatever the causes of this alarming situation, it is clear that something drastic is happening to the Canadian economy and that something must be done about it.

That is, I think a sober presentation of the problem. Something serious is taking place in the economy. That is also the opinion of such responsible correspondents as the present representative of the *New York Times* at Ottawa, who said the same thing a few days ago in his newspaper.

I am aware of the time element and I will not read his quotation, but he takes the position that the income of our agricultural population, the decline in industry, is creating a serious situation in Canada. It has reached the stage where we in Toronto have between 35,000 and 40,000 unemployed people, where the bread lines are again extending, and where hundreds of people in this city are compelled to sleep on the floors of missions and underground, hugging steam pipes to keep from freezing. We have reached the stage where the Automobile Workers' Union, according to this morning's paper, brought a special delegation to Ottawa to lobby for some action.

I have also some figures, the latest figures from Ottawa, although they are not the most reliable, showing that in Ontario there are now 142,000 applications for jobs on file, compared with 94,000 in December. This is the last figure, an increase of 47,000 over the same period last year.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that with such a situation it is impossible to shut one's eyes, unless one is a member of the government which would have to assume

responsibility for the situation, and therefore denies the existence of the unhappy situation I speak of.

The agencies devoted to the problems of the working people are now compelled to raise a cry and they speak of hunger. The *Toronto Star*, February 23rd, reports the following:

Many City Families In Need—Worker.

Many citizens do not know there are some families in the midst of Toronto's prosperous community who are experiencing cold, hunger and threat of eviction, Violet Munns, secretary of the Riverdale Neighbourhood Workers Association, told the February meeting of the district Neighbourhood Workers at Simpson Avenue United Church.

The *Globe and Mail* of February 22nd carries a letter from the Corresponding Secretary of the Canadian Association of Social Workers, pointing out a similar situation, stating that there is hunger in many homes due to unemployment.

I say, further, that I have come across in this province, cases where ex-soldiers, veterans, are now faced with the loss of the equity they have in homes because of unemployment.

In Welland, Ontario, a few of them spoke to me and told me they had bought wartime houses. The Federal Government Agency supervising and managing them served notice on them that, since they were unable to pay rent for the last couple of months, their properties would be taken away from them.

That is the situation. I say to the government by way of appealing, that they in this instance not follow the official line from Ottawa, even though they happen to be the government in power. They have to take certain action. Mr. Drew said a few days ago at St. Thomas, on February 18th:

We should not stand idly by when there are over 500,000 people unemployed.

I agree with this statement of Mr. Drew's.

Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the government and the government supporters in this House to some of the speeches made in the House of Commons last week by Mr. Green and Mr. Diefenbaker on this question, and remind them that Mr. Green moved an amendment for the setting up of a special committee of the House of Commons immediately to study the problem created of mass unemployment. I remind them that Mr. Diefenbaker said the following, and I am quoting from *Hansard* of February 15:

Indeed, as one goes back over the years, one can see that there was a similar situation in 1929, when conditions such as we face existed; but the government of that day failed to act, with a resulting depression within our country that took years to repair, if indeed it has ever been repaired.

I quote from prominent Conservative leaders because I think this government must make up its mind, and quickly, on this question. Of course the CCF had an amendment in the House of Commons on the unemployment problem. I may say that the Conservatives, as well as the Social Credit members, voted with the CCF on the amendment, bringing about a vote of 68 to 127, criticizing the government in Ottawa for not acting.

I say that in view of this situation, we cannot sit back and do nothing. I repeat what I said here before, that I agree with the government's basic position on this matter, namely, that it is the Federal Government's responsibility in the first place. Where I part company with the government is that if Ottawa should refuse to assume its responsibilities towards the unemployed, then we cannot and must not turn our backs on them. It would be cruel to do so. Certainly they have the greatest revenue, but we cannot claim poverty. We have the money, and if Ottawa fails, we must step in. We cannot shove it onto the municipalities, as is taking place.

The unemployed employables and those who have never received assist-

ance from the Unemployment Insurance fund go to the municipal government, and the municipal government is obliged to give them some help. They cannot do that.

I therefore say that this government should decide, and I appeal to it to decide, to give leadership on this question on a national scale. I would like to see them bring in a motion in this House, and it would not be partisan politics in my opinion. It would be merited and justified, and called for, for this government to introduce a motion calling upon the Federal Government to take all the necessary steps to alleviate suffering; to assume the responsibility of caring for the unemployed and their families; to provide cash relief for single unemployed; to undertake all great public works, and to see that wages are not cut, because the maintenance of purchasing power is extremely important.

I am sure if the hon. Prime Minister took such a position, every Party in this House would vote with him on a motion of that sort. I am confident it would have repercussions throughout the country and would have its effect on Ottawa. And why not? This is the biggest province. Why should not the Prime Minister give expression to a matter of national importance, particularly as our province is so seriously affected by it?

The only reason why I might hesitate would be because I am afraid he would become altogether too popular if he did that. But I am prepared to take a chance. I appeal to him to do that. But in the meantime, this government must open its doors and provide the temporary assistance necessary until Ottawa will step in, and it should start its own work project now.

It is not enough for the hon. Prime Minister to say, as he did when I spoke about this matter before, that he has work projects and will start them as soon as Ottawa will give him the signal. I say: Stop waiting for Ottawa. Start our public works, including housing and so on, right now.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few other items to deal with. There was a little interruption, but I did not object to it, or mind it at all. I welcomed it. If you insist, I will continue, but if it is all right, I will move the adjournment now and complete my remarks tomorrow.

HON. MR. FROST: That is all right.

MR. SALSBERG: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: I plan to go ahead with the debate tomorrow. If the hon. member would be so good as to intimate to the Whip, or the Assistant Whip, the hon. member for Huron South, the length of time he requires, so that we could arrange the order of the

other speakers, I would be very much obliged.

I beg to move the name of the hon. member for St. Andrew be added to the Standing Committee on Government Commissions.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been asked to announce that the Committee on Health which was called for 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, has been cancelled. Will the hon. members who are in the House notify those who are not in the House and are on the committee, that the meeting has been cancelled?

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, February 26, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, February 26, 1954.

Motion to add name of Mr. Patrick to Committee on Mining, Mr. Frost, agreed to	257
Unemployment Relief Act, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Goodfellow	257
Milk Industry, bill respecting, first reading, Mr. Goodfellow	257
Professional Engineers Act, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Welsh	259
Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Dunbar	259
Municipal Drainage Act, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Dunbar	259
Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Dunbar	260
Infants Act, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Porter	260
Credit Unions Act, 1953, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Porter	260
Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Porter	260
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Porter	261
Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Salsberg	261
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Leavine, agreed to	269
Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, bill respecting, second reading, Mr. Roberts	269
Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital, bill respecting, second reading, Mr. Pryde	270
Town of Fergus, bill respecting, second reading, Mr. Pryde	270
Town of Mimico, bill respecting, second reading, Mr. Brandon	270
Frontenac High School District, bill respecting, second reading, Mr. Edwards	270
Board of Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, bill respecting, second reading, Mr. Oliver	270
Town of Palmerston, bill respecting, second reading, Mr. Edwards	270
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954, second reading, Mr. Dunlop	270
Administration of Justice Expenses Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	270
Coroners Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	271
County Courts Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	271
Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	271
Insurance Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	271
Jurors Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	271
Magistrates Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	271
Mechanics' Lien Act, bill to amend. Bill reported	271
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	272

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1954

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER : I have been advised there will be no committee meetings held on Tuesday morning, in view of the trip being arranged by the Department of Agriculture. Those who have been called for committee meetings on Tuesday, please accept this as a notice of the cancellation of all such meetings.

It is a pleasure to welcome the students of the Hamilton Teachers' College. We are glad to welcome students of the lower grades, as we think they are amongst the more important grades, but it is a particular privilege to welcome those who are training the students, who will become the future citizens of the province.

We wish you every success in your profession, and express the hope that you may play your part in developing fine future citizens for this Province of Ontario.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the name of Mr. Thomas Patrick, the member for the electoral district of Middlesex North, be added to the Committee on Mining.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Unemployment Relief Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment, and only provides for the making of regulations prescribing the amounts of money which may be paid by the province in respect of the burial of indigents, who were resident in territory with municipal organization.

THE MILK INDUSTRY ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Milk Industry."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this new bill to the Legislature, I want to make it clear at the beginning that a good deal of thought and effort has been put forward by a great many people in regard to this particular bill.

We have been requested by the commodity groups in the dairy industry to bring forward such an Act, which will co-ordinate the dairy industry in the Province of Ontario.

I could read from a section of a brief, concerning some resolutions which were

presented to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture from the dairy commodity groups in their organizations, which requests are more or less what is included in the bill presented to this House this afternoon.

A dairy producers' co-ordinating board, composed of representatives of the four major milk-producer groups of the province, requested the Ontario Government to extend and amend the present Milk Control Acts so as to provide:

For a commission to be known as the "Milk Industry Commission" to promote research with respect to the producing and marketing of milk, and to determine standards of quality for milk, and to determine sanitary requirements in the production of milk.

This matter was given a good deal of consideration and there is a realization on the part of those people engaged in the dairy industry, that the industry does need to be co-ordinated at this time.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out at this time that it is more an educational programme than anything else, and for that reason, when the hon. members have digested this bill, they will realize there are very few new principles embodied in it. It is a consolidation of the Dairy Products Act, the Milk Control Act, the Milk and Cream Act, and those parts of the Farm Products Marketing and Sales Act, and the Farm Products and Marketing Act, which deal with dairy products.

Some of the hon. members are aware that for the past two years, there has been a co-ordinating body, composed of representatives of four commodity groups, who have been working together very well, and with a very high degree of co-operation in the interest of the producers of milk in this province, and this bill sets up a co-ordinating body similar to the co-ordinating group which has been working two years on behalf of the producers.

It is the purpose of this bill, in the consolidation of the Dairy Acts, to ap-

point the Dairy Commissioner to work under the Minister and the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, as a co-ordinator, with respect to the administration of this Act. Working with him will be an appointed board, which will be designated as the "Milk Industry Commission," which will be composed of the four milk-producer commodity groups, together with representatives of the processors and distributors, the Ontario Milk Distributors Association, the Ontario Creamery Association, the Ontario Milk Powder Manufacturers, the Ontario Cheese Manufacturers, and the Ontario Ice Cream Manufacturers.

They will constitute a Milk Industry Commission, whose duty it will be to represent the whole industry, and be concerned with the co-ordination and improvement of all phases of the industry, and the promotion and co-ordination of research. They will be interested in improving the quality of milk produced in this province.

I want to make it clear at this time that this Act, which is the consolidation of the existing Acts, does not change any principle of the present practices in connection with the existing Acts, as they are administered at the present time.

The Milk Control Board will not be affected in any way, nor will its functions.

The Ontario Concentrated Milk Producers, at their request, will be removed from the Milk Control Board, over to the Milk Products Board, under which the provisions of the Milk Products Marketing Act, and the Dairy Products Act, are in effect at the present time, insofar as cheese producers and cream producers are concerned.

The Concentrated Milk Producers feel they should be placed in the same position, and under the same administration and under a marketing scheme such as the Cheese Producers have at the present time.

Under the bill, minimum standards for milk will be established across the Province of Ontario.

As I said in the beginning, there is a great educational programme to be

carried on, and it is not the intention of this bill—nor those who will be responsible for its administration—to try and change to any marked degree existing practices in connection with the milk industry at the present time.

Those who are interested in the milk industry feel this bill is a step in the right direction and that is the reason the bill is being presented to the House at this time.

After the bill has had second reading, it will be referred to the Agricultural Committee, at which time the officials of the Department of Agriculture, who are familiar with the bill, will be called in to explain in detail just what is involved, and give any views they may have. In addition to that, representatives of all producer groups, and those interested in the processing and distribution of milk in this province, will have the opportunity to express their views before the Agricultural Committee, and to study this Act in detail, before it will be proceeded with further.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) if the bill contains a provision to establish a stabilization fund?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I neglected to mention that point. There will be provision in the Act for the collection of fees to establish a stabilization fund, but it will be voluntary, and will only be in effect after the producer groups have indicated their wish to have fees set aside for that purpose. In other words, there is nothing in the Act to force any producer group to contribute to the stabilization fund.

THE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Professional Engineers Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: The Association of Professional Engineers of the Province of Ontario is divided into five branches of the profession, and each of these branches is represented on the Council. The purpose of this bill is to add a new branch, which is becoming increasingly important in the province, that is, the branch of Aeronautical Engineers, to one of these groups, so it will be possible for them to have representation on the Council.

THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS QUIETING ORDERS ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It saves a little expenditure. It was worded in the wrong way previously. At one time, they had to consider all the boundaries, whereas, under this bill, the consideration of only one boundary may be necessary.

MR. OLIVER: The word "quieting" has been retained?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Oh, yes; it is as quiet as ever.

MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. OLIVER: What about this one?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: This gives the engineers the same power in towns and cities, as was given to them in the townships, that is, to initiate the construction of the drains.

A portion of this amendment changes the figure from "\$100" to "\$1,000"; that is, the municipality would have to assess previously if it amounted to

\$100; we have raised that to \$1,000. If it reaches \$1,000, then it must be assessed.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This is in order to give the Registrar-General power to ask for a new registration, if the first one should be found fraudulent or unreadable. Sometimes, we receive from municipalities forms not properly made out, and we think they should be in proper order. This amendment gives that power.

THE INFANTS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Infants Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in 1949, the Matrimonial Causes Act was amended to provide a procedure to be carried out by the official guardian to assist the courts in dealing with the custody of children in divorce actions brought by their parents. These have been very helpful, and the establishment of this procedure has been a signal success. It has been of very great assistance to the courts in arriving at their decisions as to the custody of children in divorce cases.

This bill, the amendment to The Infants Act, is to apply the same procedure in all cases of custody applications, whether a divorce is involved or not.

CREDIT UNIONS ACT, 1953

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the last session of the Legislature, provision was

made for the transfer of the administration of credit unions from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Insurance, and this transfer has been made, and has become effective.

In the course of the experience gained during the time since the Department of Insurance has had authority in these matters, certain changes in procedure were considered advisable, and this bill is designed to bring the Act into line with the new administrative policies of the Department of Insurance, and also in line with some of the present practices of the credit unions.

The amendments are entirely devoted to procedural matters, and I propose to refer this to the Legal Bills Committee.

I have been informed that the changes incorporated in this amendment have been approved by the Credit Union Association which is concerned with these activities.

JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT, 1954

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is a complete revision of the Juvenile and Family Courts Act which was last revised in 1927.

These courts shall be known as "The Juvenile and Family Courts," whereas, they were formerly known as "Family Courts" and "Juvenile Courts." Now they will be under the one appellation of "Juvenile and Family Courts," thus giving equal emphasis to the fields in which these courts function.

It provides for the establishment of courts, and also for the financial obligations involved, and also provides for the retirement of judges, which up to the present time, have been governed by The Public Service Act.

In other respects, the principles of the present Act are continued.

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the changes contained in this amendment are of a minor nature which have been recommended by the Real Estate and Business Brokers Branch.

The first one provides that a person may trade as a broker only if he is registered as a broker, and can trade as a salesman only if he is registered as a salesman, whereas, now the wording of the Act is somewhat unsatisfactory, in that it provides that a registered salesman is free to operate as a broker, as well as a salesman, because he is registered, under the wording of the Act, as a broker or salesman.

There is also a section dealing with the surviving or remaining partner in a partnership who is permitted to carry on the business.

It also covers the case of a limited company, and it provides that officers of limited companies who carry on this sort of business must be registered, the same as individuals have to be.

There are one or two other amendments of a minor nature, similar to the ones I have mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, I said yesterday that the greatest shortcoming in the Speech from the Throne as an indicator of government policy and intention, is the failure of the government to come to grips with a number of fundamental problems affecting the well-being and the future of the province.

I dealt, first, with the problem of unemployment, and now I want to deal with another very vital issue, that of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally recognized that the construction of a deep waterway is one of the means of providing employment, but I suggest the importance of this enterprise goes far beyond the creating of jobs immediately. It affects the future economic development of Ontario, and of Canada, and, furthermore, it touches on the basic question of independence as well.

We know that Canada has for many years desired a deep waterway from the Head of the Lakes to the Atlantic; we know this country has spent large sums of money deepening the waterway, in the construction of channels, locks, and so on. We also know that the United States has, throughout that long period, refused to co-operate with Canada in the building of a deep-sea route all the way.

I suggest there were very definite reasons why that obstruction and refusal to co-operate came from south of the border. It is true there were certain selfish interests, such as the coal producers, and sections of railroads, and so on who objected, but I suggest there was a deeper reason. The United States was not interested in the development of such a waterway, because it would make possible the industrial development of Canada, but they preferred to have Canada mainly as a base for the securing of raw materials, and as a market for the finished products, rather than make possible the development of great processing industries.

Lately there has been a change in the United States' attitude which, I think, is due to two main reasons. First, the steel interests are now desirous of having a seaway because it would enable them to bring iron ore from Ungava and other parts of Canada through the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, to their large manufacturing centres, and they have begun to support the idea of a joint seaway.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think there is even a deeper reason. The United

States has realized that Canada is determined to build an all-Canadian seaway, and is prepared and fully able to build it herself. Once that was realized, the attitude of the dominant circles in the United States was to prevent the realization of this over-all project.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of this House will recall two years ago, the House had before it a bill introduced by the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), dealing with certain developments in the eastern part of the province in relation to the seaway. I then moved an amendment that every reference in that bill to the seaway should be understood as referring to an all-Canadian seaway. It is true, I could not get a seconder, but I moved it, and, of course, it fell by the wayside. In fact, I think some of the hon. members thought I was a bit "off" in making such a suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, today there are many people who are saying the very same thing—and for obvious reasons. When it became clear in Washington that Canada was going to build a seaway, the Army, and other governmental agencies, stepped in, according to the report of a hearing, before a Congressional Committee, as reported by the New York representative of the *Toronto Telegram*. It was reported that one General said, in regard to the St. Lawrence Seaway, "It is analogous to the Panama Canal, which is under the control of the Secretary of War."

Another one declared that "Canada must not be permitted to build this seaway."

They now come forward with the proposal not to have a seaway which is all-Canadian, but a seaway in which they will participate, on condition that three of the main locks be on the American side, and that full control be vested in the hands of the United States Government and its agencies. In other words, the seaway, which they could not block any longer, would be one they could control, with the right to determine the policy left in the hands of the American Military.

Mr. Speaker, I think I am expressing not a partisan view when I stand before this House at this time and argue that we should take positive action to the effect that a seaway be built, which will be all-Canadian in character.

We have lately been advised, Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered at Kingston by the hon. Minister of Transport in Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Chevrier) that a secret understanding has been reached between Ottawa and Washington Governments a year ago, that if an arrangement can be made for power, they will make concessions to the United States in regard to the seaway. I have reason to think that no one outside of the intimate circle in Ottawa knew of that secret agreement. At the present time, it looks very much as if that secret agreement will come into effect.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not always happy to say I agree with the *Telegram*, but I am mentioning the *Telegram* in order to convey to this House, the breadth of the opposition to that secret agreement. The *Telegram* said, editorially, on February 5th, "If Canada thus got the short end of the stick . . ."

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I interrupt the hon. member? I may be quite wrong about this, but it is my recollection that hon. Mr. Chevrier denied that there was any agreement such as he mentioned. Remember, that was a newspaper statement and, I think, he declared it was inaccurate. I do not think it would be fair to go ahead on the premise that he did say that.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not recall having seen any denial.

MR. OLIVER: May I just say to the hon. member, I remember distinctly reading in the press where hon. Mr. Chevrier explicitly denied that.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: That is right.

MR. SALSBERG: If you say he denied it, I acknowledge it and will not refer to the matter.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Your premise is all wrong.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not. My position stands safe and solid, regardless of what hon. Mr. Chevrier denied, because the intentions of those at Ottawa on this issue are abundantly clear. So clear that I think this House should have something to say about it. As I began to say, I agree with what the *Telegram* says, that "If Canada thus got the 'short end of the stick,' after shouldering two-thirds of the seaway cost, it might itself do something along the line of 'unilateral' tolls." I agree with that.

Furthermore, I am glad to associate myself with opinions expressed by the officers of St. Paul's Riding of the Progressive Conservative Association in Toronto, which includes the provincial riding of the hon. Attorney-General. At a meeting of this association a few days ago, the following was said:

HON. MR. PORTER: Not by me.

MR. SALSBERG: Unfortunately, not by you. In my opinion, you should have said it. But these are rather wise words said by an officer of that association. I am quoting from the *Globe and Mail* of February 23rd:

Canada will be branded "a banana republic" if it accepts the St. Lawrence Seaway proposals now before the U.S. Congress. W. L. Archer, president of St. Paul's Riding Progressive Conservative Association, said last night.

That was the president of the Progressive Conservative Association saying something with which I agree. All he has to do, is adopt a motion there and make it obligatory on his hon. member (Mr. Porter) to get up in the House and express the sentiments of his Party in his riding.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am not bound by anyone.

MR. SALSBERG: The reason Mr. Archer used this expression is, because

the representative of the United States Army said before a Congressional Committee that the deep-sea waterway is going to be in the same category as the Panama Canal, and the Panama Canal has turned Panama into a "banana republic" with the United States having cut it in half, dominating and running the Panama Republic. I am sure that every hon. member supporting this government in this House will certainly not desire to see such a development take place here.

Let me quote a very prominent business man. You will notice what company I am seeking on this issue. I quote now from the *Canadian Tribune*, a fine Canadian paper, an excellent paper, and if I had not the desire to finish on time, I could tell you something about that paper. I will on another occasion.

MR. JANES (Lambton East): Who wrote that?

MR. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Is not the whole speech from the *Tribune*?

MR. SALSBERG: This week's issue made me feel a little bit aggrieved. I did not get headlines. Do you know who in this session got the headline story in last week's issue? The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar). I really felt I should have got a bigger play, but I found a big story—which was very laudable—concerning the hon. member for Welland, because of the stand he took here in an endeavour to secure orders for the Paige-Hersey Company in connection with the pipe line. Now, this appeared on the front page of this paper which seeks to give support to anything worth while, no matter from where it comes. The Progressive Conservative Association received publicity and you are still complaining. What do you want?

I am asked who the editor is. He is Mr. Thomas C. Simms, a gentleman who was alderman for many years in the City of Toronto.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Will the hon. member permit me to ask a question?

MR. SALSBERG: I have a quotation dated February 22nd, 1954, which reads as follows:

"Canada should definitely proceed with the St. Lawrence Seaway on her own and collaborate with the U.S. only where there is no alternative," R. H. Davis, president of Atlas Steels Ltd. of Welland declared in reply to a *Financial Post* questionnaire, February 13th. Davis warned: "Canada will regret trying to work with the U.S. on this project."

MR. ROBERTS: Will the hon. member permit an interruption?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member spoke of the report in the *Tribune* concerning the St. Paul's Conservative Association. I would like to ask him whether the *Tribune* reported that a resolution was passed there unanimously, for the attention of the Crown, regarding the emblem of the Royal Canadian Air Force?

MR. SALSBERG: I have not yet finished the story. I will read the entire story, and will gladly reply after I have read it.

Having brought this before the House, I want to suggest that we take some action. I might say that I am not suggesting we take an "unilateral" action, or that we seek to Balkanize the country, but I suggest this government should take a positive position and come out forthrightly so as to influence development.

What is necessary is not to accept a priori the arrangements which Ottawa will make on this issue. It is terrifically important for the development of this province, its industry, for the growth of the Northwest, and other areas in the province. It is sufficiently important for us to say that we want this an all-Canadian seaway. I reject any suggestion that the question of power is inseparably linked with the deep-sea waterway. On the seaway we can act independently while continuing to seek co-operation from the State of New

York for the development of power. I say this government and this House, if necessary, should be prepared to say that if the Americans will refuse to budge, then we will build our own canal on this side. We can afford it. This country can afford to build the necessary locks on the Canadian side. If the Americans will want it that way, fine; but the control of the seaway must be in the hands of the Government of Canada, to administer in the interests of this country.

I hope, before the session is over, the government will more than make a pronouncement on this question but will seek to exercise a decisive influence on this important issue. It is important enough now, but it is of even greater importance for the future.

As I said before, the United States wants to use us mainly as a source for raw materials. An hon. member—with the best of intentions I am sure—questioned that.

Let me tell the hon. member that I have here the monthly letter issued by the Bank of Nova Scotia, entitled *The U.S. Tariff and Canadian Development*, dated October-November, 1953, a few short sentences of which are worth repeating:

In 1952 Canada exported more than \$2.3 billions worth of goods to the United States, exclusive of gold. It is perhaps not surprising that close to \$2 billions consisted of products derived from her farms and fisheries, her forests and mines. But it is somewhat disturbing, in view of the recent rapid industrial growth in Canada, that in most cases the bulk of the exports went in raw or primary form and comparatively little in a highly manufactured state. This pattern reflects the structure of the U.S. tariff which permits free entry to many raw materials and imposes low rates of duty on others, while rates on goods at more advanced stages of manufacture rise progressively, in some cases to quite prohibitive levels.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the state of affairs. The seaway is important in correcting such an imbalance as now

exists. We want more processing of our raw materials. We have no objection to shipping excess stuff to the United States, such as iron and so on. But above everything, we want new steel mills here—at the Head of the Lakes, on the St. Lawrence—and processing industries of all sorts—to correct this situation, as pointed out by the Bank of Nova Scotia. I think an all-Canadian seaway will go a long way towards realizing that objective.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. member that my understanding of the Wiley Bill is that the American Congress is asked to appropriate \$100 million for the building of the canal on the American side of the international part of the river. There is nothing to prevent Canada building a similar canal on her side of the river, if she wants to.

May I further point out to the hon. member if he were in Montreal and were sailing a ship up to the Lakehead—Fort William is the name we use here—what would he do?

The canal is bound to be built through Canada in the international part of the river, so from Montreal to Cornwall it will be on the Canadian side. There is no other place for it to go.

From Cornwall, it could then go either way; on the American side of the river, or, if Canada built a duplicate on the Canadian side you could go along the Canadian side until you reached Welland or Port Weller, which is in the riding of the hon. member where we launched the big ship.

Then you must sail through Canada. Nobody can get to the Upper Lakes unless they go through Canada. Then, you would go through Lake Erie, on up to the "Soo" and then to Lake Superior where you would have to go through the canal on the American side, because this is the only way you can get through with a large ship.

Will the hon. member tell me what is the enormous importance of Canada putting in another \$100 million to build a canal on our side of the river, if the

Americans build one on theirs? I cannot see it makes a great deal of difference. As a matter of fact, it is a partnership arrangement.

You cannot get through unless you sail through Canada, then through the international section, then through Canada, then through the United States and up to the Lakehead.

Would the hon. member explain to me what is really bothering him about this? I cannot understand what it could be.

MR. SALSBERG: The fact is, there had been an understanding reached. If I am wrong, I would like to be corrected. However, I am under the impression that an understanding had already been reached for the construction of the seaway on the Canadian side, with the United States coming in as a partner. It was only a last-minute intervention which caused this change in the United States. Furthermore, the original plan for the seaway, which called for the three main locks to be on the Canadian side, had been approved by the International Joint Commission of Canada and the United States.

Why do certain American interests, at this later hour, desire to change a plan which had already received approval? Because they want to use the key locks as pawns and as pincers to "put the squeeze on" any time they want. Shipping rates, as we know, can determine the growth or decline of industry.

HON. MR. FROST: We can build a canal on our side, if we want to spend the money. But should we do that in a partnership deal—

MR. SALSBERG: I think so.

MR. NIXON: Are there not two canals?

HON. MR. FROST. Yes. But the American canal is the one which is used the more because it is the larger. We could build a large canal at the "Soo" at the present time, which would take all shipping. The United States could also

do that, for instance where we have the Welland Canal, which is there for all shipping, so why duplicate it in that way?

May I point out to the hon. member the reason the canal is being built—and the reason why it will go through—is because the Government of Canada and this Legislature said: "We will do it ourselves."

MR. SALSBERG: Is it?

HON. MR. FROST: We wanted them to come in with us. That is a fact. The hon. member knows for years we endeavoured to negotiate through the International Joint Commission. It was only after years of negotiation that we said, "We will do it ourselves. We will build the canal." Canada and Ontario have said that, and if our friends come into this partnership, we must realize that, after all, they are partners in the rest of it.

MR. SALSBERG: I agree with the last words, with one exception, and that is, that we build a canal separately or jointly on condition that it be an all-Canadian seaway as was originally proposed, as was originally agreed to by the International Joint Commission, which agreement they are now trying to get out of.

All I suggest is, it will be the safest—perhaps the only—way to guarantee uninterrupted growth and development of industry in this country, and to provide them with the means of shipping our products as well as our grain to any part of the world at the lowest possible shipping rates. We should build that seaway in a manner which is controlled, and leave that control in the hands of the Canadian Government. Otherwise, I do not know whether even the grain shipments from the West, let alone timber and industrial products coming from the Northwest, will be in a competitive position, if the Americans will be the sole determiners of rates on the key canals. It will be exclusively under their control, as Mr. Davis of Atlas Steels points out. They will have their

working control there. They will have the locks, but they will also flow over onto the Canadian side.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, may I just interject? This is all hypothetical. The fact is, we control it because we own the Welland Canal. They have to use the Welland Canal. They have to go through Welland, and you have the parallel locks at Sault St. Marie. There is no reason why Canada cannot—in fact, they contemplate it as I understand—put a big lock on the Canadian side, no matter what the Americans do.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very glad we have the Welland Canal. I think it is to the credit of those who have gone before us, and of all the governments which were farsighted, and started to build that great canal so many years ago. All the more reason why, after half a century of U.S. sabotaging, we should not slip up now in the crucial hour.

HON. MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I promised the hon. Prime Minister to finish at a certain time. I am trying to oblige, but I find it very difficult.

I want to go on to a third item, regarding the question of the Canadian Natural Gas Pipe Line.

This too, is a vital issue for the province and the country. I want to say a few words on it. It is true it is touched upon in the Speech from the Throne, but not as it should be. One cannot overstress the importance of bringing natural gas to Ontario. It is extremely valuable fuel. It is a Canadian fuel and we can get it almost without limit. It can help industry to develop and bring great benefits to the domestic consumer.

Attempts were made at the beginning to divert the natural gas pipe line southward. Those were the initial steps taken by the Texans who came up here. One gentleman, a former horse trader—so his record is given in *Maclean's*, and this is not to his discredit, he is now a

tycoon—thought it would be good to get hold of our gas pipe line. The idea was to divert the line to the south, as was done with the oil line. I think Conservatives in Ottawa opposed the granting of a charter to pipe western Canadian oil to the United States and I think they were right.

I must say that the *Canadian Tribune* carried on a heroic campaign for an all-Canadian gas pipe line. Hon. members will, I feel sure, excuse me if I bother them a great deal on this subject between the sessions. I have done all I could to arouse public interest in this question. I gave a lot of credit to the Prime Minister of Ontario with whom I am in political disagreement, for having said, and I quote him, that the construction of an all-Canadian gas line is as important to us as was the construction of the first trans-Canada railway. That is true. But there were private interests trying to interfere for a number of reasons, even after Ottawa made known that it would favour an all-Canadian route. I think the Consumers Gas Company's campaign was scandalous. Its publicity campaign was definitely misleading from beginning to end. But I do not want to take the time of the House to go into that in detail now.

We want an all-Canadian pipe line which will bring this natural gas here at the lowest possible price. Therefore, we say it should be not only all-Canadian but a publicly owned utility. The government, having made a fine statement through the hon. Prime Minister, then subsided for a while. . . .

HON. MR. FROST: What statement did I make?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister said the building of an all-Canadian gas pipe line is as important as was the construction of the first trans-Canada railway.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. I did not say "public utility."

MR. SALSBERG: No, you did not say "public utility." I do not even imply

that the hon. Prime Minister has sinned to that extent. He is not guilty. But I say that not only should it be an all-Canadian pipe line, but it should be a publicly-owned utility to assure the supply of gas for industry and domestic use at the lowest possible rates.

I am glad to be able to say that, for a while, the action of this government looked very encouraging. The hon. Prime Minister placed the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) in charge. He went west and east and south on this question. The Chairman of the Ontario Hydro came in and everything looked as if it were travelling in the right direction at a good clip. I was very happy about it because it was in line with what I and the *Canadian Tribune* and the Labour-Progressive Party have been advocating.

Then something happened. After the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) had visited all necessary places, there seemed to be a new hitch developing. And perhaps we would all be wiser if the government were to make a full explanation to the House. It seems to me now that some very ominous developments are taking place. For instance, the Senate at Ottawa approved the application of the Consumer Gas Company without having prior guarantees and assurances that its so-called north-south line will not eventually pipe gas southward.

I suggest we take a very positive position on the gas question. First, that this House should say to Ottawa, and to the country, that we are going to fight like Trojans to make sure we shall have a pipe line that will bring the gas from the Prairies down to Ontario and Quebec. Second, I suggest that we insist that the pipe be manufactured in Ontario. I am glad the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar)—and this is one of the things I hold against this government—was selected as the candidate in Welland, as he is a man who works in the pipe works, and, therefore, manages to secure a number of votes from the workers. I agree with everything he says. I was in

Welland addressing a meeting of the unemployed, after he—quite rightly—had addressed another meeting, and found that the Paige-Hersey Company, the only big pipe company in Canada, has laid off a lot of men, and I think the pipe for the pipeline should be made in Welland. I think that company should make them, even though it may mean installing new machinery to construct pipes larger than those being made at the present. I suggest the government provide an opportunity to discuss it in the House, give a full report and, if it will listen to reason, take my advice, and set up a Gas Commission to construct and operate the pipe line for the benefit of the people of Ontario, and sell the gas at cost.

In conclusion, there is this question of markets. I have already overstepped my time and I want to conclude. Let me just say this: In addition to providing home markets for the products of farms and factories, which means purchasing power, which means keeping wages high, reducing taxes wherever possible, so that more money remains in the pockets of the consumers, we are confronted with the problem of finding new markets. The hon. members who come from the Ottawa Valley know that the textile towns are facing a severe crisis. Hon. members from the Hamilton and other Southern Ontario areas know that the textile mills in their towns have been compelled to reduce staffs, or close down. That is so in a whole number of other industries.

I think it is shameful that Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe—on behalf of the Ottawa Government—should have told a delegation of workers from the farm implement industry, that they should go and find other jobs when he knows there are no other jobs in Hamilton or other places where the farm implement works are situated. It is shocking that a man in this day and age should speak that way. It is a fact that there is no reason why 2,000 men should be laid off in the Brantford agricultural implement industry when there are countries in the world still using wooden ploughs,

who are anxious to buy every plough and combine and tractor produced in this country and to trade with us.

I am glad we have not reached the stage where hon. members will say "Ah, you mean with Russia." I would say, "Yes, and with the British Isles and with the Commonwealth." We want to regain all the markets in the Commonwealth and accept Sterling for the sale of our bacon and cheese. I would even say, "Yes, sell to China." We do not sell to China because the United States prevents us. They could not stop us if we were to tell them "Mind your own business," but unfortunately Ottawa is not inclined to say that. Every piece of farm machinery produced in this country in the next 25 years would find a ready market among countries which are anxious to raise their living standards. I would also say, "Yes, sell to Russia and other countries." It is safe to say that this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, after Prime Minister Churchill said the same thing last night. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that while the United States tells Canada not to sell farm implements to China, they have in Hong Kong representatives of the largest American corporations waiting to jump into that market and take orders.

There is no reason why we should say we cannot develop something independently. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that we send an independent Ontario trade delegation to Europe. I would like to see the hon. member for Hastings East (Mr. Robson) or the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Pringle) be on that delegation, because they represent the dairy industry, and I would like to see hon. members of this House, representing areas producing other farm products, on it. I would like to see representatives of labour and industry included on the delegation. Such an Ontario trade delegation should go to the British Isles and other countries and say to them, "We have bacon, we have tobacco, we have beef, we have . . ."

AN HON. MEMBER: Bananas.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, the hon. member is the representative of a "banana republic."

I want to say the recent order we received for cheese was a sort of windfall, but there is no guarantee we are going to get it again. The sale of salmon from British Columbia was the result of private negotiations, not of arrangements by Ottawa.

I would like to see an Ontario delegation with, of course, a Cabinet Minister or two on it to shepherd the hon. members composing it. Let us say to all countries "We want to trade with you." The former hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) made a statement a number of times that I felt was very wise. He said "Let us sell food rather than guns" and I think this province should take some independent actions, not in opposition to Ottawa, but independent action nevertheless—which it has done on other occasions and at other times—to find markets for our agricultural and industrial products.

I conclude with this, Mr. Speaker. We are at the crossroads. I am sorry to take a tone that differs from the Speech from the Throne. I do not think it is all rosy. I do not think we have no cause for worry. I am sorry, but I do not think it is a matter of settling down. I do not think we are suffering because of growth in the recent period. I think we are facing serious challenges which will determine the well-being of this province for a long time to come. The few issues upon which I touched are those which concern the future development of the province, and I call on the government to give leadership to all these issues. I do not suggest that we embark on a struggle, Queen's Park versus Parliament Hill. Or that we begin every day to shoot arrows towards Ottawa, and Ottawa replying with other weapons. I do not mean that at all. But I do mean that this government on behalf of this great province, in the interest of its people, in the interest of the country, should give statesmanlike, sound leadership. And if, as a result of such leadership, they should secure some political benefit, I for one, will not at

all resent it, providing the government does the right thing.

And I think the right thing should be done right now.

MR. S. F. LEAVINE (Waterloo North) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

SAO PAULO LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY

MR. A. K. ROBERTS (St. Patrick) moves second reading of Bill No. 15, intituled, "An Act respecting the Sao Paulo Light and Power Company Limited."

He said: Perhaps I should say a word on the principle of the bill at this point.

The purpose of this bill is to enable the Sao Paulo Light and Power Company which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Brazilian Traction Light and Power Company, Limited, with offices located in Brazil, to change its head office to Brazil, and thereafter to apply to the Brazilian authorities for the necessary decree under Brazilian corporation law, to become a naturalized Brazilian corporation, and if and when that occurs within the limited time mentioned in the Act, to file with the Provincial Secretary a certificate showing that that has been done, after which time the Ontario corporation law and the Companies' Act will cease to have any application.

May I say that this company, which has very large assets—something like \$275 million of assets—all of them in Brazil, has played a very important part in the development of electricity in the heavily-populated centres of Brazil.

The State of Sao Paulo, which is a highly industrialized section of Brazil, is dependent to a very considerable extent on this company for its development and the electricity produced is not sufficient for its present requirements, and for the growth contemplated.

If this bill becomes law, and the procedure I have mentioned is followed, it will enable the people of Brazil to invest

in this company, and take part in the development in that way, by supplying the additional capital.

Mr. Speaker, a bill with respect to another subsidiary—the Brazilian Telephone Company—of the same Brazilian Traction Company is, at the present time, going through the House of Commons in Ottawa, having received approval in the Senate, and it is asking for the same ends this bill seeks in the Ontario Legislature with respect to electricity.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TORONTO EAST GENERAL AND ORTHOPAEDIC HOSPITAL

MR. PRYDE, in the absence of Mr. Macaulay, moves second reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF FERGUS

MR. PRYDE, in the absence of Mr. Root, moves second reading of Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting the Town of Fergus."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF MIMICO

MR. BRANDON moves second reading of Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Town of Mimico."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FRONTENAC HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

MR. EDWARDS, in the absence of Mr. Pringle, moves second reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the Frontenac High School District."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE BOARD OF THE BAPTIST CONVENTION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

MR. OLIVER, in the absence of Mr. Nixon, moves second reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF PALMERSTON

MR. EDWARDS moves second reading of Bill No. 29, "An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT, 1954

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves second reading of Bill No. 63, "The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill goes to the Committee on Education.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways) moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE EXPENSES ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 34, "An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Expenses Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 34 reported.

THE CORONERS ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 36, "An Act to amend the Coroners Act."

On section 1:

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if that applies only to Toronto?

HON. MR. PORTER: It does now, yes.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 36 reported.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 37, "An Act to amend The County Courts Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 37 reported.

THE CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 39, "An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 39 reported.

THE INSURANCE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 42 reported.

THE JURORS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 44, "An Act to amend The Jurors Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 44 reported.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT, 1952

House in Committee on Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend The Magistrates Act, 1952."

On Section 1:

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if some magistrates had jurisdiction throughout the province before this legislation was passed?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: What proportion did have?

HON. MR. PORTER: The magistrates frequently have been sent to different points to fill in, when there was a vacancy or illness, but, generally speaking, I think there were but a few, perhaps three or four, who have had jurisdiction to fill in, and for those, that was most of their work.

We have two or three magistrates who have been travelling about the province filling in, which is really their full duty. They are not assigned to any particular place at all. The majority of the magistrates are assigned to one particular county.

But, if I recall correctly, there are only two or three in that category.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 45 reported.

THE MECHANICS' LIEN ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 46 reported.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report eight bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House reports eight bills without amendment, and begs leave to sit again.

Report adopted; motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. OLIVER: Will the hon. Minister tell us, Mr. Speaker, if it is the government's intention to proceed with the addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne on Monday?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, the addresses will continue on Monday.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.40 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, March 1, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, March 1, 1954.

Passing of Mr. William Bruce Harvey, expression of tribute, prayer, Mr. Speaker	275
Third Annual Report, The Alcoholism Research Foundation, tabled by Mr. Phillips	276
Passing of Mr. Harvey, expressions of regret, Mr. Frost, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Salsberg	278
Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Leavine, Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Roberts, Mr. A. G. Frost, Mr. MacOdrum	279
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Chartrand, agreed to	304
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	304

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable members of this House have experienced this morning the profound sorrow through the passing of one of our most esteemed and kindly members of our Assembly in the person of William Bruce Harvey. His genial nature, always carrying the spirit of supreme optimism and bright outlook, left an impression upon all whom he served of the real possibilities of life. He was possessed of a rich happiness which was so evident in his cheerful nature and ready smile. His enthusiasm for his part of the province which he loved so much carried a contagion which made so many feel that his was the best part of God's creation. His love of nature, his abundant faith, and his simple charity were distinctive marks of a true servant of God and man. We give thanks for the gift of his life to our day and generation, and to his family extend our understanding, sympathy and prayers for strength and faith and courage.

May we observe one minute's silence please, in grateful recognition of the life of William Bruce Harvey.

One minute's silence; all hon. members standing.

MR. SPEAKER: Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those that depart hence, we most humbly beseech Thee to look in love and mercy upon the soul of Thy child, William

Bruce, whom Thou hast called from the cares and duties of this world, into Thine Eternal Presence. Grant that as we believe in the reality of Life Eternal, so too may we, his friends and associates, find comfort in that same knowledge for him. Graciously look upon those bereaved by their loss, and may they find in Thee—the God of all mankind—a sure refuge and strength in their time of sorrow. For all his weaknesses and shortcomings we beg Thy mercy. For all his good deeds performed in the midst of this world may he be a lasting memory of thanksgiving and may his human understanding add to the betterment of all with whom he came in contact. May he find Eternal Rest in Thine unbounded love. All of which we ask in the name and for the sake of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, who is the Resurrection and the Life. Amen.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Before the Orders of the day, I think, perhaps, I should explain for the benefit of those who are not aware of it, the significance of this very important day. This is St. David's day.

Those of us who are Welsh, and we have at least two born in Wales in this august Assembly, 2 out of 90 is not too bad for a little country with only a few million population, but I can assure you that the smallness of our numbers does

not represent our enthusiasm, I think, our devotion, and I would say perhaps, even our intelligence, but in that perhaps I would not find too much agreement.

I can assure you, it is a very great privilege for me to accept from the Welsh Players, in token of this day, this very lovely basket of daffodils. I am extremely grateful they did not send a bunch of leeks with them, which is, of course, our emblem, as I do not think I would have been able to stand the leeks beside me—not nearly as well as the daffodils, I assure you.

I do want to express my public thanks to the Welsh people of Toronto for thus honouring our patron saint.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad today to join you in expressing our tribute to our patron saint, St. David. Although today is St. David's day, the Welsh people in Oshawa had a banquet on Saturday night, and I wish you had been there to listen to the singing of the old Welsh songs and hymns.

We had a very large gathering. We had some friends from Lindsay, who, although we enjoyed their company, I am sorry to say were supporters of the hon. Prime Minister.

The English have their patron saint, St. George; the Scottish have St. Andrew; and the Irish have St. Patrick; but they are not quite sure where they were born. The Welsh people can truly boast that St. David was a native son, born in Wales.

I am very pleased to see that you received a beautiful basket of daffodils. There is some controversy respecting the national emblem, whether it should be the daffodil or the leek. I am very glad to know the Welsh players of Toronto favour the daffodil; otherwise, I am sure you would be drinking a great deal of leek broth for the rest of the year.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MACKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I beg leave to table this Third Annual Report

of The Alcoholism Research Foundation, and, at the same time, to make a few explanatory remarks.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. McNab, the President of The Foundation, and all its members. These men are doing a remarkable job in the fields of treatment and rehabilitation of patients who are suffering from chronic alcoholism.

This takes the form of, first, diagnosis, which is based on research; second, treatment; and third, and most important, rehabilitation.

I also want to congratulate the Executive Director, Mr. David Archibald, and his Medical Director, Doctor Armstrong. Within the last few months they have taken on a Director of Education, Mr. Ross. Our new Alcohol Clinic and Hospital was opened last spring. It is situated at 9-11 Bedford Road.

May I say, at the present time, there are only two copies of the Third Annual Report available, but if any of the hon. members of the House wish a copy, if they would write to Mr. Archibald or Mr. John Scott of the Public Relations Division of the Department of Health, they would be glad to mail it to them.

I would like the hon. members, while they are studying it, to look at last year's Annual Report, and also the first one, so they will realize that chronic alcoholism is a disease.

Research has proven there is a change in the bio-chemistry of the blood, that there is a difference between chronic alcoholics and normal people in that their internal glands do not work the same.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to mention the legislation which was passed by this Parliament in the spring of 1949, and to keep in mind the foundation must carry out the measures, and not go beyond the legislation which was passed at that time.

For your information, I would like to spend a few minutes in describing alcohol itself, how it was made yesterday and how it is being made today. In the distillation process of alcohol, we have four alcohols which are given off.

The first one is ethyl alcohol which is the one, and the only one, which should be taken as a beverage or in any other form. Then we have the so-called fusel oil, butyl, propyl and amyl.

In the old days the great distillers in Great Britain were very particular about the distillation process, because the ethyl alcohol is given off first, at the lowest temperature, and then the other three alcohols. They aged it for many, many years, mostly in oak which was charred on the inside. I might say, it was the charring of the inside of the oak barrel which gave the whiskey its colour.

Strange to say, during the early part of the war in the lend-lease programme, Britain had to send her whiskey to our neighbours to the south in order to help repay them for armaments, and by the end of the war most of the aged whiskey was gone.

You may ask me, what the aging of the liquor has to do with it. First, in the distillation, and if that is properly done, there should not be over an ounce and a half, to two ounces, of these so-called oils in an Imperial quart. Today, in a great number of liquors, there is as much as two to two-and-one-half ounces of so-called fusel oil. What is done, is we actually shake it up. What we should do is siphon it off the top, because that part is really poison. These fusel oils—so-called—are deadly poison. What we actually do is shake them up, and we get it in a diluted form.

It is aged in oak, or in hardwood, over a period of years. As a matter of fact, in Ontario today the law requires them to age it for at least 2 years although the old distillers in England would say that was falling far too short of the mark; they say it should be aged 10 or 20 years; in fact, most of them like to age it for 20 years, because they want to give time for the oak to absorb the fusel oils from the liquor.

They are trying out experiments in Britain today. These experiments have not been used here in Canada as yet, and what they are doing is a form of electrolysis. They take an electric churn, and it is churned for a period of 3 weeks.

Some say that 3 weeks' churning in one of these electrolytic churns is as good as 60 years' aging in the wood. That is still in the experimental stage and must be proved. But in Ontario they are still storing it in wooden kegs not larger than 150 Imperial gallons, for a period of 2 years.

There is just one other thing I would like to say, and that is about our present hospital and clinic at 9-11 Bedford Road. At 11 Bedford Road we have 15 beds available for alcoholics. They are open to the people of Ontario—not only to the people of Toronto or the people of this particular district—but for everybody in the province. We have at the moment 12 beds for men and 3 for women—the usual ratio is 5 beds for men to every 1 for a member of the female sex. They have found that both in Canada and in the United States, to be a convenient division. As we study this problem we find that these people come into a hospital, or into a clinic and that afterwards, apparently, about 50 to 52 per cent. have remained sober. We call that a trend. We are not saying that they have recovered or are cured, but it is just a cessation of taking alcoholic beverages, as a crutch, for a period of time.

We hope that no chronic alcoholic will ever become a social drinker again. If he does, the chances are almost 99 out of 100 that he will go back to being a chronic drinker. So if you read reports which state these men, in 6 months, or 2 years, or 5 years, have been cured of chronic alcoholism, they can be regarded as misleading, because such people, if they are given even one drink, will probably go back to their chronic alcoholism.

I just want in closing, Mr. Speaker, to offer each and every hon. member an invitation to come to our clinical centre at 9-11 Bedford Road, where Mr. Archibald or one of his assistants will see that hon. members are taken through the hospital and clinic and are shown just what is being done there by the Alcoholics Anonymous which accounts for about 25 or 30 per cent. of our total. They have been getting more men and more women to come in for treatment.

Their great job is the rehabilitation of these people—it is not just a matter of stopping drinking. Under the rehabilitation programme it is a matter of seeing that they may once again enter their homes, their communities, and their industries, or wherever they work, and become normal individuals.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: Is there a waiting list of those desiring to attend for this treatment?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition mean, have we beds enough for them all? I rather think that we have. We have 6 beds. We have 2 beds in St. Michael's, 2 in the General and 2 in the Western Hospital for the acutely ill alcoholics. When they have been there about 5 days or a little longer they can be moved to our hospital. I feel that we have as many beds as we need at the moment. If I am wrong, I shall correct that statement tomorrow.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak concerning the passing of our friend, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey). I am not in a position at the moment to give hon. members of the House the particulars concerning the date and time of the funeral, but I will do that just as soon as I can get the information. I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and hon. members of the House would want to join with me in making reference to our late friend and colleague whose unexpected death was a very great shock to us all.

Mr. Harvey was a man of great personality, and a sincere friend. He had been a member of this House since June, 1948, representing the great riding of Nipissing, which from the very earliest days of our history has been a crossroads, a place of meeting for people of different racial origin, and, to an extent, of different language; a gateway to the north going back to the days of the beginnings of this country and this continent, a crossroads for the voyageurs, traders and missionaries of those days.

Mr. Speaker, the late hon. member for Nipissing served his country well, in his own capacities as a private individual and as a businessman. He also served his country and his province in the Legislature. Elected, as I say, in 1948, he was for some years a commissioner on the Ontario Northland Railway, where it could be said he rose from the ranks, because "Bill" Harvey, to some extent, followed the great riding from which he came. He was a New Canadian. He was born in Scotland and came to this country about 40 years ago and after coming here, went through the course often taken by new arrivals in this country.

Like many other great men, he sold newspapers in his early days. He served as a fireman on the Ontario Northland Railway, the railway he was afterwards to serve as vice-chairman. He became a businessman, he became an expert in mechanics, flew his own airplane, and symbolized not only the fact that Nipissing has always been a part of our province which has welcomed newcomers to Canada, but that he was privileged as a New Canadian to rise to eminence in this country and in his own community, a tribute to the man and a tribute to this great country. It is wonderful to think that a man, born in another land can come to this country as a New Canadian, and, in his own lifetime, serve his adopted country in a variety of capacities, do well from a business standpoint, become a member of Parliament, and become a vice-chairman of one of our great undertakings—all that in the lifetime of one man.

It is a very great loss to this province and to this Assembly that this young man, with so much promise and so much ability and so much to give to this country should have been taken at such an early age. I am sure we all feel his passing very keenly and we want to join with you, Mr. Speaker, in the tribute you paid, and to extend to Mrs. Harvey and her family, our sincere and deepest sympathy.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Frost) in his expression of the sorrow we all feel today in the passing of our friend "Bill" Harvey, the late hon. member for Nipissing. I think the shock comes more directly to us because of the fact that he was so recently among us, taking part in the deliberations of this session. I was going to the train on Friday night, and took the opportunity to talk with "Bill" Harvey a few minutes before entering the train. It does not seem possible that he has been taken from us in the prime of a very useful life—a man who, as the Prime Minister has said, has done many things in this country, has not been afraid of work, and has lived long enough to see the results of hard work, and the achievements which spring from it.

I think it emphasizes the uncertainty of life itself. Those of us who spoke with "Bill" Harvey in the past few weeks can hardly realize he is gone from us. I found in my companionship with him that he was a genial sort of a man, a firm friend and a good companion. He was a good representative from a good riding and—I think this is the thing he would like us most to say about him—he was never found wanting when it came to extolling the beauties, the possibilities and the potentialities of that great riding.

I join with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in expressing our sorrow and our sympathy to Mrs. Harvey in the loss of a man who was one of ourselves and a great citizen of this province.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I join with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) in expressing our very great sorrow and sense of shock at the sudden passing of "Bill" Harvey. He was a friend of all of us. We knew him for his kindly smile. He went around the building always with a genial word and a welcome to everyone he met. He will certainly be missed by all in the House. I also wish to join with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Leader of the Opposition in extending to Mrs. Harvey

and others in her family our very sincere condolences on their great loss.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): May I add my own expression of sympathy to the family of the late member for Nipissing who so suddenly passed away, and also to the government for having lost one of its loyal supporters, as well as to his many friends.

Mr. Speaker, we have been rather a lucky Parliament, in the sense that there was no loss in our ranks for the first couple of years. Some people remarked on that fact—that this present Parliament was very fortunate.

Unfortunately the spell was broken with the very sudden and untimely death of the former member for Simcoe East (Mr. McPhee) and now, so soon, the loss of another member. I hope that this will not be repeated in the life of this Parliament and that, politics apart, and leaving to one side the differences which we have, the hon. members who were elected will be enabled to complete their terms and to serve the electorate to the best of their ability.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. S. F. LEAVINE (Waterloo North): I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my appreciation for the able and kindly manner in which you have fulfilled the duties of your office. I think that too often remarks that I and many other hon. members make in this Chamber are only too well illustrated by the "morning smile" that was published in today's *Globe and Mail* and I would recommend to all hon. members that they look at it when they get home this evening.

May I say that my training in life has been, insofar as one is able, toward attempting to make a reasonable diagnosis and applying the proper remedy, insofar as cure or alleviation goes. I suppose that we all regret the alleged irregularities that are supposed to have

taken place in the Highways Department. I think that we will all commend the action of the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in that they have acted in a safe, sane and salutary manner in this matter, and I think that in fairness to all, they are entitled to reasonable time to find a solution of the problem.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that we in Waterloo North are quite appreciative of all the work that has been done with regard to our roads system in the past year, or promised for the year to come, but I would like to make a case for the development of roads in Waterloo North almost as sound as that of the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope). May I point out to you, sir, that the City of Kitchener ranks fifth in industrial production in the Province of Ontario and if we include the thriving City of Waterloo, we rank fourth, and if we group the two communities together, we stand first in the per capita production of the value of goods manufactured in the Dominion of Canada. And so it is for that reason—and that reason alone—that I make an appeal for roads on each and every occasion.

We have of course the unfinished portion of the dual highway Number 8, from Kitchener to Freeport, which I think requires completion at an early date. We have, of course, that historic bridge at West Montrose which is still covered and which still necessitates the children disembarking from the school bus and walking across, because the bridge is not safe to transport them. These are some of the minor problems that I am quite certain will be solved at a very early date.

In the discussions pertaining to planning in the neighbourhood of Kitchener and Waterloo, we find one recurring theme, that is the question of controlled access roads. There seems to be a belief held by the majority of those interested in planning that this is, of necessity, to handle the traffic problem not only of our area but probably several others. They make this com-

plaint—and it comes from a number of people—that they have no sure way of finding to which department of government they should turn, in order to get direction, that if they go to the Department of Planning and Development they are told: "Well, that is probably Highways" and if they go to Highways, it is some place else; and I am quite certain that at least the planners of my area would be very, very pleased and happy if some simplification of the procedure were introduced.

The safety campaign inaugurated in the County of Waterloo, in the fall of 1953, has been well publicized and I do not suppose that at any time in the history of Ontario more groups have been aware of the problems which exist as to highway traffic and the desirability of lessening the terrific loss of life, and I think we have the co-operation of every group, and I would say to the department, that the work they did thereon is very much appreciated.

Recently a local magistrate—and may I say a very excellent representative of the legal profession—in passing judgment in a motor accident case, had occasion to make reference to what he termed the "menace of black buggies." Now hon. members may or may not know that there is a religious denomination in our county who forego the use of any modernized means of transportation, and I think that I am quite fair in saying that it was not the intent of the magistrate to cast any reflection upon these great and satisfactory people, but I might point out if there is any difficulty with regard to the operation of vehicles by these people, that I would suggest some member of the Department of Highways talk to the leaders whom they will find to be extremely tolerant and understanding.

Last year I had occasion to make some reference to examination of drivers for permits. I would say that insofar as my own area is concerned, there is reasonable evidence that a more thorough job is being done, and while there has been a great deal of discussion as to the factors which precipitate accidents—and I can agree with the statement that the human factor plays

a large part—and by “human factor” I suppose they simply mean our own selfishness, both in regard to the roads, and in regard to drinking—but I do think the department can very well accept that, and can see that there is complete enforcement of their own slogan: “If you drink, do not drive.”

Material damage is important but it is replaceable, but the loss of more than 1,000 human lives in the province last year is deplorable and I think that is admitted by all.

I suggest that the case for or against the motor car will ultimately be decided on whether the benefits outweigh this useless slaughter. I have at the present time a request to support any move which is made to lower the speed limit to 15 miles per hour in school areas. I am aware that petition has been sent around many times. I know many appeals have been made, but if you have had occasion to have a youngster killed in your area under circumstances in direct relation to a more than 15 mile-an-hour rate in a school area, I think you would very readily support it.

Inland municipalities, unless located in proximity to a body of water, are ultimately going to be faced with a problem of water supply and sewage disposal. This of course creates the inevitable problem of stream pollution, with all the possibilities of causing pollution and contamination of existing water supplies, property damage and deterioration of or interference with proper land use. In the past it has been believed that if an urban community located upon a body of water, be it lake or river, of sufficient volume to give dilution of sewage or of self-oxygenation, that is adequate. I think that we will admit that that is no longer fair. In simple justice the treatment of sewage must be carried to completion. Insofar as the Kitchener-Waterloo and Elmira areas are concerned, we presently have a rather adequate water supply from artesian wells, but if we are to continue to prosper—and I do not see any reason why we should not—we must look further afield for water supply. As to sewage disposal, we have

a large monetary investment, but only to give primary treatment. The work accomplished is good as far as it goes, but does not go far enough.

I agree that treatment should be complete and if we are to have complete treatment, it is going to require a great deal more money. I observe that there is a move on foot in certain municipalities to appeal to the Provincial Government for aid in this regard. I will not dwell upon that phase of it at this particular time.

In common with other counties, Waterloo has made representation that it should be the site of the pioneer village first mentioned by the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Root). May I say that on the credit side we have a historical society which is probably second to none in the province and, secondly, we have on hand, at a conservative estimate, relics valued at over \$100,000. I have at no time felt that there should be only one such village. I rather think that areas should get together and arrange to preserve the history of their own districts, and I would think if that were done, the government would find some reasonable means of giving fair assistance to those who have helped themselves.

In the fall of 1954, Waterloo County will be the site of the International Ploughing Match which, as most hon. members know, is growing in importance every year. In the summer of 1954, the City of Kitchener celebrates its Centennial. I would extend to all hon. members a cordial invitation to visit the County of Waterloo and see some of the characteristics of its people and even of its food.

The move toward unconditional grants by the province is one to be greatly commended. I have always felt that was a desirable move and was more than pleased when the government of the Province of Ontario introduced such legislation. I have also subscribed to a belief that there is a relationship between population and responsibility. However, coming back, sir, to the proposition that we have a water and sewage problem

and recognizing that many other communities seem to have problems peculiar to themselves, I am rather of the opinion that some up-grading of the per capita grant is a much safer method of solving municipal problems than making specific grants to any particular item. The making of specific grants, particularly with regard to sewage—and I suppose it applies to most other things—simply means that if you do it for Kitchener you do it for Waterloo and you do it for every other place in the province, you do it for every village, you do it for every farm house, and I think they are entitled to it, if you do it on that basis; but I state again that I think every municipality, be it rural or urban, has some problem which is peculiar to itself and that there is some justification for an up-grading of the per capita grant.

Mr. Speaker, may I make a plea at this time for the decentralization of government. You know that we in Waterloo North have no purely provincial institution, unless you consider the liquor stores as such, and we have a regional welfare office which is doing a good job. I grant you that a liquor store is a very valuable asset and I rather suspect brings in a pretty excellent revenue—I will have to ask the commissioner some day what the profit from our area is—and I do not wish to compare it with that which Waterloo South has, or with that of any other riding, but I want to point out the philosophy which appears to have prevailed, and that is that when the Liberals were in power they could say with certainty: "What's the use, we win it anyway" and when, once in a generation, a Conservative wins, they can say: "Well, that's a freak, it will never occur again." Maybe that is true. However, regardless of Party, there is a feeling of neglect on this subject.

Relating to pensions for disabled persons from 16 to 65, this has been well received in my riding. From experiences gained, the Department of Welfare can no doubt make recommendations to the Federal Government for the extension of the type of case which can be reasonably included.

Home and office medical care provided through the Department of Wel-

fare in co-operation with the Ontario Medical Association has worked well for the old-age pensioners, as have mothers' allowances and pensions for the blind. I recognize the difficulty with regard to that which I am about to suggest, but we must admit that there is a tremendous number of people who are hospitalized for just cause and in many of these cases it requires such things as a Smith-Petersen pin for a fracture of the hip, or some elderly males have operations peculiar to themselves and our specialists or those operating in that field, feel that there might be some token payment with regard to their services. Inasmuch as this does not apply to me particularly, I cannot say that there is a personal element in it.

There is another topic which I mentioned before, namely that there is a wealth of material in our homes for the aged. I doubt whether there is any caloric deficiency in the care of these patients. I do believe there is some evidence of dietary imbalance, and sub-clinical vitamin deficiency and I have suggested that a visiting dietitian should be available to instruct the chefs of these institutions throughout the province, because it is possible that we can do a great deal to further the study of geriatrics, diseases of the old, and I think that that is one group which is readily available. Furthermore I rather suspect that we might salvage from this group a reasonable percentage of people who could be returned to some form of activity or at least made much happier in themselves.

I think hon. members can all agree with the special grants which have been made towards the treatment of and research on the problem of cancer. I think we also can readily admit that radiology and surgery are not the complete answer to the problem, and it is for that very reason that I think the research phase should be stressed and I know full well that no person in the province will begrudge any sum which is spent upon this particularly great work.

I have suggested at other times that I thought some work could be done on research as regards rheumatism. I observe that we do make a grant in that

regard. I think multiple sclerosis is another problem which needs considerable attention and I would direct a plea to the Department of Health that they should, at the first indication of success, make the poliomyelitis vaccine readily available to all the people of this province, again regardless of cost.

To the Departments of Health and Welfare, I bring this little peculiar problem, that is, of a number of defective children for whom possibly there is some hope in the future, but who at present are waiting admission to Orillia. They are in the meantime either admitted to a general hospital where they should not be, or they are kept at home, and if the latter condition happens to be the case, they create a problem within the family. Certainly it is not very stimulating to the other members of the family. This problem is creating a great deal of worry in many Children's Aid Societies throughout the province. I recognize the defect of decentralization of a great number of these children in Orillia, but I would rather suggest that small regional hospitals be constructed upon a basis to be worked out later. I should think that is the solution of the problem and I am not putting in a "plug," sir, for Waterloo North—I am putting in a "plug" for the service to this particular portion of the community.

In view of the development in a neighbouring province, may I say that I question whether any medical practitioner has had more children adopted during his practice than I have. I have found the demand greater than the supply, and the procedure and arrangements very satisfactory.

The indigent patient continues to be a problem with general hospitals. I know that the definition of "residence" is one of extreme difficulty, but may I suggest that if residence is established as being within a province, that it should be accepted by a province as their responsibility, and if without the province but still within Canada, that we make representations to Ottawa that they accept the responsibility which would be either that of the municipality or of the province otherwise.

I should think there is a case to be made out for an increase in the per diem rate in statutory grants. I think that is in order. I admit some municipalities are, by agreement, paying more than the required amount and I think probably it is desirable that we should all do that, or make it official.

I hope there is some virtue in repetition, because I return to an old subject, that is as to whether the cost of operating a training school bears any relation to the operation of a general hospital. I, for one, fail to see how in this day it does. In days of old, as the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) has mentioned, a year or two ago, you obtained services for training; at the present time the tendency has been mostly for didactic training or for demonstrations with a minimum amount of work, and that is probably as it should be, until you come to the straight clinical period; but to say that the cost of operating a training school should be charged to a general hospital, I cannot see that at all, and this is recognized in part by the fact that grants are made to special schools which are pioneering pilot plants to see whether they can speed up the training of nurses.

One of the more hardy perennials I hear mentioned from time to time: nearly everyone at some time or another has sponsored a plan for socialized medicine. I have nothing but support and appreciation for prepayment of medical services. I accept the desirability of the general population, along with the medical practitioners participating in the management of such plans. I would make this observation about the problem—and I say this based upon the fact that I have a practice which is probably over 60 per cent. social security or covered by insurance, and I know the amount of work this is entailed—I am not talking about the work common to the profession, but I am referring purely to the clerical work. There is no evidence that the government can do a better job than private enterprise, except when it has a monopoly and can be subsidized from general revenue or is tax exempt. Human nature being what it is, I do not think there can ever be a

plan for socialized medicine that is complete and solvent at the same time. Some responsibility must be placed upon the individual to obtain screening from minor and nuisance demands. If that is not done the plan of complete service will become financially insolvent or unbearable.

We have had over the last few weeks a great deal of discussion as to the advantage of natural gas. I suppose we are all agreed that natural gas is very desirable to the Province of Ontario, although I am told by coal dealers that it is going to be a very serious blow to their particular phase of commercial activity. However, I think there may be some legitimate difference of opinion as to how the thing can be handled. In 1950 I supported a resolution asking that the handling of natural gas be a public utility. Ever since then, I have been thinking of this problem and I do not see how one can cross two or three provinces and still have it a public utility unless it is federal. Nor do I see how one can operate this hybrid plan of having the transmission a private enterprise, and the distribution a public utility. It would seem to me that that is a rather haphazard manner of accomplishing the desired end. I do not know how that could be done. Rather I should think if we had a complete Gas Commission, it would have some powers of regulation and that would be as far as we can go.

It has been stated that there is to be some change in our labour legislation. Representing as I do a labour constituency, I am quite interested in any legislation which may be introduced. It is quite true that I receive all the requests, including a request to discuss next Friday evening the problem of the revokable check-off, but the problem I wish to deal with is that of the vote for certification, which is one I have never been able to understand, I am waiting very patiently for an explanation, and that is, we will say 51 per cent., or a majority, has to support an application (51 per cent. of all employees must vote yes and failure to vote is a negative vote).

I am willing, as I have expressed before, to support compulsory voting, with the proviso if you have religious scruples against voting, or are absent, you may be exempt, but to say you must have 51 per cent., regardless of the practices which are accepted in general elections is wrong. I think, at least, we could have accepted the common custom.

We have presently observed our Federal Government voting an increase in pay for themselves. This practice that is common to all Parties, and all occupations, who have tried to cure their economic ills. I think it should be apparent at the present time, it is not an answer. They have adopted an easy-money policy, and this has, directly or indirectly, created depreciated money. This is a debtors' world, and the pay-off will come when grim necessity forces attention on the fact you cannot get something for nothing.

Income taxes, which I have considered the fairest of all taxes, if wisely expanded, have reached and continued at a level which breeds so-called "shrewd practice," such as the Loblaw stock gift of a few months ago, and all too many people turn to earning money outside of that which is taxable. This undermines character and respect for law.

Housing is a subject, of course, of considerable concern to all of us. It is only a few months ago that I heard a responsible building architect make the pronouncement that he thought houses should be built now, so they could be destroyed in six to eight months or a year. In other words, they are following the philosophy of the clothing industry—particularly of the female—and we will have a change of "clothing" for every season, and sometimes, for no reason at all. I do not think that is desirable, nor do I think the constant wasting of our substance will get us anywhere. I rather think what we have to do is to produce value for the money paid out. Up to the present time, it is questionable to me as to whether that has been so. I will correct that to the extent that I think the building contractors of the present day are more prepared to give you better value than possibly any time

within the past 5 or 6 or 7 years. We come to the fact that we are going to have an altered position in the mortgage business, and, so far as I am concerned, this seems to me to be rather a peculiar sort of legislation. We take a group of people who are doing an excellent job in their own field, and ask them to go out into a field of which they have no knowledge. That is not within our province, of course, but it is all a reflection which must bear upon the average tax payer. I think what we need is more homes at lower costs, and the best way to get them is by co-operative building, with the stimulation of Credit Unions, which are interested in building. I can show you quite a number of people in my experience who have gone out and built their own homes—with the help of contractors, of course—but they themselves have been on the job, and have done a much better job, and are a great deal happier for it.

It seems to me educational plants have never been better. Our teachers and the Department of Education, are doing good work, but somehow there are certain basic qualities which do not, for long, carry over into everyday life. It may be we do not set a good example, or maybe we are stressing material values too much, but one thing is certain, we are not as happy, contented and honest individually, as we were a generation ago—and I hold no brief for the "good old days."

Happiness and contentment are a state of mind, and come from within. We need to recapture the spirit of the old. There is nothing this grand country needs more, and no problem it possesses, which cannot be served by greater production and lower prices, whether it be in your profession or mine.

MR. JOHN YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak this afternoon, I should like to go perhaps a little more deeply into a subject which has already been touched upon by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Leavine), and the other day by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon).

You will recall, a year ago I expressed my concern over the increase of traffic deaths and accidents. Today, a year later, that concern is even greater, because rather than our traffic accidents and deaths decreasing, they have increased.

As the hon. member for Waterloo North said, since last year, over 1,000 people have been killed, and 25,000 have been injured. At that rate, Mr. Speaker, in the next 3½ years, there will be more people killed than live in your fair town of Amherstburg with its population of 3,700, and also at that rate in the next 25 years—God willing, within my lifetime—there will be 25,000 people killed, and over 500,000 injured.

Even last year's rate can no longer be used, because January, 1954, is up 12 per cent. over January, 1953.

Who are the victims? They are all ages, but especially the young. The other day, the United Nations World Health Organization reported in a survey that it is amongst the young, where the general death rate is usually low, that traffic is the number one killer, and that up to one-half of the young people who die between the ages of 15 to 24, die as a result of traffic accidents.

We are all agreed, I am sure, on the two common causes of traffic accidents. To my mind, the first is unreasonable speed, and the second, a disregard for the rights of others. I agree with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that the major element is still the man at the wheel. There are other causes, but I think we have a sufficient knowledge of those causes to be able to tackle them, with the hope of lessening the number of traffic deaths.

We cannot cure this disease by engineering alone. I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. Prime Minister when he states that our highways are second to none, and yet our hon. Minister of Highways, who, after having performed a wonderful piece of highway construction, known as Highway No. 401, must report that it has the worst accident record of any highway in the Province of Ontario.

If "Jimmie," now aged 15, is not to become one of the 10,000 who will die in traffic accidents before he reaches the age of 24, he must be taught proper driving methods, and his father, who should know, must continually be reminded of that necessity. I know of the hon. Minister's efforts in that regard and I urge him to expand and enlarge those efforts. If any individual does not want to learn, or does not want to put into practice that which he should know is proper, he should be taken off the highways.

I have seen great safety signs along our highways throughout the province. There is one which I would like to see more often, which says, "This is a patrolled highway; traffic safety strictly enforced."

Last week, *Life* magazine reported that a three-months' campaign, with no holds barred, in regard to traffic enforcement, reduced the number of deaths by 45 per cent.

We know that traffic enforcement is not popular, but I am sure when we note results like reduction in deaths of 45 per cent., there will be few voices raised in protest or complaint.

A year ago, I spoke on two items which were endorsed last week by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon), two causes which I think should be tackled. One is the re-examination for physical fitness. Again I state my belief that some provision should be made at intervals of renewals for the examination of drivers, to make sure that no defects have presented themselves in the meantime. It is said that 10 per cent. of the accidents are attributable to this kind of thing. Let us go after this 10 per cent. also.

Secondly, may I refer to the re-examination of motor vehicles, Mr. Speaker. Note the result of an examination carried out in the City of Toronto less than a year ago, of some 2,376 vehicles. Of that number examined, only 58 per cent. were approved. Some 612 owners were summoned for defective brakes, and 185 had defective lights, or something similar, and 44

were removed entirely from the highways. It is not very comforting, Mr. Speaker, to know that 4 out of every 10 vehicles so examined were lacking in the minimum requirements of safety.

There is a field of responsibility which, to my mind, has not been sufficiently stressed, and that is in regard to the makers of these, the deadliest weapons of North America, that is, the responsibility of the car manufacturers.

Year in and year out, they unveil new models with tremendous and amazing engineering developments. A great many will be seen this week at the National Motor Show, at the Canadian National Exhibition. The latest I have seen is called the "Thunderbird," which is described as, "handsome and racy-looking, with power brakes, power steering, and push-button window controls," and, if you please, for the amateur racers, an elapsed time clock, and a tachometer. I had to look up the word to see what a "tachometer" is, and I discovered it is an instrument for measuring velocity. Plenty of advertising about all these things, but scarcely a word to the public about traffic safety. Where are the crash-proof doors, the plastic windshields, the flexible steering gear, and other safety devices? Surely engineers, who can devise a convertible top that goes up when a drop of rain comes down, can devise for us a frost-free windshield, and wipers which will give us a full field of vision.

And when a safety device is devised, why is it not put on all vehicles?

I would like to speak for a moment or two about the directional signals. We all know the value of hand signals, and the Department of Highways stresses their use. Your signal tells every other driver what you are going to do next, otherwise, it is bound to be a hit-and-miss procedure, and more often than not, it is a "hit" procedure. But, as we all know, the use of hand signals is not as extensive as it should be, and I am thinking particularly of the weather a couple of weeks ago, when we had the rain and sleet. Did many drivers, wishing to make a turn, roll their windows down, time and time again, and stick out

their hands which could not be seen anyway? How much better, under such circumstances, to use a flashing light, which will indicate to everybody that the driver is about to make a right turn or a left turn.

Why is that device, recognized as a safety device, not a standard part of equipment on all cars? I believe the directional indicators should be a "must," and the chrome plating an "extra."

The same applies to these safety reflecting tapes. Surely the manufacturers of cars do not have to be told of the advantages of the safety reflecting tapes. How often do we hear of one vehicle plowing into another, because in the darkness, it was not seen. Surely the tragic accident, where the bus struck a parked vehicle might have been avoided if the parked vehicle had had on the rear, the safety reflecting tape, which would have reflected the lights from the on-coming bus. Why is this not standard equipment? Why is this not built right into the cars? Style is fine, but life and limb are more important.

The public demands style, and I believe the car manufacturers have created, to some extent, that demand. Surely, companies such as these, with their tremendous advertising and merchandising methods, could sell any safety device to the public if they wished. I urge these members of the public who will attend the National Motor Show, by the tens of thousands, to make enquiries about these items.

Mr. Speaker, I believe traffic accidents should be the concern of all hon. members of this House, in fact, of all the public throughout Ontario. It has become of national concern with our neighbours to the south, where President Eisenhower has called together men from all the states to discuss this problem.

Last week, we heard of some discussion in the House of Commons at Ottawa, to the effect that the Federal Government would be willing to meet with the provinces to discuss this subject. Mr. Speaker, Canada's rating as No. 2 in traffic accidents, among the

nations of the world, is, to my mind, very regrettable.

I feel so strongly on this point, that I do not hesitate to state that I think this would be a proper matter for a Select Committee of the House.

The hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon) also referred to the level crossings, and I agree with his comments in regard to the crossing at Dundas Street and Royal York Road.

I know it costs a considerable amount to provide overhead crossings, but it appears to me, as an ordinary member of the driving public, that slight changes would create a longer area of vision, and the hazards would be reduced, by such an increase in vision. I see no reason why representatives of all Parties concerned should not re-examine every railroad crossing in this Province of Ontario, and recommend the making of any necessary remedial changes.

Before I pass on, I would like to mention two related matters. To one interested and concerned about traffic safety, the accident reported on Saturday last, where a truck in Port Credit drove into a group of young children, was a most tragic one. Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, one of the amazing things to me was that a truck with a permissible load of 40,000 lbs. should have been overloaded to the extent of a further 7,000 lbs. I dread to think what trucks overloaded, such as that one, are doing to our highways in the Province of Ontario, and I urge the department to clamp down very strictly on those who are breaking the regulations regarding load weights, which may be very common.

I should like to express my pleasure that we are still retaining the two licence plates. I notice in the United States, they are doing with one. It is my belief that two are necessary and proper, and I believe here again that the car manufacturers should provide an appropriate place at the front of the automobile, so that a licence plate can be placed and stay there without being battered and beaten in ordinary traffic.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to join with the hon. Prime Minister and

the hon. Minister of Labour and other Cabinet Ministers and hon. members, at the official opening of the Workmen's Compensation Building. Symbolizing the tremendous development of workmen's compensation in this province, that building and its equipment should be a source of pride to the people of the province. The board is now provided with all necessary facilities to carry out a most thorough administration of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Now that is accomplished, I suggest we get on with a new, large, most modern building to either replace, or serve as an addition to the Rehabilitation Centre at Malton.

Our genial hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) whose genius is evident in the solution of labour-management problems, has, I believe, indicated a movement in this regard, and for all I know, he is so far ahead of everybody else, the plans may be already on the drawing board. But, in any event, I can assure him of my wholehearted support and, I am sure, the support of all hon. members of this House in proceeding with that building. Of some 3,769 patients treated in 1952, I was pleased to hear that 85 per cent. were returned to gainful employment, and anything which produces results such as that is deserving of the highest support.

Before leaving this, I should like to comment on the other 15 per cent. It is distressing to know that some 500 or more were not able to return to gainful employment. There may be reasons for that. If the reason is that men were physically unfit because of injury, then nothing further can be done, and the fund is there for their assistance; but, if there be some other reason then it should be overcome, and if the injured workman could have suitable or lighter employment or work, where his injury would not be a handicap, or if he could be trained to do some other type of job, I urge the fullest team work between the board, employer, and unions in order to assist that workman being so placed, for it is very difficult for an injured workman when he has to shift for himself to find employment even in times when employment is available. In times when

there is unemployment he is cruelly handicapped.

It has been my good fortune to have been in close proximity during the past year to, what is in my mind, the finest rehabilitation centre in the Dominion of Canada. Lyndhurst Lodge, across the street from my home in the riding, is becoming famous for its accomplishments although those associated with it do not like to talk of miracles, to me, as a layman, the work being performed is indeed miraculous. To the lodge come those who are crippled by serious injury, those who are stricken by polio, those suffering from muscular dystrophy—they come in often hopeless and helpless, but they leave able to look after themselves, and filled with hope and spirit.

I have seen the skill and understanding of the staff. I have seen the superhuman efforts of the patients which bring about these changes, the lodge's strongest feeling of accomplishment is when they are able to return the patients to a normal life. We owe the lodge a further debt when they completely rehabilitate the patient and return him to gainful employment of some kind.

I know that all departments which were mentioned in the Speech from the Throne have played a great part in rehabilitation in the past, and I am looking forward to seeing new measures which will be introduced, a development symbolic of the fact that this administration, not satisfied with what it has done, is always taking new steps forward.

Speaking of things done, of which this administration may well be proud, in my mind, there is one thing which this administration has not done of which it can also be proud, and that is in the words of the hon. Prime Minister, the Treasurer of this Province, no sales tax.

I was interested to discover only recently that this is a tax which five of the provinces, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Quebec and Newfoundland, have inflicted upon their people. Yes, one out of every \$3 of all the dollars collected by those provinces is in the form of sales tax.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, no province, with the exception of one, calls it a "sales tax." They call it, "Social security" and "Municipal aid taxes," "Education and hospitalization tax," "Social security assessment," but the dollars come out of the consumers' pockets just the same. Not so in Ontario, and may it never be so in Ontario. Yet, every citizen, I am sure, will agree that in the total sum of those services whose names are included in the naming of those taxes, the administration of this province is far ahead of the others.

You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that housing and planning for some years past have been two of the major problems which have confronted this area of Metropolitan Toronto. The hon. Prime Minister has rightly said that by virtue of the action taken last session in introducing Bill No. 80, a great many hurdles have been overcome. However, it seems to me that the type of housing and planning stressed both here and in Ottawa, has been the type which has been springing up in our suburbs, subdivision after subdivision; yea, even whole communities.

A home is not built in a vacuum. We all recognize that. As soon as a home is built, it needs all those services which we have discussed and re-discussed in this House, such as, hydro, sewers, pavement, street lights and the like. Even that is not all, because Mr. and Mrs. Jones, who live in the suburbs, have to get to and from the downtown area of Toronto, to work, to the Gardens, to Yonge and Queen Streets, to Sunnyside, to the Canadian National Exhibition. So, the Metropolitan Council has, and will have the problem of expressways on its hands, and the Parking Authority at the end of the expressways will have its parking problems, and Mr. Jones will "dig down" to pay for them.

I am not decrying the benefits of living in the suburbs. If Mr. and Mrs. Jones want that "dream home" in the suburbs, they should have it, and we are assisting them in doing so. But, I am afraid, we have all forgotten about

Mr. Smith. He is the man who enjoys living in the city. He wants to be able to walk to work, to the movies, to his church, to the shops; he wants to be able to walk, or at the most to "hop" on or off a street car or a subway. Mr. Smith is presently living in a flat, or a converted apartment. In many cases he could afford to build a new home without assistance, and, in many cases, he could afford a home with the assistance which is being rendered in the suburban areas, but he does not believe that the pleasures of the suburbs outweigh the disadvantages, the chief ones being long distances and the waste of time.

To my mind, the 40-hour week is not a great accomplishment if a man has to spend 10 hours travelling to and from his work. I am no expert on town planning, but I wholeheartedly agree with a scheme which was placed before the Board of Control of the City of Toronto, and which is now before the Metropolitan Planning Board. That is, we should not decentralize Toronto too much, but let us rebuild where all the facilities and services are already installed. Let us not drive all the "Mr. Smiths" into the suburbs today, battle over the problems which arise immediately, and then be "stuck" with the problem of central Toronto tomorrow.

In the place of homes spread over many acres, many miles away, Mr. Speaker, let us start building dwelling units, one on top of the other in the area. I am quite sure if assistance were rendered to "Mr. Smith" to enable him to acquire a home unit in an apartment-like dwelling, he would very gladly do so, and I strongly urge the Department of Planning and Development to watch very carefully the planning and development of home-dwelling construction which will be taking place in the Carlton-Yonge area.

In regard to the Regent Park housing, it has always surprised me why we have stopped at the third floor. Surely, where space is so valuable, where there are so many people, we should not stop at 3 or 6 floors, but go to 10 or 14 storeys.

If such a scheme is feasible for rental

units, why should it not be feasible for people to own such dwelling units outright? I am sure there would be a great many people who would be willing to put a down payment on a dwelling unit in such a large apartment-like dwelling and have the privilege of paying it off in 15, 20 or 25 years.

Surely, the cost of the land for the optimum number of dwelling units in an apartment-like fashion would not exceed the cost of servicing the acres of land required for a similar number of detached dwellings. I envisage some day in the future, rising into the skies of Toronto, a great many apartment-like dwellings, housing a great many families who are content to be city dwellers.

Mr. Speaker, a great many factors enter into the industrial economy of today. I can never tell whether jobs and industry attract people, or whether people create jobs and industry. To me, they are two sides of a simultaneous growth, and one cannot exist without the other, and when one comes to a standstill, so does the other.

We, in the Province of Ontario, have had a tremendous industrial expansion, which appears to be on the same basis as our population. As has been pointed out we are to exceed the 5 million mark this year.

A great deal of that has been due to the natural increase in the birth rate, and a great deal has been due to the influx of many new people into the Province of Ontario. How are those who have come here, doing, Mr. Speaker? In short, and in truth, they are doing well. They are establishing their homes in this city, a great many of them in my riding. What that means to so many of them, who, for some 10 years or more, wandered through Europe with nothing they could call a home, and because they know that here in their homes they are the masters. They have taken homes which, because of age or lack of interest on the part of the owner who was about to move to another area, were in a state of disrepair and in a run-down condition, and they have practically re-made them. They have rejuvenated whole areas.

I spoke earlier of expansion in the suburbs. Many of those owners who live in the suburbs now, are owners for the first time, but many have previously owned a home in the city, sold it, and bought a new home. Often before a new home is acquired, there are a whole series of sales transactions, and often at the start the first link in this chain of transactions is a new-comer. Remove that first link and in a great many cases, there would be no one to purchase that home in the suburbs, and where there is no prospective purchaser, no home is built.

Expansion is a complex process and, for the ordinary chap like myself, it is difficult to put one's finger on all the factors. But, there is one point in expansion which has been very interesting to me.

As you know, a great many new-comers have come from Italy in the past two years. A great many of them are employed in the construction business for which they have the physical stamina and a certain innate ability and genius for it. A great many of them are staying in the city. They are buying their homes in the city. And to me it is a wonderful thing that, in buying their homes in the city, they are passing the down payments to someone else who is buying a new home in the suburbs, because it was in the building of those new homes that the new-comer obtained the funds to make a down payment on his own home.

New-comers, like many other Canadians, are confronted with the hurdle of the down payment, but a great many of them have found a unique solution. One will join with a friend or a relative, and with small savings, and small borrowings, together they will put a down payment on a home, and, lo and behold, they are then home owners. Within a year or two, sometimes not peaceably, but more often peaceably, one will buy out the other, who will then purchase his own place, and so a whole new series of transactions is completed again. The result is, new homes are built and other homes are re-built.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time one hears or reads comments that such-and-such be done in order to prevent the new-comer from succumbing to the wiles of the Communists. In fact, as I believe, there is no one group which is less susceptible and more anti-Communist, than the new-comers, for within those people there is still the strong remembrance of their experiences in Europe, and within those people still burn bright the hopes for those they have left behind who did not escape.

We in Canada and in Ontario are fortunate that our history has been such that there is no need of commemorations of days of independence. We have been fortunate that our history has disclosed an orderly development of our institutions and steps in the attaining of full sovereignty, and yet in Europe, within the lifetime of all of us here present, there have been many nationalities who stood up before the world and said: "We, too, are free men as all men should be." For some that freedom was short-lived. The Ukrainians, who declared their independence and freedom in 1918, were soon swallowed up by Communist Russia. For others, there were almost two decades or more of freedom. The Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians, for some 22 years, until 1940, too, had independence and freedom, until they were swallowed up by Communist Russia.

Acting Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the tenacious determination of the small municipalities round about Toronto last year who were determined to maintain their little identities. Do you think that whole peoples would of choice commit national suicide and give up their independence as it is claimed the Baltic States did, and which I do not believe? Then there are other nations of which Poland is a prime example who retained their identity but whose proud free people now live in the shadow of the Kremlin. So, Mr. Speaker, you will see throughout this province from time to time peoples of various origins gathered

together commemorating the day of independence of the country of their forebears. They meet to speak on behalf of those to whom the privilege in the so-called "people's democracies" is denied. I do not know whether their voices are heard across the thousands of miles that separate those peoples. They hope and pray that their voices are heard.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I think, really, that the hon. member (Mr. Yaremko) can do very well without reading. I do not think he should read his speech. I would not suggest this, Mr. Speaker, for another hon. member but the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) can make a speech without reading and he should follow the rules of the house.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend—he is not my friend—I withdraw that remark . . .

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member had that part of the speech prepared for him but he should not read it.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly send a copy of these notes over to my hon. friend.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not interested in that.

MR. YAREMKO: The member made a claim that I was reading the speech.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right.

MR. YAREMKO: Would he like me to repeat the speech?

MR. SALSBERG: You certainly memorized the speech.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: If the hon. member is reading from his notes that is perfectly permissible.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) interrupted, he chose a very appropriate time. I am almost due to sit down, so his conscience can be eased.

Mr. Speaker, may I repeat, that throughout this province from time to time you will see reports of people gathering together, and may I say they meet to speak on behalf of those to whom that privilege in the so-called "people's democracies" is denied.

Their voices may not be heard across the thousands of miles. And I hope and pray as a great many other people in this province do, that they are, but if these voices are not heard across the ocean, they should not go unheeded within this province and so long as I am in this House I will never hesitate to bring that to the attention of hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to me to get up to make my few comments on matters which have been of concern to me throughout the past year.

MR. A. K. ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Little did I think when I dictated a few notes at my seat here this morning that I would come into the House this afternoon and find that the hon. Prime Minister was about to eulogize the name of the late hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey). I wish to join in the tributes which have been paid to his memory and to say that an hon. member who has been a watchman for the "Gateway to the North" has been called to his reward.

In speaking today I do not intend to take up much time of the House. It was not my intention to speak in this debate, but I do want to bring before the House one subject, but before doing so, I wish to join in the felicitations extended by previous speakers to the two new members and to endorse the good record of a good government under the leadership of a good Prime Minister and a good Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: With the Lenten season close at hand this may not be an inappropriate moment to refer to a subject which I am glad to say is not too acute in our midst but which by reason of occasional excesses, does give cause for constant reflection. I refer to discrimination.

In my riding of St. Patrick which includes a very cosmopolitan section of the City of Toronto, there are residents of many races, creeds, and national origins and it is therefore natural for spokesmen on this subject to discuss with me this problem and to seek my sympathetic support.

May I refer to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris in 1948 by a vote of 48 to 0 with eight countries abstaining—the U.S.S.R., the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Saudi Arabia and the Union of South Africa.

This declaration is a statement of principles approved as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations. Article I, reads:

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article II:

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

And then Article VIII:

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

I will also mention Article XXIII, which declares the right to work, to free choice of employment, and to protection against unemployment, the right to equal pay for equal work; Article XXIV, the right to reasonable working hours and periodic holidays with pay; and Article XXVI, the right to education with the field of professional and technical higher education accessible on the basis of merit.

Canada subscribed to this declaration and I am sure the people of the Province of Ontario do.

There has been on the North American continent a good deal of legislation dealing with the subject of discrimination. I have had the opportunity of examining a compilation of states' law on race, colour, etc., published in book form 3 years ago at the instance of the Women of the Methodist Church in the United States, the second largest Protestant denomination in that country. The compiler is a California lady lawyer, the daughter of a principal of a Negro Public School.

We in Ontario have not stood idly by. In 1944 the Progressive Conservative Government of the day enacted The Racial Discrimination Act of 1944—prohibiting publishing or displaying any notices indicating discrimination because of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin of any person. Still another step was taken that year—the Labour Relations Act invalidating a union-management contract which discriminates against a person because of race or creed. Then in 1951 came the Fair Employment Practices Act prohibiting discrimination in hiring in all conditions of employment, and in union membership.

There does, however, remain the occasional discrimination in public accommodation and service—instances of which we have read of several times in our Ontario papers since the present Legislature came into existence. It is not necessary for me to name specific instances, or places in this fair province and no good purpose will be served by recalling certain notorious instances but there have been enough to cause this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, to think about this subject.

There are at least 18 states of the United States of America with legislation against this type of discrimination—discriminatory in places of public accommodation. For example in California, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New York and Utah, innkeepers are forbidden to refuse to receive guests without

reasonable cause. Discriminating advertising to discourage racial or religious minorities from patronizing places of public accommodation is forbidden in a number of states.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated what we have done in Ontario both before and since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Whether the time is approaching when we in this Legislature should enact legislation with respect to discrimination in public accommodation similar to that already in our statutes relating to the other types I have mentioned, all of which seem to me to be in the "ejusdem generis" class, is something for the government to consider and determine. I take this opportunity of drawing it to the attention of the House.

Perhaps it will not be inappropriate in speaking on this subject, which is the offspring of pride and prejudice, to quote, in doing, nay, to ask that we, who are the servants of the public, adopt the declared belief of a great Oriental Premier Chen Cheng of Formosa—he may now be vice-president—who very recently said:

My creed is the common good instead of personal self interest; fellowship and co-operation instead of ill-will and intrigue; mutual trust instead of mutual suspicion; and encouragement for one another instead of blame.

MR. A. G. FROST (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, may I express my sincere regrets in the loss of another hon. member of our present Legislature. He was most friendly and very sincere. I am sure he will be greatly missed by us all.

Mr. Speaker, may I extend my sincere congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the address presented by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) represents a riding rich in historical association—a part of our province wherein 140 odd years ago the fate of this nation was decided. He presented to us a few days

ago a brief picture of the amazing developments in his part of the province, more especially the development of the hydro enterprise without which Ontario could never have attained its present position in the Canadian scene.

It is a pleasure to welcome the hon. member from Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) to our ranks. His recent victory is a compliment to him personally, to the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the administration. I am sure that the hon. member (Mr. Jolley) will make a worthy contribution to the work of this Assembly. The verdict rendered by the electors of Niagara Falls, I suggest, was a considered judgment expressing approval of the type of government which we have in Ontario today.

Mr. Speaker, may I also commend the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) for his contribution. He comes from the far northwestern part of Ontario, and it was indeed a pleasure to listen to his informative address. We in the south realize the immense contribution which the north makes to our provincial economy.

My congratulations also go to the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby) who won a most impressive victory on February 8th, last. It was a personal triumph for him; it must have also been most gratifying to the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues. Simcoe East is a representative riding; it contains thriving towns which are a cross-section of the industry and commerce of Ontario; it embodies a rich agricultural district; it is one of the great centres of the tourist business.

It is, of course, with me as with all of us a matter of regret that this bye-election was occasioned by the death of a veteran member of this House who over a long period had endeared himself to all of us. He had rendered excellent service to Simcoe East and to Ontario. The sympathy of all our members goes out, I am sure to the members of the family of the late Dr. John McPhee.

It is good to see the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell)

resuming his official duties even though his activities must be somewhat curtailed for a little time to come. I hope that coming days may see his early and complete recovery.

I think I should here interject a word of congratulation directed to our good friend, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). In point of years he is senior, I think, to all of us, and there are very few of us who have seen as long a period of service in this House. His long experience in the municipal field has been brought to bear on his conduct of the affairs of his department. His efforts over a long period have helped to establish good provincial-municipal relations. His keen awareness of municipal needs and problems has been a major contributing factor in devising ways and means of stepping up municipal aid. I hope that he will be with us for many years to come. His genial presence is something which we all value in this Assembly, and which I valued very much during my 7 years' experience in Toronto City Council.

The government of today is contributing, in the form of municipal grants, as the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) remarked the other day, about \$130 million a year—and this without allowing for the per capita grants instituted at the last session of this Legislature. The figures speak for themselves. The record speaks for itself. And well do our municipal councils, our municipal officials and our municipal taxpayers know the facts.

Right now the biggest municipal experiment in the history of Canada is going on here in the Toronto Metropolitan area. The implications are of the utmost importance to Toronto and to the whole suburban area. In fact it is an item I have been personally interested in for many years.

I suppose most of our lesser centres of population are indeed enjoying a new growth resulting from the general healthy state of our economy. But at the same time, there remains the tendency for our big centres to grow still larger, bringing with this growth

problems of housing, transportation, and services generally which require all our courage and ingenuity to face and to conquer.

Here, within a radius of 20 miles from where I stand, is the biggest concentration of industry, of commerce and of people in all Canada. In the general Toronto-Hamilton area more than one-third of our motor vehicles are owned and operated. This alone poses problems of the greatest magnitude. I may say a word about this a little later.

It was apparent 30 years ago and more, that a huge metropolitan problem was in the making—13 separate municipalities—with essentially common problems—running 13 costly, and in many cases duplicate establishments. A year ago, after a long period of intensive study, this administration enacted Bill No. 80. For the year 1953, the Metropolitan organization was being welded into shape. It is now, shall I say, a going concern which promises well for the future.

There has been a lot of give and take. There has been and will be much of compromise. But I suggest that the local councils and the members of the Metropolitan Council by their co-operation, their mutual goodwill, are going to accomplish great things for this great concentration of population living and working within the Metropolitan borders.

By the time this House meets again in regular session the Metropolitan-area organization will have been in existence long enough to give a demonstration of practical results. A large part of their effort will have been devoted to improvements along the line of through streets and highways. The rush-hour traffic, indeed the ordinary traffic in this city and its environs, yields a practical lesson in the need for such improvements as have already been projected.

In point of individual use, the motor car is recognized as something almost absolutely necessary to the ordinary family. However, to move people in the mass is another matter. An automobile carries a very few people in relation to its size. Hence, as our urban

population grows, the problem of increasing motor traffic simply multiplies itself. That we need more and wider and longer through streets and highways in our population centres and their suburbs is elementary, but of themselves, they are not going to meet our problem. Street cars and bus services help to meet abnormal transportation problems, but again they are not sufficient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate and express my sincere appreciation to our genial and very efficient Prime Minister for his advice and assistance leading up to the new contemplated Sunnyside Highway, which I said in my last address was a real "must." Many thanks, Mr. Prime Minister.

We are expanding at a commendable rate our highways system and one of its modern features is the limited access highway. This is in line with the modern engineering concept that through highways can no longer serve the dual purpose of expediting through traffic at high speeds and at the same time giving access to land.

Now we have radiating from Toronto in all directions—and the same statement applies in degree to all our larger centres—we have radiating existing rights of way of which we are making only limited use. I refer of course to our railways. If, 50 years ago, the railways had acquired the state of mind impelling them to realize that they should be in the transportation business generally, and not merely rail transportation, they would not have been in trouble today, as they so often are.

North, east and west, railway lines radiate from this city. They serve scores of communities which are within easy commuting distance. I need mention only Port Credit, Oakville, Cooksville, Newmarket, Aurora, Whitby, and a dozen others. Perhaps we might include centres as far distant as Barrie or Port Hope. Now I know the railways traditionally dislike commuter services. They say they do not pay. But they have them in England, the United States, and even Montreal,

which I have used. A railway man said the other day there is a yearly loss of \$170,000 on the Oakville-Toronto commuter service. But I ask, have the railways ever really attempted to make these services pay? I doubt it because they tend to use conventional equipment with conventional operating methods. Metropolitan Toronto is a big centre and it is getting bigger, perhaps a lot too big for this atomic age. The suburban growth demands new schools, new streets, new services all down the line.

I suggest that it would be better for Ontario and for the scores of thousands who work in this centre of commerce and industry if some of our thousands of workers were lodged in our smaller and nearby centres. It would be a good thing for the small towns and villages; it would be better for our workers and their families.

I suggest that our railways with their wealth of experience might devise commuter services that would be helpful to them while at the same time taking a big load off our existing streets and highways and lessening the demand for new and costly traffic arteries. Diesel driven cars, pulling 2 or 3 or 6 passenger units and operated by perhaps 2-man crews seem to me to be a distinct possibility. If some such services could be established on an experimental basis, I can see very many of our people living in our smaller centres, parking their cars at the local railway stations, coming to town by rail, and picking up their autos on their return in the evening.

In and around this city the building of a new traffic artery is an expensive job. Land values are high, indeed inflated, and where homes or business structures have to be removed the acquirement of a right of way runs into fantastic figures. Our railways must survive. They are the very basis of our transportation system.

The parking problem, too, enters into the matter. We see our streets and highways clogged, our buses filled to capacity, our conventional methods of transportation, generally, hopelessly overloaded. At the same time we see

many trains running almost empty, rights-of-way used only at a fraction of their capacity. Is there not, I suggest, a great opportunity on the part of all the many interests concerned with the problem, to sit down around the conference table and find out whether much more use cannot be made of our railway facilities than is the case at present? The solution will not be an easy one. As I said before, I don't think that conventional railway equipment nor conventional operating practices will afford the solution. None the less I sincerely believe the whole subject is one worthy of the most searching investigation.

Here, perhaps I should mention another item in relation to our suburban development. First, let me say that the Regent Park development is an experiment which affords a fine example of governmental co-operation at all three levels. A huge depressed area in downtown Toronto is becoming an example of modern housing with many commendable features. It is centrally located; houses, churches and schools are already in existence; services are in place, and speedy transportation is conveniently at hand. Now out in the suburbs we have many examples of mass housing, including quite a number of apartment suites. Here, all the essential services have to be provided, resulting as is bound to be the case, in a formidable local tax rate. I think we should hear in due course from the hon. the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Warrender) as to how he views the general housing situation. I am wondering also whether he could advise us as to any immediate or long-range plans whereby depressed areas in Toronto and other cities will be rebuilt. We agree, I think, that the detached house is the ideal family environment. At the same time there are thousands of business couples and older folk who find the apartment building more to their liking. Here in Toronto, shall I say on Sherbourne Street, Parliament Street and many other streets, are houses long past their prime. In so very many instances the land which is involved would contain an apartment

structure housing a much larger population. I am sure the hon. the Minister of Planning and Development will let us have his views in due course.

Recent years have seen in this city a very large influx of New Canadians. Many of them live in my riding. May I say this. They are mostly hard-working, thrifty folk. Most of them have known poverty and oppression in the lands from which they came. They have an inborn love of the land; as a result very many of them have acquired their own homes in this city. Their thrift and industry enables them to work their way out of debt in a surprisingly short time. And, generally speaking, they take a great pride in their homes. Their programmes of renovation, painting and so on are making their homes a credit to themselves and to this great city, and I am sure we all welcome them in our midst.

Here in Ontario we have largely left behind us the age of exploitation. We have entered the era of conservation and of orderly development. The White Paper laid before this House a few days ago is an imposing document. It is a milestone in the march of progress as related to our natural resources of forest, lake and stream. Our natural resources are not inexhaustible. Far from it. They have found that out in the United States. Our neighbouring country has, in fact, become a "have-not" country in respect of certain essentials, wood-pulp and iron, to mention two of the most important.

No more important job has ever been undertaken by this government than that of terminating the export programme related to our forest products, a programme which arose out of the pulpwood agreements of 1936-37 and which are detailed in the 1938 Annual Report of the Department of Lands and Forests.

I am certain we shall await with interest a report from the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly), on the development of our mining industry. The 2 major iron properties, Steep Rock and Algoma Ore Properties, Ltd., are already producing iron ore at the rate

of nearly 2,000,000 tons a year. This is an entirely new item in our economy, for 10 years ago we produced no iron ore at all.

It is well-known that the iron-ore resources of the United States are wearing very thin. In degree, the same applies to zinc, lead and copper—all of these metals, as we know, being the very foundation of industrial progress. Again, in the Blind River area, investigation is being made of finds of uranium. It is evident that Ontario, long a leading producer of gold, is destined to be a most important producer of base metals. These facts are of much more than provincial importance. World conditions today demand that we remain on something approaching a war footing, and our possession of strategic minerals enables us to make an extraordinary contribution to the cause of freedom and democracy.

It is scarcely necessary to state that our supplies of forest and mineral wealth immensely improve our trade position and our bargaining position with the United States.

It is a pleasure to say a word of commendation on behalf of the work of the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips). A few years ago we spent provincially, in the cause of health some \$12 million. Today the annual outlay is nearly \$50 million.

Aided by capital grants initiated by this government, our general hospitals have added 15,000 beds or thereabouts to their establishments. Special renovation grants are enabling many of these hospitals to bring their equipment up to modern standards.

One of the very big jobs of the department, and one of which we hear all too little, is the work of treating and caring for nearly 20,000 mental cases. It will be a matter of great satisfaction to our people in the north to see the mental hospital at the Lakehead brought to completion. A similar hospital is projected for North Bay. The construction of these large and costly institutions will be a great comfort to the people of the north. They will also, in the fulness of time, make available to this part of

Ontario, the facilities of the excellent and large mental hospital at New Toronto, which, from time of its construction, more than 75 years ago, has been used almost exclusively for northern patients.

Our people of this city will approve of the 100-bed extension being made at the Toronto Hospital—999 as it is familiarly known. This construction, I understand, will be in the nature of a reception unit, and in degree will supplement the work of the Psychiatric Hospital, opened nearly 30 years ago as a result of provincial-municipal co-operation. I was alone viewing the work just a few hours ago. It is coming along very nicely.

The large extensions at Orillia and the huge new hospital at Smiths Falls, the extensions at Brockville, the renovations at Kingston, among other projects, will all improve the provincial establishment for the care and treatment of mental cases.

The high discharge rate in our mental hospitals, considerably better than 50 per cent. indicates the high standards of medical and nursing care which are available to those who suffer from mental illness.

In the public welfare field, it is gratifying to note that our Federal Government is proposing to initiate pensions for unemployables on a national scale. I have no doubt that the Ottawa decision was hastened by the example of this province. It is also gratifying to see the great improvements in institutional care for our aged people. This has been made possible by the provincial contribution in relation to homes for the aged. As you know, 50 per cent. of all costs related to these institutions are now borne by the province. I suggest that the warmest commendation should go to the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) for his humane leadership and excellent administration. He has done a tremendous job in improving and enlarging the facilities required for those who for one reason or another are unable to care for themselves. But there is still a necessity for more accommodation and this morning they have a list of

over 600 people waiting to receive admission to Lambert Lodge.

There is at this time a very considerable demand for so-called free hospitalization. If in the fulness of time we are able to develop some form of health insurance, it seems to me that it should be on a national rather than a provincial basis. But there are two important points among the many related to any such scheme. First, there is the necessity for facilities in the form of hospital, sanatoria and nursing home, also convalescent home accommodation. We are gradually building up these facilities here in Ontario. I have already mentioned the increase in the number of hospital beds. Second, no such scheme is free in any sense of the word. Right off the bat it means new taxation that hits every man, every woman, every home. Our revenues here are buoyant. They are however, no more than equal to our needs. We have been able to avoid provincial sales taxes and generally, provincial nuisance taxes. Most of the other provinces have them. Quebec has had to resort to a provincial income tax. In approaching the question of health or hospital insurance there must be the most careful survey of the subject; there must be a calculation of the cost; and there must be a determination of who will pay the cost and how it will be collected. And as a start, let us get away from the idea that any such plan is free. Ask them in British Columbia or indeed Great Britain if you do not want to take my word for it.

Before I take my seat I should like to say a word on one other subject, namely the traffic toll on our highways. As the hon. the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) explained the other day in his informative address to the Ontario Good Roads Association, there were 1,010 traffic deaths in 1952—and 1,082 such deaths in 1953. The injury toll was given as 23,364 for 1952 and 24,353 for the next year. In 1953, the estimated property damage was about \$25 million.

It is a tragic thing for us to think that more than 1,000 people alive and well on January 1st of this year will be in their graves by December 31st by reason

of street and highway accidents. I must commend the safety campaign which the hon. the Minister of Highways sponsors through press and radio, through safety literature and through so many local safety organizations. Year in and year out he suspends 20,000 and more drivers' licences. The courts are clogged with traffic cases. Perhaps the greatest single cause of traffic accidents is the wholesale violation of what I might term the code of good citizenship.

There is a heavy burden of work every day on the shoulders of our excellent Ontario Provincial Police force. The job of patrolling 10,000 miles of King's Highways is a very formidable task. To do this job adequately—to round up the drivers who violate every rule of safety, common sense and good citizenship—is beyond the resources of the traffic division of the provincial police as presently constituted. If the hon. the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) could deal with the subject of law enforcement on our highways I am sure we should all listen with the greatest interest.

The administration of justice in relation to crimes of violence is a big task in itself. I think, however, when we consider the loss of life and the property damage on our highways, and compare it with the loss of life and property related to crime in general, we should be sure to get a comparison which would astound us. I wonder if the hon. the Attorney-General cannot come up with some proposals, some stepping-up of administrative procedure, which will make 1954 the year of the big roundup for those hare-brained motorists who will not listen to reason nor observe the rules of common sense.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I should like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) not alone on his qualities of leadership nor on his accomplishments in the fields of legislation and administration. I should like to congratulate him on the renewed vote of approval and confidence as evidenced by the results of two by-elections in recent months. Simcoe East was his birthplace, the community wherein his earlier

days were spent and where his late father enjoyed the respect and esteem of the whole community. It was natural enough that his own people should rally around the Prime Minister when he asked for a renewed vote of confidence. I think the hon. the member for Simcoe East will agree with me. I have heard many good things about him, and I trust we shall hear from him before this session concludes.

At Niagara Falls there was a somewhat different situation. Our Party was fortunate in having an excellent candidate who has already given a good account of himself in this House. But I think the Prime Minister and his colleagues appreciate in full measure the vote of approval which they received at the hands of a group of voters who, in the past, have very often chosen a representative of another Party.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. Prime Minister again appeals to the people, he will again receive the same whole-hearted approval as was rendered him on November 22nd, 1951.

MR. C. G. MACODRUM (Leeds) : Mr. Speaker, may I first extend to you my thanks for the courtesies extended to me not only during this session, but between sessions. I was unfortunately delayed today, being in attendance at the Court of Appeal, and it was not until approximately three-quarters of an hour ago I learned of the unfortunate and untimely death of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey). I wish to extend, in common with all other hon. members of this House, my sincerest sympathy to his wife and family, and I wish her and to them to repeat a little quotation :

To live in the hearts of those you leave behind, is not to die.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to congratulate the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) and the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) for their excellent presentations when moving and seconding the reply to the Speech from the Throne.

When extending my congratulations,

I also wish to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) for the innovation of having our "Red Coats" now engaged in the Provincial House. We are keeping pace with Ottawa, and I think it is a pleasant thing to enter this building and observe these young, trim red-coated ladies. I personally feel, and I feel that probably most of the hon. members of this House will agree with me, that it is but another indication of the high regard and high esteem in which the Frost administration holds the female sex. We are, at all times, looking after the rights of women, and this is but another indication that we recognize here a further sphere of service in which they can be active.

Mr. Speaker, we were all impressed by the Speech from the Throne. It is wide in subjects, not only dealing with human beings, but also deals with all animal and vegetable life, and the only worry I have in regard to the Speech from the Throne is—what has happened to the warble fly? I must assume that his wants have been attended to, as he has not been mentioned.

I should like to say a few words on the transportation of natural gas to eastern Canada. I may be wrong, but I do not think there is any more important legislation to be brought before this House than the transportation of natural gas to eastern Canada. In this regard, I wish to express my own appreciation to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) for the assistance which he personally has given, and the assistance his staff has given in my search for some information along this line.

I am anxious, living as I do in the Town of Brockville, in the great County of Leeds, to make sure that the constituents of my county have some appreciation of the magnitude of this development.

The cost of this development really staggers one's imagination, and I believe there are perhaps few hon. members of this House who realize that in actual dollars and cents this development will surpass the St. Lawrence Seaway and

Power Development. I have had the opportunity of reading the report of Dr. G. S. Hume and also discussing the matter with provincial officials, and reading some reports of economists. By way of illustrating the magnitude of this development, these are figures which I have gathered as to the costs, because the cost is estimated at approximately \$700 million—and that is a lot of money.

The main transmission line from Alberta to this province will cost approximately \$300 million; covering lines and processing plants in Alberta, approximately \$200 million; gas mains and transportation systems in Ontario, approximately \$200 million.

I appreciate to some extent the difficulties which lie ahead, but again I do congratulate our hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Mines and his Cabinet for the foresight which they have already shown in appreciating not only the magnitude, but the importance of this work. There are some obstacles still to be overcome, and I do trust and I am confident that our sister Province of Quebec will, as she has done in the past, co-operate with us in bringing this Alberta line through to eastern Ontario, because, my understanding is, that without the co-operation of the Province of Quebec, the gas line will not run past the town of Brockville.

A word of warning, I think, should be sent out, and so I send it simply to my own County of Leeds, the municipal bodies and Public Utilities Commissions. I suggest they should be very wary, very careful before entering into any franchise with any corporation or persons for the supply of this natural gas fuel when it does come. I suggest to them that before they enter into any agreement by way of a franchise, they should at this stage, as of today, check with the Department of Mines.

I further understand there are three Acts apparently at the present time: The Fuel Supply Act, The Well Diggers Act, and The Natural Gas Conservation Act. These, I believe—although I am not sure—are to be consolidated into one Act in this Legislature, and I say there will be no more important legislation

brought before this House, in my opinion, than the legislation having to do with natural gas.

I would like to say a word regarding the Department of Public Welfare. I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow). He and his staff are doing a magnificent job. I know something of that, because we have one of the largest institutions in the Town of Brockville. However, I would suggest—and I see that the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is not here—so I can press rather strongly to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare that he give consideration to making Brockville the central point for his units, as they are scattered from the County of Frontenac on the west to Grenville-Dundas to the east from the Town of Brockville. It is a central point, and I say it would be economical as that the Town of Brockville is conveniently located to look after the needs of the people in all of those counties.

I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger) and I do that with much feeling. It was some months ago I contacted by telephone the hon. Minister and asked him if he could possibly see his way clear to come to Brockville, and look over the great work which is being done there in renovating and improving the General Hospital, and perhaps meet some of our men. In spite of his busy life, he consented to come. So we, in Brockville, started the next move, with the result that we had a banquet at which over 300 men attended, and, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that never have I in my somewhat lengthy years of public life, met a man who could circulate amongst men of all ranks, all walks of life, listen to their problems, and talk to them at their level, more than the hon. Minister. That is exactly what the hon. Minister of Public Works did, and when he left Brockville, it was with the feeling amongst our people that he was an hon. Minister of a government which is a government of the people.

I want to say just a word about the Eastern Ontario Hospital, and we are in hopes of getting two new buildings,

the erection of which will soon be commenced. I put these "two new buildings" in at the end, because without any praise to the hon. Minister, we will get them, because we need them.

Just a word in regard to the Department of Education. This is a subject on which I spoke last year, and one with which I am very much concerned, because I feel there is no more important topic although there may be some equal importance—but none more important than the subject of education.

I am one of those who was brought up as a son of the Manse, and, of course, had no money, but my father always said, "All you have to do is to give a boy a good education, give him good health, and put him out into the world, and that is all you need to do." I believe in that philosophy.

The hon. Minister of Education has done much along the line of getting rid of the so-called "frills," which have attached themselves to educational courses like barnacles, and has come down to the basic essentials.

Putting a boy out with a sound body and a sound mind is not enough. We must surround him with good teachers, and that is the reason I said last year that I can strongly support the brief presented by the Ontario Federation of Teachers. That brief contained the following:

A reduction in the number of years on which is based the average salary used to compute the amount of the pension;

An improvement in the minimum pension and the addition of \$120 to the pension of pensioners now receiving less than \$1,200 a year, to a limit of \$1,200;

The removal of the fixed maximum for a pension.

Those, Mr. Speaker, were in the brief last year, and of those three, last year the Legislature granted the removal of the fixed maximum for a pension which takes care of that matter. Now I think we should give consideration to the other two.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the superannuated teachers of Ontario, they are making a request which is twofold, as follows:

That surviving dependents of pensioners who died before April 1st, 1949, be given the same consideration as is provided for the dependents of all other deceased pensioners.

That the average of the 10 best years be used as a basis for calculating the pensions of those pensioned between 1937 and 1949.

I do hope the remaining items in those two briefs can be taken care of before very long.

In all fairness, I must say the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the government, are doing, in my opinion, all that is possible at the present time. They must strive for these things, and I am satisfied that if at all possible they will meet the requests of these deserving teachers.

Now, a word in regard to the Department of Highways, a subject which is interesting to all of us.

I am not minimizing what happened up north, but I am not the least bit alarmed as to what did happen, and for this reason: It has been said—and rightly so—that the errors or discrepancies were discovered by the Provincial Auditor, and that the steps taken by the provincial government, under the able leadership of the hon. Prime Minister, are parallel steps to those taken by the federal authorities. I may say now, Mr. Speaker, that I think the federal authorities did a good job once they awakened from their lethargic state. I was at the Petawawa trials and I can speak with some knowledge, and I know that once they were seized of the seriousness of the situation, they did a good job as far as Petawawa is concerned, even though the conditions seem to be mushrooming all over the dominion.

I do not think there is any citizen in the Province of Ontario who would impute any wrong motives to an hon. member of the federal House or of this House. The citizens of Brockville were

not disturbed, and not shocked. They know we have, in the Province of Ontario, a Prime Minister who is an honest man, and no one will be spared if wrongdoing has been committed, and for that reason, I say I am not disturbed, although I do not minimize the seriousness of it.

With respect to highways: I am sorry to see the hon. Minister of Highways has left his place but I am pleased he is now in the House, because I want to direct the attention of the hon. Minister to some of the thoughts and feelings of the people in Brockville, and in the County of Leeds. I think the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) will agree with me that we are not isolated in our thinking. We know we live in the grandest part of the province, and we know that other parts of the province have their problems and their difficulties, and we want to share those problems and difficulties with them. At the same time, we do not wish this government to be unmindful of the fact that we have running from Brockville to the county represented by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) one highway, Highway No. 2, which is a very old highway. It has many twists and turns, and I doubt if there is any highway in Ontario which has any heavier traffic than Highway No. 2, because now it is taking the whole vehicular flow from Toronto, including trucks coming from Hamilton and other points to the west, as was evidenced by what happened during the very severe snow storm of a week ago.

In addition to the great number of trucks going over that highway, there are many motor cars. Perhaps not as many as travel the highway between Toronto and Hamilton, but there is an extremely heavy commercial traffic over Highway No. 2, and within the past year, we have had numerous serious accidents, and many deaths.

Editorials have appeared in the Brockville *Recorder and Times*, and the Cornwall papers, stressing the seriousness of the situation, and all I can say—and I doubt if the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) can do else

but add his voice to the seriousness of this situation, because it is serious.

I am glad to see the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) in his place, and I was pleased to listen to his remarks in regard to access roads. To my mind, there is no use in establishing more lines to these camps or mines, if you have not a trunk road which will handle the traffic. Similarly, today, we have from Brockville to Cornwall, a road which is presently not capable of handling the traffic which it must carry, and so we are stressing—and that emphatically—that not a year from now, but now—this year—a start be made in regard to a new No. 2 Highway between Brockville and Cornwall.

The hydro development and the seaway have been spoken about, and, as I have said, I am not under-estimating the value of that great work. Nor am I very much concerned, as I have already said, with the question as to where the locks may be built. I live on the banks of the mighty St. Lawrence, and I can come home and get into my swimming suit in the summer, and by taking just a few steps, enter the water, and the same holds true in regard to skating, when the river is frozen over. I can look across the St. Lawrence and see the great State of New York. There is no curtain between us, I can assure the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). Even on a foggy morning, one can see the great State of New York across that mighty body of water. It exemplifies mutual consideration and friendship, and I say let us get on with the job, and if our cousins to the south do not wish to join with us, let them get out of the way, and allow us to proceed.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say about the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development.

I find it rather difficult to speak extemporaneously, for the reason I am inclined to speak too rapidly, but I am trying to abide by the rules of the House, and not read a prepared speech, but I do feel that very often it is far better to have a man prepare a speech, and consume perhaps 15 minutes read-

ing it, and tell us something, than to endeavour to speak without a prepared manuscript and ramble on for an hour, and say nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word with respect to the Department of the hon. Attorney-General. I do suggest that more study be given to the setting-up of a staff of competent parole officers. The system of parole officers is considered to be very important in certain parts of the United States, and it is working out well.

I had a case during the past year, of a bank robber, who received 12 months. There was a great hue-and-cry about it. I even received letters myself asking why this man should only have been given 12 months, and sent to a reformatory. Our local judge, who presided at the trial, and who, in my opinion, is doing an excellent job, said to me, "If there had been a proper system of parole officers, I would have put that man on parole," and he would have done exactly right, as you would have agreed once you heard all the facts.

I feel that money should be set aside for this purpose, because it will require money. A parole officer is not an ordinary man. He must be a man of many accomplishments; he must be trained, and educated, and if you secure the proper type of men, they will save their salaries in dollars and cents many times over, but, over and above that, they will be helping the poor unfortunates, for the reason I think that further study should be given to the setting up of a system of parole officers, and I am sure that money will be found in the treasury to carry on this great work.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like just for a moment to mention hydro, and I want to pay my respects to the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, the Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Commission (Mr. Challies). He occupies a difficult position. I would like to say that during the past year, on many occasions, I have found it necessary to write or telephone to the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, the vice-chairman of hydro, and at all times I found him

not only sympathetic, but a man who had the ability to grasp a situation. As a matter of fact, he was the man who started me to thinking a little more in regard to the vast possibilities of natural gas, and what it meant to eastern Ontario.

And so I say that certainly his counties and this province are being well and truly served in having as the Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Commission, a man such as the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas.

MR. A. CHARTRAND: (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) will bring in his report on the activities of the Select

Committee appointed to enquire into the Cemeteries Act, following which we will continue with the addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

When this report is brought in, if any member of the committee, or, in fact, any hon. member of the House, has any matter of interest they would like to bring up, I hope they will not hesitate to speak to it.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Could the hon. Prime Minister give some indication as to when the redistribution matter will be considered?

HON. MR. FROST: I will let the hon. Leader of the Opposition know at the end of the week.

MR. OLIVER: That is very good of you.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, March 2, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 2, 1954.

The Cemeteries Act, Report of Select Committee, Mr. Allan, Mr. Whitney, Mr. Murdoch, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Root, Mr. Pryde	307
Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Chartrand, Mr. Myers, Mr. Child	319
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	332
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	332

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Motions.

Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I might combine the last order with the motions and advise the House that the funeral of the late hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey) will be held at 2.00 p.m., Thursday, March 4th, from Trinity United Church in North Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I think out of respect for the late hon. member, the House should not meet on Thursday afternoon. On the other hand, that does not apply to the committees or other business of the House. The committees' meetings have been set and, no doubt, arrangements have been made. It may be, in some cases, witnesses have been called, so that the committee work will go ahead on Thursday, but the House itself will stand adjourned during that afternoon.

HON. MR. FROST moves that when this House adjourns on Wednesday afternoon, it stand adjourned until 2 of the clock on Friday afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, would you revert to "presenting reports by committees"?

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. JAMES N. ALLAN (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into and review The Cemeteries Act, the regulations made thereunder and related matters.

Mr. Speaker, before I comment briefly upon the Cemeteries Committee's activities, I would like to add my words of regret at the passing of my desk mate. I am sure that everyone in this House realizes that to be as closely associated with the late hon. member (Mr. Harvey) as I have been during my term in the Legislature, led me to become very fond of him. I learned to love him, to respect him and to admire him. I am sure that all hon. members will miss him greatly, and I would like to express to his family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to point out some of the important decisions of the Cemeteries Committee during their deliberations. I would like to mention the fine work being done by splendid citizens of a great many communities in the Province of Ontario. I suppose it has not occurred to every hon. member of this House how important a cemetery is to a community, and how desirable that it shall serve as a memorial to those who have passed on, a sort of shrine which can be looked up to by the citizens of that community.

In our meetings, most of which were held in Toronto, and during our visits to some of the cities throughout the province, if you read the reports in the press, you no doubt saw mention made

of the neglected cemeteries. I am sure the opinion of every hon. member of the committee is, after looking at a great many cemeteries, and after appraising the cemetery situation throughout the province, that we were bound to feel there were a great many fine cemeteries. There were many more well-kept graves than those which were ill-kept.

I would like at this time to give a word of praise and appreciation to those fine citizens throughout the province, who are doing such a grand job of maintaining very fine cemeteries in our cities, in our towns and in our smaller municipalities. This is not confined to men alone. We found instances where women and women's organizations of the community had undertaken the beautifying of what had been abandoned cemeteries, and it was a pleasure and a great delight to look at the work these people have done. I hope we will always encourage them, and will always appreciate their fine work.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, as chairman of this committee, to express my very sincere thanks and appreciation to every hon. member who served on that committee. It is my first experience with a Select Committee of this House, but I am sure every member on the committee appreciated the responsibility placed upon him when he was appointed. Each member approached the cemetery situation with an open mind, and a desire to be fair in the consideration of the problems, and to bring recommendations to this House which would assist in passing legislation which would help to improve the cemetery situation in this province.

In discussing our consideration of cemeteries I think it might simplify matters if I divided them into two parts, because the problem of cemeteries is itself divided into two parts—the situation of the cemeteries as they exist, and the question of which course to take in the establishment of new cemeteries.

I may say that all the members of the committee endeavoured to acquaint themselves with the problem which existed so far as the cemetery situation was concerned in the province, and after

two or three sittings they came unanimously to this conclusion: that the condition which should be sought after in this province is that cemeteries should continue to be a memorial of those who have passed on, a resting place which relatives may visit, and at which they may find comfort, and that funds must be available to assure the continuous proper care and beautification of these cemeteries.

The committee also dealt with the possibility of these cemeteries becoming a charge upon the municipality. Most hon. members know that under our present legislation, when a cemetery has been abandoned it is the duty of the municipality to assume care of that cemetery. It is the hope that this committee may bring in recommendations which, when they finally become legislation, will prevent, or at least reduce to the smallest degree, the number of cemeteries becoming abandoned or neglected and, finally, reverting to the municipality and becoming a charge on the taxpayer.

With that in mind we proceeded, and as we looked at the problem of cemeteries presently established, and being used, we found that it was not desirable to bring in any recommendations which would upset to any great degree the work of the persons who have been conducting these many cemeteries, especially the smaller ones. So the recommendations which will seem most definite will be those which have to do with perpetual care of lots unsold, or the possibility of collecting perpetual care funds upon unused grave spaces. With that in mind, and with the hope of helping the cemeteries in this work, the committee has recommended the appointment of supervisors whose duties it will be to inspect cemeteries, to safeguard the plot holders, to obtain accurate records, and to assist the owners in programmes of improvement, maintenance and efficient administration. In explanation of that recommendation it is our hope that legislation will be introduced which will make available field men—who may be called “inspectors”—who will help in an educational way to solve the

problems of the various cemetery boards throughout the province. In considering those boards that might be helped, our committee had mostly in mind the boards of smaller cemeteries, of small plot-holder cemeteries, of church cemeteries, of small municipal cemeteries and it was hoped that once these men became available, their encouragement and suggestions could very easily lead to a great many local groups becoming interested in cemeteries which have been considered as neglected. The result might be, as it has been in several instances of sites which we visited, that they will become real beauty spots in the community.

And so, having regard to neglected cemeteries, and with the hope that this is going to create a movement which will tend to reduce the number, these are the recommendations our committee present:

That every effort be made by the province and local governments to restore and maintain in satisfactory condition all those cemeteries which have been deemed abandoned and neglected.

The full extent of this problem is not known. That is true. There is no definite and correct record of every cemetery in the entire province and the committee is not able to make specific and definite recommendations. A survey is to be made as soon as provincial inspectors are appointed, and let me again suggest to hon. members that it is not the intention that these men should be inspectors in the sense of complaining and demanding, but rather that they should be educational officers, field men, who will help to examine this problem and it is believed that an educational campaign under the guidance of the provincial inspectors will go far to limit these unsightly patches.

With regard to cemeteries which are in another group, those which have many graves sold but not used; your committee has considered this, and suggested means whereby a cemetery board might, if it desired, pass by-laws which will require that the cost of permanent

upkeep of an unused plot could be collected before an interment was permitted.

Those are pretty much the views of the committee so far as cemeteries which are being used and established are concerned. We want to give every encouragement to those persons who have been endeavouring to do a good job, many of them under difficult circumstances, to help them in every possible way and not to upset many splendid persons in rural communities who have conducted, through a small group, this endeavour to keep a respectable cemetery in the community.

With regard to the establishment of new cemeteries, that is where the committee felt they can make recommendations that would be most useful. They considered the question of ownership. As hon. members know, there are several types of ownership of cemeteries. They considered too that cemetery lots are not ordinary articles of trade and barter. They sought to make recommendations which would be helpful to maintain burial places which will be a comfort to relatives who have to visit them and a memorial to those who helped to build this province. They were of the opinion that religious cemeteries, municipal cemeteries, plot-holder cemeteries are the types which are to be most desired and encouraged. During the last few years we have had cemeteries of the type which were operated for gain, becoming established in the province, and the committee gave a great deal of consideration as to how they should handle these various types of cemeteries, with the hope of establishing something which would be permanently available to assist in the establishment of cemeteries, they have recommended the appointment of a three-man advisory board whose chief function would be to review and advise the Minister on requests for establishing and enlarging cemeteries, to control the sales and licencing arrangements of cemeteries and such other matters that the Minister might desire to be advised on.

Now, gentlemen, as I mentioned before, and as you would suspect, a

great deal of consideration was given to these various types of cemeteries and we went back to the opinion we had in the beginning, that finally our cemeteries should be established as places of comfort and beauty. And with that in mind we made some rather drastic recommendations, and let me say in explanation of these that we do not feel we have injured anyone by making these recommendations. We have recommended setting aside of adequate funds—a very generous percentage of the proceeds from the sale of lots—be placed in perpetual care funds. We have suggested, so far as what might be called “cemeteries operated for gain” are concerned, that these funds should be placed in an irrevocable trust. It might be better if I read this to hon. members and perhaps explain some of the thoughts we had when we considered these matters.

The first recommendation in this respect was the licencing by the province and the bonding by the cemetery owners of all salesmen to prevent possible misrepresentation. Hon. members will realize that we had suggestions from individuals who appeared before our committee that “high pressure” had been used in the selling of some of these plots. And while I speak of the individuals who appeared before the committee, I had intended to say in the very beginning that we were greatly indebted to the groups and to the individual persons interested in the development and maintaining of cemeteries who appeared before those nine open meetings of the committee we held. They were most helpful, and some of the recommendations in the report are certainly due to the help we had from some of those who have taken a great deal of interest in cemetery operation and who were most helpful.

So in our report we have not said that there cannot be personal solicitation for the selling of cemetery plots. We have instead made recommendations which will certainly make it possible to prevent any high-pressure selling, because as I said before, it was the unanimous feeling of the committee that

a cemetery lot is not an ordinary article of trade and barter—that there is something almost sacred about the last resting place of a friend. And we feel the restrictions we have placed on the selling of cemetery lots were justified for that reason. And so we recommend the licencing by the province and the bonding by the cemetery owners of all salesmen to prevent misrepresentation. In our consideration of this particular matter we went to a great deal of trouble and were helped in this by the opinions of many with expert knowledge of the situation. There was a great deal of discussion as to whether or not these cemeteries could be carried on without personal salesmanship and here the opinion of the experts we called in was of service. We consulted Mr. Alex Miller, manager of the Canadian Association of Advertising Agencies, Mr. L. L. Dunstall, the general manager of the Life Underwriters Association of Canada, Mr. Russell Frieman of the London Life Insurance Company, Mr. John A. Tuck, assistant general counsel of the Canadian Life Underwriters Association of Canada—also Mr. Frank D. Talchard and Mr. Murray Bosley, to endeavour to find from experts if this really was the fact. After listening to the opinions of these gentlemen and listening to the results of their experience, those were the recommendations. Provision has been made for the limitation of the number of salesmen at any one time for any one cemetery and our three-man board will have direct control in this regard if the recommendations of the committee become legislation.

We have also recommended the mandatory use of a prescribed sales contract or agreement which will contain a restrictive covenant, and it is suggested the contract should be written by the department which will administer this Act. Where the purchaser has been solicited and has not personally viewed and inspected the plot before signing the agreement to purchase, the money paid should be refunded if the purchaser so requests in writing within 60 days of the purchase contract. This is in the hope of completely discouraging “high-pressure selling.”

Then the next recommendation has to do, not with any suggestion that any person has been high-pressured, but rather with the persons moving away. It provides:

The cemetery owner be required to repurchase, until such time as at least 95 per cent. of the plots in the cemetery have been sold, any unused but fully paid for plot if the purchaser desires to cancel the agreement, and to refund to the purchaser an amount equivalent to that having been paid into the perpetual care fund on the plot concerned, together with the balance of the purchase price less such administrative costs as may be determined by the Minister.

I think you may realize this was taken from a suggestion by insurance men, and is comparable to the cancellation of a fire insurance policy.

The next is:

Where photographs, plans, maps or illustrations are used in selling plots they shall clearly indicate the name and the location of the cemetery referred to, and they shall also include representative material on the cemetery in which the plot is offered for sale.

You will understand the wisdom in that recommendation. It is to prevent misrepresentation. Then, No. 7:

There be adequate supervision over perpetual care funds as to their amount, security and investment.

You will find, as I proceed, there are different methods of supervision for various types of cemeteries.

Then, the next recommendations are:

No plots be sold in any part of a cemetery until that part has been developed and made ready for burial purposes to the satisfaction of the Minister.

The owner of a plot have the right to purchase monuments, plaques, corner posts, and other needs from any source and to have these placed on his plot providing this material

and its erection is in keeping with specifications contained in the by-laws or rules of the cemetery concerned as approved by the Minister.

The prices of services and supplies in the cemetery including interments, disinterments, foundations, markers and other common needs be controlled at a rate in keeping with those of other comparable cemeteries in the locality.

Where a plot is purchased on a pre-need plan or on a time payment plan the number or designation and exact location of the plot be specified in the contract and that the prescribed amount of perpetual care be paid into this account from each such payment made on the purchase.

Those are recommendations which have to do with the selling of plots. The other important consideration, as I have mentioned before, is the provision for an adequate perpetual care fund, and when considering this, may I say to the hon. members of this House, that the percentage of cost for a bereavement which is required by the cemetery, was felt by the committee not to be unreasonable, so that in requiring a generous amount to be set aside in a perpetual care fund, it was the opinion of the committee that it would work no great hardship on any person.

The next is:

Adequate provision be made for the creation of perpetual care funds for the maintenance of all cemeteries in the future.

It was the recommendation of the committee that no cemetery anywhere be permitted to be established without a perpetual care fund, whether it be a large or small cemetery, religious or not. Every cemetery must have that provision, because we cannot help but recognize that throughout the province, the cemetery problem has arisen, because of the establishment of too many small cemeteries. That was the reason for the recommendation, that before a cemetery may be established, this three-man board—if appointed—will have to

be shown there is need for such a cemetery.

The committee further recommend that:

On all future sales of plots an amount be placed in the perpetual care fund equal to at least 35 per cent. of the total sale price of the plot or 35 cents per square foot of the plot, whichever amount is the greater, and that the Minister be authorized to increase this amount for any cemetery should it appear necessary to do so to ensure reasonable maintenance for the future.

That recommendation is proposed in the hope there will be certain to be a sufficient amount of money in the perpetual care fund, so that the income from that fund will care for the cemeteries in an acceptable manner, in the future.

Further that:

The appropriate amount for perpetual care be paid into this fund from all amounts as received in whole or in part payment for the plot.

Perpetual care funds be levied on the sale of lots only, not on other cemetery services.

Adequate supervision by the province be maintained over all perpetual care funds through examination of funds and securities, and supervision of the use of the income from these funds in the maintenance of the cemetery plots concerned.

We were very definite in that particular recommendation, because as I am sure all hon. members can realize, if a Cemetery Board did not have supervision, income from the perpetual care fund might be used for excessive salaries, payments, or for the payment of dividends or for some purpose other than the care of the cemetery. Supervision of spending as well as of collecting is therefore recommended.

The next recommendation is:

Perpetual care funds in all cases be invested in trustee investments prescribed by The Trustee Act.

Perpetual care funds, when collected by the owners of cemeteries, be deposited with a recognized custodian such as a trust company licenced to do business in Ontario or the Public Trustee under the terms of an "irrevocable" trust.

I will come back to that in a moment. The next recommendation is that:

The proposal for the custody of the funds apply to all cemeteries except:

- (i) Municipal cemeteries, and
- (ii) Religious cemeteries where the parent church organization operates 3 or more cemeteries in Ontario.

The thought behind that suggestion was that a municipality is a continuing organization, and a religious body, which has 3 or more cemeteries, is also continuing, and if, by any means, something should happen to this fund, you still have the municipality or the religious organization which may be held responsible for the care and upkeep of those cemeteries.

The next recommendation is that:

Annual financial reports in a form prescribed by the Minister be certified by licenced public accountants or municipal auditors and be submitted to the Minister by owners of all cemeteries.

All owners of cemeteries other than those operated for gain be required to make annual financial statements available to any plot holder on request.

Perpetual care funds, being in a sense charitable trusts, be audited in the same way as any other charitable trusts, namely before the local Surrogate Court judge, and that such audits take place at least once every 5 years and more often if the Minister or the Surrogate judge so directs, or if 25 plot holders so request, but with the following exceptions—

(i) cemeteries having perpetual care funds of less than \$25,000.

(ii) religious cemeteries where the central church organization operates at least 3 cemeteries, and

(iii) municipal cemeteries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to a section which I have already mentioned.

In established cemeteries authority be given the owners of the cemeteries—

(i) to charge perpetual care against any unopened grave on which perpetual care has not been paid.

Just one more item, Mr. Speaker, and I will conclude. That is in regard to "taxation."

We had representations made to the committee to the effect there was a need for the taxation of cemeteries. I have no doubt persons who made that suggestion very probably had not considered—nor did they have in mind—how difficult it is to tax a cemetery, especially one in which the graves are filled, or nearly so. We found it is just not possible, because, after all, you have no means of collecting the taxes, and there would be no income to pay the taxes, except from the perpetual care fund, which was paid into by persons confident that the income from the perpetual care fund would be used for the maintenance and upkeep of the graves of their loved ones.

We decided it was not possible, but we did realize that cemeteries in some municipalities may be a problem, because as cities grow, the probabilities are that cemeteries will be established in neighbouring municipalities, and having had representations made to us, pointing out the need of certain money for taxation, and similar purposes, we formulated this recommendation, which we hope will be helpful:

Since taxation of cemetery lands has considerable merit, but is not without complications in its application, municipalities be given the right to limited taxation, especially in the case of cemeteries operated for gain. (This might include the right to require cemetery owners to pay to municipalities a sum not exceeding \$1 per grave space as it is sold—

that is to take the place of taxation.

—this would be intended to compensate for loss in general taxation and for local improvement works, and

especially so in regard to cemeteries situated in certain municipalities but intended for use of citizens of other municipalities. It also would be expected that land approved for but not yet developed for burial purposes would be subject to all taxation.

That is not really taxation. It is a sort of service charge, although it may appear to the hon. members, as they listen to that paragraph, that it would not furnish much money to a municipality, it would help.

There are from 800 to 1,000 graves per acre, so that a municipality would receive from \$800 to \$1,000 per acre, money which they could use, or put aside and simply use the interest. The committee felt this would be of some assistance to the municipality in which the cemetery is situated.

Those are our recommendations, Mr. Speaker. I once again want to say to you, sir, and to the hon. members of this House, that it was a great pleasure to serve on this committee, especially with the personnel composing it, and we feel, after a great deal of serious, sound and fair consideration, that this report will be useful in formulating legislation by this House, and will be serving in some measure to solve the cemetery problem in the Province of Ontario.

MR. NORRIS WHITNEY (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, in our country, to our people, the matter of cemeteries is really important. I think all hon. members, when they read the history of the British Commonwealth, are impressed by the fact that many of our most famous people have been interred in Westminster Abbey, and reading of that, brings us down through the years, and a little closer to the achievements by the great people of the past.

Similarly, I think we cannot help but realize that it is important to recall the fact that Sir John A. Macdonald was interred at Cataract, and when we visited Brantford, we were deeply impressed by the fact that Joseph Brant and Pauline Johnson were interred

near the only Royal Chapel outside of the British Isles, located at Brantford. These things have all left their impressions, and form an important part of the history of our people, and of our own background.

I, as were other members of the committee, was impressed with the great work done by many of our local people, who have taken a great deal of pride in the maintenance of our cemeteries. It is true that we find a neglected cemetery now and then, but, as our chairman so ably stated, in the over-all picture, certainly there are more cemeteries which are well kept, than there are those which are neglected.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a great pleasure to serve under our chairman, and to be associated with the other members of the committee.

Our chairman, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk, was fair, capable, and proved a very excellent chairman indeed. We are sure the people who came before us were honest in their presentations, and imbued with a sincere desire to be of assistance to the committee.

I only want to speak briefly, to say how great a pleasure it was for me to serve on the committee under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, what I would like to say may be in the form of a question. I understand that many graves having perpetual care, are marked with the letters "P.C.". One of the hon. members of this Legislature, in the course of his occupation, was asked to go to a cemetery, and put stones on certain graves, marking them with the letters "P.C.", and he was naturally suspected of having an ulterior motive.

I wonder if there is not a possibility of this being changed, or if the chairman of the committee thinks this should be continued.

MR. GEORGE T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I also was a member of this committee, and I agree

with the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox, that our chairman was indeed very competent.

In regard to the cemeteries we visited, may I say it was interesting to see some of them. One in particular, in a district we visited, contained only the graves of children. I think there was the body of but one adult person in that cemetery. It had been completely abandoned. All the children buried there had died, within a matter of a few weeks, as the result of a scarlet fever plague, occurring many, many years ago.

Abandoned cemeteries may constitute a problem, but I will say, Mr. Speaker, that in Brantford that problem is beginning to clear up. We proceeded in this way: before it was abandoned completely, and the stones overturned, and broken, attention was given to it, and it is today a very beautiful place. It has been made permanent, and is now a very lovely park, called "Tranquility Cemetery."

We were not always in full agreement in the committee, but we found it very easy to compromise, and we were able to bring in the report as you have heard it today.

On page 4 of the report, there is about one-half of it which would not have had to be written at all, if the committee had taken the advice of two or three of us, and not made provision for salesmen for cemetery lots. I do not think there is any more need for salesmen selling cemetery lots from door to door, than there is for selling caskets. As I say, this portion, on page 4, would not have had to be written if it had not been for certain sales methods permitted to be used in connection with some of the cemeteries.

As I say, we were able to compromise, and I think our chairman has brought forward a very fine report which will correct many of the evils which existed before.

MR. THOMAS D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, may I first express my thanks to our able chairman, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan). I am very happy to have

been associated with him and the other members of the committee. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege and a pleasure. I would also like to express my personal thanks to Doctor Berry, Mr. Walker, and Mr. John Scott of the Department of Health who helped so much in the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the report on our desks is not a voluminous report, and is certainly not cluttered up with a great many recommendations. While the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk has spoken on most of the recommendations, the one with which I am concerned the most, is in regard to the appointment of a 3-man Advisory Committee. That, I think, is the keystone of the cemetery problem today.

I have no wish at this time to be too critical of the division, because I believe Doctor Berry is one of the most capable men in the Department of Health, but I think the trouble is the division, so far as Doctor Berry is concerned, is under-staffed, and does not have time to pay sufficient attention to some of the problems. The present regulations provide certain conditions with which the cemetery operators must comply. One I have in mind is that the department must be notified, and the approval of the hon. Minister received for a change in ownership, or an increase in the price of a cemetery plot.

In my riding, we have 3 large cemeteries, and in one of the largest there was a change of ownership last July. Under the plan designed by the new owners, they agreed on an increase in price from \$40 to \$59, but permission and consent of the hon. Minister was not received up to 2 weeks ago, and those people are still operating. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the recommendation of the committee is approved by the House, they will appoint men who are capable and efficient to enforce, clearly and definitely, the Cemeteries Regulations. I believe, even with the increase in perpetual care from 15 per cent. to 35 per cent., the present cemetery operators, in the business for gain, will pass the increase along to the people buying plots,

unless we have a 3-man board strong enough to prevent any increase in price.

The president of the Toronto Burial Trust Company, in giving information to the Select Committee, said it was his opinion that cemetery plots could be sold at \$1 per foot, and maintained profitably and well. Mr. Speaker, that means a cemetery plot could be sold for \$27, because the average plot is 3 feet by 9 feet. Yet, in my riding, we have 3 large cemeteries, in one of which a cemetery plot 3 feet by 9 feet can be purchased for \$27, in another for \$35, and in still another for from \$40 to \$59.

I think a 3-man Advisory Board, if appointed, would have a great deal of work to do. I am not opposed to people investing money in cemeteries if they want to, under our free enterprise system. They are entitled, I suppose, to a reasonable profit, but I think every hon. member of this House will agree the public should be protected by making sure these people do not make an unreasonable profit.

In respect to cemeteries operated by the municipalities: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities should be encouraged to enter this field. It is not a burdensome business for them, and I feel quite sure it could be put on a profitable basis. I hope the department will encourage municipalities to enter the field of cemetery operations, because I believe it fills a semi-public need.

Regarding the recommendations: as the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) has mentioned, there was some disagreement, but he and I and one or two others could see the other fellows' point of view, and I was very happy to go along with the recommendations, and support the report, but I would like to emphasize the need for the government appointing a 3-man Advisory Committee, at the first opportunity.

MR. J. ROOT (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have tabled this report, and as a member of the committee I want to make a few comments.

First of all, I want to say that it was a privilege to serve on the committee

under a very able chairman. He was fair and gave every group which appeared before the committee a fair chance to present its views. He gave every member of the committee a fair chance to present his views, and, at the end, we agreed, by compromise, to the report which has been tabled today.

On the committee we had representatives of 3 political Parties, and I want to say it was a pleasure to work with every one of the members. In fact, I found all the members so broad-minded I sometimes wondered why the opposition members could not just move across the floor, close up the ranks, and make it a solid bloc on this side.

I appreciated the co-operation and assistance we received from the officials of the Department of Health, Doctor Berry, Mr. Walker and Mr. Scott. It was an inspiration to find, scattered all over this province, so many groups, councils, and individuals interested in providing proper burial facilities, and in keeping the burial grounds of this province in a way which will show respect for the pioneers who developed this province.

We listened to many representations and arrived at certain conclusions. There will be individuals who will not agree with everything we recommend, but I believe the recommendations in this report are fair and are in the best interest of the people.

There are certain recommendations in which I was particularly interested. Our chairman has dealt with most of them, but I feel the government should give full consideration to our recommendation that adequate perpetual care be provided in all future sales of plots, so that there will be an end to the abandoned cemeteries. I think it is right, if we are going to ask everyone to buy perpetual care when they buy a plot, they should have protection for the funds they have invested.

Another clause in our recommendations, which I do not think has been emphasized here, is the recommendation that perpetual care be made a legal charge against an estate. At the present

time, if a person dies and makes no provision in his will for an amount for perpetual care, it is rather difficult to establish the Care Fund unless you hold the family up on the way to the cemetery, and that is something, I think, which should not be necessary. If this recommendation is implemented and perpetual care charges be made legal charges against estates, there will be no need for presenting a bill at a time when people are not in a condition to discuss such matters.

The recommendation with regard to a fee being collected in lieu of taxes, I feel, has a great deal of merit. At the present time, we are witnessing a great expansion in population in certain areas, for instance, in the Metropolitan Toronto area. We were told, in this area, there is no available land for the establishment of cemeteries, with the result that cemeteries could only be established in the townships surrounding this area, and that the same situation will develop in other areas. To my mind, and also in the minds of the other members of the committee, it does not seem fair to ask outlying municipalities to have ground removed from their assessment to provide services for another municipality. Therefore, the recommendation has been made that if a municipality desires to do so, it will be able to collect a nominal fee in lieu of taxes.

If any of our established cemeteries find it difficult to establish a perpetual care fund, there is in the report, a recommendation that local Cemetery Boards can, if they wish, pass by-laws which will place a perpetual care charge against all unopened graves.

Another recommendation is that they could repossess unused space in abandoned plots. In many of the old cemeteries, plots were sold with perhaps spaces for 12 graves. Possibly 2 of them were used, and the family moved on, so that at the present time the cemetery board is faced with the problem of cutting the grass and maintaining 10 empty spaces for all time. There is provision in the recommendation for a local Cemetery Board to pass a by-law making it possible for them to repossess the

unused space in abandoned plots, but to hold that space for a period of time, and if no one then comes forward and establishes a perpetual care fund, the board would be in a position to sell it. I do feel this provision will make it possible for some of the old, established cemeteries to get their perpetual care fund on a more sound basis, and perhaps be relieved of the burden of cutting grass for all time on land which would not be used and could not be used, unless it be repossessed.

I particularly like the recommendation with which the chairman dealt very fully, dealing with protecting the public from misrepresentation when purchasing plots on a pre-need sale programme. I think that is sound. While some of the members of the committee felt there was no place for pre-need selling—and quite frankly, there is not—I cannot find any particular fault with a man providing for what is inevitable, but I do not think there should be any place in that programme for any misrepresentation. I think if the recommendations are carried out, that will be eliminated.

As other members of the committee have mentioned, I like the idea of an Advisory Board. If a group comes forward with a request to establish a cemetery, the board would be in a position to conduct a hearing to find out how many available grave spaces there were in that community at the time. It is not serving any useful purpose to create any cemetery in an area which is already overserved with cemetery plots.

I like the recommendation that there be a provincial field officer to work throughout the province. Many of our local Cemetery Boards are not aware of what they can do under the provisions of The Cemeteries Act. These field men would be in a position to assist groups who are anxious to clean up some of the abandoned cemeteries in the province, and advise them as to what could be done. They would be in a position to secure accurate information as to the number and condition of abandoned cemeteries. Perhaps after making a study of this kind, they could make suggestions to the government which would be sound, and would make it

possible to work out some scheme whereby, in a short time, the abandoned cemeteries could be cleaned up. Instead of being in the condition they are now, they would be a credit to the Province of Ontario.

Another recommendation I like is that a clear definition be given of what is meant by the words "abandoned cemetery." I think the municipality has the responsibility of taking over abandoned cemeteries, and it is thus very necessary there be a clear definition of what is meant.

There is also the recommendation that local councils being given authority to deal with this problem in a practical way, after it has been established that a cemetery is abandoned.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to say it was a privilege to serve on this committee under a very able chairman and to work with the hon. members of this House, who are all so broad-minded and who all made great contributions. I hope the government will act on the recommendations contained in this report.

MR. THOMAS PRYDE (Huron):
Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to take a few moments to add a few words to what has already been said regarding this subject.

I think we must all appreciate the very fine explanation of these proposed recommendations given by the chairman and supplemented by other members of his committee, and I will endeavour not to repeat too much of what has already been said.

If there is one thing which has been emphasized by each one of the committee, it is their realization of the fact that the creation of adequate perpetual care funds, properly safeguarded, is the crux of the whole question of caring for cemeteries in the province. They apparently have given it much time and thought, and received many representations. I hope the government will take steps in the very near future to amend the Cemeteries Act so it will be mandatory to place an adequate percentage of the selling price of the plot in a trust fund. The 35 per cent. suggested by the

committee seems to me to be the very bare minimum which is required for this purpose.

Another point which has been very strongly stressed is the matter of supervision. The recommendations respecting the appointment of field men or supervisors, seems to me to be the only solution. I make bold to say that the Department of Health, which supervises the cemeteries in the province, has no idea of the total amount of perpetual care funds collected by the cemeteries in this province, how they are invested, or how the revenue is expended. The management of cemeteries is comprised in the main by men who are honest, and invest the funds in a legal manner, but it is undoubted that some at least are unaware of their responsibilities in this respect, and field officers would certainly be of great assistance in cleaning up this situation.

They have also said it is a matter of education, and with that I agree. Field supervisors, or whatever they may be called, should be men of tact and good judgment, who would not go into a community with the idea of telling people what ought to be done, or how they ought to operate their local cemetery, but would go in, as the chairman well said, more or less as helpers to advise them with their problems.

I think a supervisor ought to be a person who could address County Councils, for instance, and arouse the interest of municipal bodies all down the line, Municipal Councils, as well as local interested groups. I was very pleased to hear the chairman pay tribute to these numerous bodies throughout the province, for instance, Women's Institutes, Service Clubs, and those who have done so much to clear up and put in good order many of the smaller cemeteries throughout the province. From my own observations, I have seen much of that done, and I think the words of the chairman were well chosen.

In the matter of the establishment of new cemeteries, an application for a charter to establish a new cemetery should be very carefully scrutinized. Public interest, in my opinion, should

be the very first consideration of the establishment of public burial grounds, because any excess of the anticipated needs of a municipality will inevitably lead to trouble.

Regardless of the law, if a commercially-operated cemetery is not paying dividends, it will soon be abandoned, and the responsibility will fall upon the municipality. It will then become either an eyesore or a further blot upon the landscape, and will inevitably fall back as a charge upon the taxpayers.

The committee has pointed out the evolution of cemeteries since the early pioneer days of "God's little acre" to the present time. They said something about these larger commercial-type cemeteries being established only nearer the larger centres of population.

That of course is so and that is what makes the problem all the more difficult, because if these are extended beyond the needs of the municipality, they are just going to complicate matters in the question of town planning and the extension of city boundaries, so I say before a charter is granted to establish a new cemetery some careful scrutiny should be made.

That brings us to the appointment of the Advisory Board. This is something, Mr. Speaker, I have advocated for many years, and I hope the government will soon be able to interest a number of able citizens who will give their time and effort to serving on a board of this nature and advising the hon. Minister on matters of this kind.

I do not think I should go on and take up much more time. We have to realize that cemeteries or burial places have existed since the beginning of time and they will always be with us. It has been said that the reverence shown to the dead marks the rise and fall of civilizations. The heathen placed their dead in the trees and the vultures had ample opportunity to consume the bodies and we remember during the last war, when Hitler committed many of his atrocities, that public condemnation was aroused by the disrespect shown to the dead. Today we have advanced very far from that and we in this country show

reverence to our dead. When we bury them we want to think their last resting place will be a place of beauty which will be cared for long after we have passed from the scene. I think that should be one of the most important objects of the Advisory Board, to see that is brought about everywhere in this province. It has been the custom down through the ages to mark the last resting places of our dead. The Pharaohs of Egypt erected those great tombs and monuments to their own memory. That is the only record we have of those ancient civilizations and even today excavation and research is going on all the time, so we shall get further knowledge of those ancient civilizations.

It is futile for us to say that we do not care what happens to us when we have passed from the scene. I think most of us do care. In this connection I would like to ask hon. members a question. On panels in this building appear the names of every member of every Legislature from Confederation down to this day. Many hon. members may not know this. These panels are in the north building. I would go as far as to say that if any of the hon. members' names were left off that record, I am quite sure the hon. Minister of Public Works would soon hear about it. They want to be remembered, the same as others.

This is all leading up to what I believe is something that we all want—to think that our last resting place will be cared for, and we shall be suitably remembered as the days pass by.

Mr. Speaker, you may not have given very much attention to what I have had to say in this respect, but may I close by suggesting we might remember what a very great British statesman of a past age, who was very well regarded in those days, had to say on this subject. The great British statesman the hon. William Ewart Gladstone said this:

Show me your churchyards and I will tell you the character of your people.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I want to take a somewhat unusual

course at this time. I do not think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) nor the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) have ever heard of the adjournment of a debate in connection with tabling a report. But we are living in a new day and a new age and I think perhaps we should consider that innovation.

There are some hon. members here who have expressed to me a desire to have an opportunity of reading the report and then giving it further consideration later on. The hon. members who have spoken, of course, have spoken unanimously in favour of the recommendations.

There may be some who have questions to raise and I think that perhaps it might be a good thing to adjourn the debate at this point. Therefore I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Daley, that as some of the hon. members may desire to speak on this report after they have had the opportunity of considering it, that the discussion be adjourned to a later date and that an Order be placed on the Order Paper for further consideration.

I may say, sir, I do not suppose, since the days of Walpole, has there ever been a motion like that.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, however, it will have to be by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address this House, I believe I would be remiss in my sentiments, if I were not to offer you, Mr. Speaker, my compliments and felicitations with regard to the fairness and impartiality you have displayed at all times in the discharge of your duties, and assure you of my entire co-operation in complying with rules as laid down in this House, so as to assure you the maximum enjoyment during the tenure of your high office.

May I also extend my congratulations and felicitations to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I believe every hon. member in this House will agree with me when I say they have displayed exceptional talent in extolling the virtues and accomplishments of the government, while minimizing, to the point of oblivion, its frailties, its misgivings and its failure to live up to the expectation of the citizens of this great Province of Ontario. I do not wish, however, at this juncture of the proceedings to join issue with the previous speakers, who have expressed sophisticated opinions of a very doubtful and debatable nature. I am rather inclined to discuss two topics which have gained a great deal of momentum in public opinion in recent times.

In the first instance I would like to bring the matter of public health to the attention of the members of this House. I believe it is generally conceded that the expectancy of life since the turn of the century has increased by from 10 to 15 years. The advancement of medical science, new techniques, painstaking research, early diagnosis of ailments, and appropriate treatment at the proper time, together with greatly increased hospitalization, have all contributed their shares toward the attainment of this goal. Aside from the humanitarian and social significance of this attainment, can we for one moment consider, imagine and visualize what this prolongation of life expectancy has meant in the way of the fulfillment in the field of cultural, spiritual and material advancement, and enhancements of this country of ours, and of this province in particular? If we could only devise a means of preparing a complete, total computation and assessments of benefits conferred, it would stagger the imagination. And yet we are told on good authority, that we have not reached the end of the road and that we may still expect a greater expectancy of life, if we have the will and the determination, and the courage to take the necessary steps at our disposal to achieve that most desirable goal.

So far as public health is concerned, what will tomorrow hold? What line of advance shall we follow? That, to my mind is the paramount, if not the greatest, challenge of our day and age, which offers itself and awaits its solution from our public bodies and more particularly from our government.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we have heard much in this House in the past about compulsory hospital insurance plans. I have no doubt that much will be said about them in the future. It is a subject such as provoked Mark Twain's famous comment about the weather: "Everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it."

The reference is, of course, to this province, for already at least two other provinces in Canada have done something about compulsory hospital care. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the merits or demerits of the plans which British Columbia and Saskatchewan have adopted. Perhaps there is no such thing as a perfect plan of hospital insurance. But at any rate, they have done something about it and the fact remains that the plans are still in operation and the people of those provinces apparently are satisfied with them.

I understand the Quebec Legislature is also seriously engaged in dealing with proposals for early action on health and sickness insurance plans for that province. A few weeks ago, the Quebec College of Physicians and Surgeons, an organization with 4,600 members, presented a 20,000-word brief to the Quebec Royal Commission on Constitutional Problems advocating a contributory sickness insurance programme which would provide complete hospital and medical care.

I have not seen the brief, Mr. Speaker, but I learn from the Canadian Press report about it that the sickness insurance would be part of an over-all programme which would include a health insurance plan sponsored by the provincial government. The government programme would cover the treatment and cure of such things as tuberculosis, venereal diseases and mental

illness, and cover such things as workmen's compensation, immunization against certain diseases, health inspection of schools, infant and maternal hygiene, health statistics and aid for indigents. The government would be called upon to pay sickness insurance benefits for indigents. The brief said the programme should be exclusively provincial, and should be operated by private enterprise on a non-profit basis.

Mr. Speaker, one of my reasons for bringing this subject up at this time is to point out that other provinces in this country are accepting their responsibility in relation to health insurance, but Ontario is not. As far as I know, this government has no compulsory health insurance plan. The only thing on which we have any assurance is that Ontario would be willing to participate in any conferences with federal government authorities dealing with a national health plan. Just another instance of the favourite pastime of this government to "pass the buck" or place the onus of responsibility on the government at Ottawa.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if we are ever to get a national health plan, we have first of all to accept our own responsibilities and devise a plan adaptable to the individual problems and needs of this province. Any other procedure is putting the cart before the horse. It isn't right or proper to expect the Dominion Government to do this for us. I think the provinces are all agreed that matters of health should remain exclusively under provincial jurisdiction. I know the hon. Minister of Health of Ontario (Mr. Phillips) has been quoted frequently in the newspapers as favouring an insurance plan worked out for national direction and financial support, but run by the individual provinces. I accept that view, Mr. Speaker, but I submit the provinces must take the lead in formulating such a plan before any conferences are held with Dominion authorities.

I note, from newspaper reports in recent weeks, that the hon. Minister of Health for Ontario (Mr. Phillips) has mentioned a health plan he has in mind,

similar to deductible auto insurance. He said Ontario officials had been working on such a plan, but admitted they had not gone very far, but had given it a great deal of consideration. It is some satisfaction to know the hon. Minister is thinking along the lines of a plan, but the fact remains there is no definite plan, nor any assurance that the government contemplates any action beyond the thinking stage.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is time this government gets away from vague talk about health schemes and gets down to some definite planning. A Select Committee should be appointed to study health insurance plans and obtain some reputable statistical data covering the cost of a workable plan for the people of this province. Armed with such information, some progress could be made, in the first instance, on a provincial basis and, later on further factual data could be secured. Thus we could engage in any discussions with federal authorities regarding a Dominion-Provincial Health Insurance scheme, on a much sounder basis of approach.

As I see it, the delaying factor in any over-all national health programme is the cost. Nobody seems to have come up with the right answer. I understand that original estimate of the cost of the plan in the United Kingdom was £230 million annually. But this figure increased to £277 million, when the scheme was put into operation. Since then, the British Government has seen fit to put a ceiling of £400 million annually for this purpose.

I am informed that slightly over 60 per cent. of the people of Ontario have hospital insurance under existing company plans. That percentage might shrink considerably in the future because of the rising costs of this insurance. Just a few weeks ago, the Blue Cross Hospital Plan announced a 26 per cent. increase in its rates, effective April 1st. We are all aware of the general protest raised when this announcement was made, particularly by the labour unions. We must keep in mind, too, that health insurance under any private company plan is limited in its coverage.

Its sole purpose is to bear a major part of the expense of the individual during any period of sickness.

I think the increasing interest in health schemes, as shown during the past 10 years by the rapid increase in the number of Canadians who have signed for such security with private companies, points to the need for government action to make a close study of the whole question. There are thousands upon thousands of people in this province who cannot hope for hospital treatment, or hospital insurance, simply because they cannot afford it, and are unwilling, and rightly so, to accept the other recourse, that of being classed as indigents and dependent upon the municipality.

At this juncture may I point out, recipients of old-age pensions, mothers' allowances, blind pensions, and certain other types of social aid, receive comprehensive medical and hospital care in Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan and Alberta, the government also pays for dental care, and in Saskatchewan and British Columbia the government pays for drugs. In Ontario the programme is restricted to the services of physicians in the homes or offices. All these services are provided on a means-test basis. They represent an assumption by the Provincial Government of part of the traditional responsibility of municipalities for the care of indigents.

It should also be borne in mind at all times that the indigent, the aged, and the uninsurable are the three groups for which it is well-nigh impossible to provide assurable protection. I submit this government should be interested in the welfare of these people, and a health security plan be made available for them, at the same time relieving the municipality of the burden of the cost for their hospital treatment.

I have no doubt, too, that under such a scheme, our hospitals would be placed in a much better position financially. It is a generally accepted belief that hospitals operate at a loss. I have no doubt this belief is well founded. But have we ever asked ourselves why? Surely it

cannot be for lack of business. Most hospitals seem to be operating at capacity. In many of them, surgery cases have to be booked days and often weeks ahead to secure accommodation. I am sure it is clear to all of us that hospital deficits occur because of the large numbers of patients who, by force of circumstances, must be classed as indigents. Hospitals operating at a loss are an increasing burden on our already overstrained municipalities, which have to make up such deficits out of the taxpayers' money.

I believe that any government plan of hospital insurance must be directed primarily toward these people, and if made compulsory, must be grouped accordingly. By that, I mean a range of premiums with a ratio of corresponding benefits.

Another matter I want to bring to the attention of the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, is that of hospital costs.

This government is fond of frequently boasting of the amounts it is contributing toward hospital maintenance, the construction of new hospitals and additions to older existing ones. In connection with construction, I note, it is always careful to refrain from mentioning that the Federal Government contributes a similar amount, dollar for dollar.

I admit readily that the costs of hospital construction are tremendous, but it is equally true that they are tremendously burdensome.

Some publicity was given recently in the newspapers to claims of overcharging and extravagance in hospital administration. I submit it is the duty of this government to investigate such reports, and ascertain if they are unfounded or not. If there is maladministration in our hospitals, the sooner we do something about it the better for everyone. Such charges cannot and must not be ignored.

Where government spending is involved, it is the duty and responsibility of the government to make certain the money is wisely administered, and used for the purposes for which it was intended. All the more reason, then, for a Select Committee to enquire into

matters of public concern when there are whisperings of irregularities.

In bringing my remarks to a conclusion on this topic, I cannot too strongly recommend that the government appoint a Select Committee of this House to inquire into and investigate all phases of medical care and hospitalization, with a view of recommending a public-health insurance scheme in this province which will be in the best interest of the people of the province, and that it be put into effect at the earliest possible date.

I wish to deal now with a subject which, only on rare occasions is ever brought up in this House. I admit it is a delicate subject to some extent—one that might have wide repercussions politically. Perhaps, that is why so many hon. members refrain from mentioning it, no matter what their feelings about it may be. However, I rush in where others fear to tread. If you have not guessed it, already, let me say I wish to deal with the subject of the sessional indemnity. Perhaps I should qualify that somewhat by saying that I intend to deal with a particular aspect of sessional indemnities. I want to make it abundantly clear that this is my own idea entirely. I speak for no group, nor for any other hon. member of this Legislature, and am under no compulsion whatever.

It is publicly commented on in Ottawa that the late Gordon Graydon, Q.C., M.P. for Peel, in a letter written to another hon. member of the Federal House just a few days before his death, said that he had been in politics a long time, had given to it his best years, his devotion, and his health. "I am dying a poor man," he wrote, "but I have made many friends. What in the world would we do without our friends?"

No loftier ideal could be expressed, and no greater admiration aroused by such a dying declaration. At the same time, serious-minded and level-headed people are questioning the wisdom of the opinion entertained among a large number of people that public-spirited and gifted citizens should devote their time, energy and talents to public life, for the sheer glory attached to it,

jeopardizing their personal future, their health and the welfare of their dependents.

In this House in the past, there have been numerous cases of public servants who have been left in dire financial circumstances, after giving long and useful years of service to this province. At the moment, I understand, there are hon. members of this House, even Cabinet Ministers, who are in failing health, and their unfortunate predicament brought about in the line of duty from heavy responsibilities and the burdens of their duties which, no doubt, played some part in bringing on the illness with which they are afflicted.

At a time and age when social security is paramount in the public mind, in all walks of life, and pension or annuity for a rainy day or provision in advancing age, are the great concern of every individual, I believe the time has come when we should re-examine our position in this House and make provision for those amongst us who may become casualties or suffer some calamity in the future.

I am in a happy position to speak on this subject because I have no expectation of being accused of having any axe to grind. I believe I can well take care of myself, and any dependents I may have in the future. I am, however, quite concerned about the matter from a political standpoint because I believe the trend of events will drive us irresistibly towards one of two choices—either we remedy this situation by granting some financial security to public-spirited citizens with relatively little financial means, or the political arena will become, generally speaking, the preserve of people of affluence, or of political adventurers. I think the citizens of this province would be the poorer in the event of the choosing of the second alternative. So I earnestly urge the government to give my suggestion serious consideration and to seek a solution for a pension plan which will be in accordance with the paramount and long-range interests of the people of this province as a whole. I am sure that no hon. member of this House will object to contributing to such

a plan, and upon that basis I am convinced that public opinion will look upon it as the natural outcome of a most deserving cause.

Mr. Speaker, in bringing my remarks to a close, I realize I have taken more time than I anticipated. I do not know if my contribution will be considered in any way worth while, in shaping the future policy of this government. I wish, however, to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and also hon. members of this House, that all the suggestions I have brought forward were actuated and motivated solely by the desire of giving due recognition to the rightful claims of some of our most deserving citizens. I am very grateful for the opportunity afforded me to express these views and for the attention I have received from all hon. members of the House to my remarks today.

MR. R. M. MYERS (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I propose to say a word or two about the industry which is Canada's largest employer of manufacturing labour and one which is now experiencing hard times due to no fault of its own—the textile industry.

The textile industry in Canada—which actually comprises two industries, the primary and the secondary industry—is located mainly in Ontario and Quebec, the number of mills in each province being about equal. The industry employs 200,000 workers, of whom just over half are women. One in every 6 persons employed in manufacturing industries in Canada is a textile worker. No other industry employs so many women.

Most of Canada's textile plants are situated in small cities and towns and the prosperity of these communities is dependent upon the employment provided by the industry. Hespeler, in my riding, is a typical example of an Ontario textile town. It has been predominantly a textile town for more than 90 years. In the early days the inhabitants made a coarse linen cloth manufactured from flax grown in the area, as well as woollens, but in late years the manufacture of linen was abandoned. In Hes-

peler is situated one of Canada's largest mills. The town has a total population of about 3,780 of whom 1,100—or almost 1 in 3—is employed in its textile plants. Many third generation men and women in this town, and some of the fourth generation, are textile workers. The welfare of the people of Hespeler is dependent entirely upon the prosperity of Canada's textile industry.

The textile industry in Canada is modern and efficient and the workers are skilled. It is estimated that the industry has increased its capital investment by more than \$300 million in the period 1946 to 1953, and almost all of this money was spent for replacement of machinery and equipment. I am told that the products of Canadian manufacture cannot be distinguished from British goods after even the most exacting examination.

The use of textiles in Canada has been constantly increasing. Textile sales in 1953 exceeded any other year and it seems likely this increase will continue. In 1936 there was in Canada an average per capita consumption of textiles of 35 yards. In 1953 this per capita average rose to 48 yards. In the United States the per capita consumption in 1953 was 80 yards.

Canada's textile workers receive higher wages than textile workers in any country in the world except the United States. It would appear from a recent item in the press that workers in a Hespeler plant receive an average wage of \$1.11 per hour. By way of contrast the average wage of textile workers in the United Kingdom is but 41 cents per hour or 40 per cent. of the Canadian rate. Textile workers in Japan (which has a completely modern industry and is the largest exporter of textiles) receive only 9.3 cents per hour. It is apparent, therefore, that the Canadian industry cannot be expanded by building up an export trade.

By way of summary it may be said of the textile industry in Canada that:

1. It is located in small communities and is already decentralized at a time when governments are stressing the

desirability of decentralization. It pays fair wages and it provides congenial occupations for a great many men and women.

2. The use of textiles has been constantly increasing with increasing national income, and there is every prospect of further increase.

3. Canadian textile mills are modern, efficiently operated and produce an excellent product.

4. Because of the very much higher wages paid in Canada than any other country except the United States of America, there is no possibility of building up an export market.

It would seem from what has been said that the future of the textile industry and of the textile worker in Canada is extremely bright, but the reverse is the case.

Many Canadian mills have been operating at a loss in recent years. 14 mills in Ontario have been closed in the last year.

In April, 1951, the total man hours worked in the industry stood at 4.5 million. In April, 1953, the total was 3.5 million or a decline of 22 per cent.

Before the war Canadian workers made 73 per cent. of the textiles used in Canada. In 1953, this percentage dropped to 51 per cent.

In December, 1952, there were 10,500 unplaced applicants in the textile industry and in December, 1953, this number increased to 22,000 and represented a ratio of unplaced applicants to the number of workers of 11 per cent. and this at a time when general employment in Canada was at an all-time high. In one large woollen mill in my riding, which at one time employed 1,200 men and women, only 505 employees remain.

The principal reason for this distressing condition in the textile industry is the fact that for the past 15 years Canada has been consistently reducing its import duties on textiles with the result that the Canadian market has been all but captured by goods of foreign manufacture. Our customs tariffs now are about one-half the 1933

level and are less than half of the world average. Canada's import duties on textiles are the lowest of any important country in the world, and one-sixth of all fully manufactured textiles imported into Canada in 1951 came in duty free.

The increase in imports, to the detriment of the Canadian textile worker, has accelerated very much in recent months. For instance during the first 10 months of 1953 imports of wool cloth increased more than 40 per cent. over imports during the first 10 months of 1952. In the same period imports of rugs and carpets increased 80 per cent., and imports of cotton yarns and piece goods increased by more than 20 per cent.

Fifteen years ago Canadian mills supplied 3 yards of fabric used in Canada for every yard imported. Today Canadian manufacturers barely match imports yard for yard. Imports have increased in the past 15 years by 131 per cent.

In addition to many of our textile workers being totally unemployed, many more are on short time.

I suppose foreign countries will not purchase our goods unless we, in turn, buy theirs. This is easy to realize, but it is difficult to understand why Ottawa should have made a sacrifice of the industry which gives employment to more of our people than any other. Other countries faced with the same problem have met it practically by the provision of safeguards to protect their textile industries. The United States undertook to lower duties on wool products, but its duty is 36 per cent. as against a mere 15 per cent. imposed by Canada and the United States retained the right to increase the rates if imports exceed 5 per cent. of the domestic products. Other commonwealth countries have actual quotas on textile imports.

The textile industry and our textile workers realize that in order to promote an export market for Canadian goods, foreign products must be permitted to enter Canada. They believe, however, that the goods imported into Canada to balance exports should be of many varieties and there should be a limitation

on the quantity of any one kind of import to the end that no Canadian industry should be ruined. Our textile industry and workers believe that Canadian textile industry ought to be permitted to supply at least 70 per cent. of Canada's requirements and that if further inroads of foreign goods in the Canadian market must be made, the additional inroads should be to other industries.

In the Galt area, which includes the City of Galt and the Towns of Preston and Hespeler, there have been as many as 3,341 textile workers. Now 50 per cent. of these have been laid off and of the balance 42 per cent. were on short time on February 12th, 1954. It is interesting to note that last Sunday there was a meeting of the employees of a large mill in my riding and they voted to voluntarily accept a substantial wage reduction in order to permit the mill to operate.

I have been asked by the textile workers in my riding to bring their unhappy plight to the attention of the House. So far as I know Ottawa has never indicated it is prepared to assume any of the burden occasioned by the distress it caused in the industry. It seems to me proper that the Government of Ontario should make it clear to both Ottawa, and to the people of Ontario, that the responsibility for the present state of the industry and for its improvement lies with the Federal Government. It might be advisable now for the province to enter into negotiations with Ottawa to determine what is to be done when substantial numbers of our unemployed textile workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

In other words, it should be made clear to all that if Ottawa chooses to single out the Canadian textile industry, and sacrifice it, in order to permit the sale of Western Canadian wheat and other raw materials abroad, then Ottawa, and not the province, should be faced with the responsibility of meeting the disastrous results which are being experienced by both workers and owners in Canada's oldest and largest industry.

After all, we must remember that it is not the workers in other countries, making goods to be shipped into and sold in Canada, who live in houses built by local bricklayers and carpenters, who wear out the doorsteps of local retailers, queue up at the local movies, subscribe to the local newspapers, who render public service for the development and betterment of the local community, or who call in the local physician to ensure "happy landings" for new Canadians. It is gainfully employed Canadians who ensure the activity of Canadian municipalities.

MR. ARTHUR J. CHILD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in joining with my colleagues in speaking in the debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to congratulate both the mover and the seconder on their addresses, which I consider were extremely well presented.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few remarks I would like to make today concerning matters which have been brought to my attention by a number of persons in my riding, and I believe the matters which have been brought to my attention, are very well taken.

Turning to the Department of the hon. Attorney-General, I would like to point out that today we still have, under The Fire Departments Act, a maximum work week of 56 hours. Considering the trend of labour in the last 10 years, this appears to be somewhat outmoded. According to the latest figures from the *Canadian Statistical Review*, the average work hours per week in manufacturing across Canada is 41. At the same time, most municipal employees work less than 40 hours. I do not see why firemen, who risk their lives to protect our families and property, should be singled out for a 56-hour week maximum, and I suggest that serious consideration be given to reducing it to a maximum of 48 hours which, in my opinion, seems to be very reasonable.

Another item which comes under the same Act, is the establishing of a fire college for the purpose of teaching the theory of fire fighting, and to give full

courses in the practical method of fighting fires. The standardization of equipment is a step in the right direction, but a college is a definite need today with the added hazards which are encountered including those from chemicals. This brings me to another very important matter, that of oxygen apparatus. The fact that firemen are often called on to work in the presence of toxic gases which can do irreparable harm to a man's lungs, suggests to me that there should be added to the present legislation entitled the Fire Departments Act a provision that all fire trucks should carry a minimum of two approved self-contained oxygen or fresh-air masks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to a matter that concerns the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), namely, a section of The Municipal Act. I spoke on it last year, because I believed it to be undemocratic, and since that time it has been proven to me beyond a shadow of a doubt that this is true.

I refer to Section 20 of The Municipal Act which gives a municipality the right to apply to the Ontario Municipal Board to annex territory from a neighbouring municipality without the consent of that municipality, and, as a matter of fact, over the protest of the council, and the majority of the citizens in the area desired to be annexed. I consider this to be the worst type of land exploitation, when one municipality can take choice land away from another, even though the annexing municipality needs it for survival. I know of two municipalities adjoining the City of Hamilton which have been affected by annexation. One is practically bankrupt, because a recent annexation took practically all of their water mains, and a large percentage of their assessment. The other township is fighting for survival against annexation which, by the way, the whole council unanimously opposed. Approximately 80 per cent. of the people in the area to be annexed signed a petition opposing the annexation, yet, in spite of this opposition, the Ontario Municipal Board saw fit to grant the application for annexation. The municipality annexing practically

"blackmailed" the residents of some of the area to be annexed into signing a statement that they would not oppose annexation if the city sold them water.

In the other township adjoining the City of Hamilton, a number of wells were polluted and the parents had no water with which to care for their babies and older children. Yet, in spite of this, the city said,

We will not supply you with water unless you sign an agreement not to oppose annexation at a later date.

I would like to read into the record an extract from a letter addressed to me by the township clerk of Barton, dated February 23rd, 1953:

There are 13 families involved in the application for water for Wellington Street. In return for the privilege of supplying these families with water at a price of 30c. for the first 1,000 gallons, 22½c. per 1,000 for the next 240,000 gallons and 18c. on all per 1,000 gallons over 240,000, and, in addition, the charge for meter service for a 12-inch main. Also, the council must agree to the city establishing a 156-acre garbage dump in Barton. They must also agree as a township that they will not oppose the annexation of the area supplied with water and, further, the property owners must also sign a declaration that they will not oppose annexation of the area supplied with water. To the end that you have documentary evidence of the requirements of the City of Hamilton, we submit herewith Exhibit "A," By-Law No. 6926.

Signed, A. Broughton,
Township Clerk.

Mr. Speaker, this gives a pretty clear picture of the extent to which some municipalities will go, under the present legislation and how unchristianlike it can act to a neighbouring municipality. It also shows how easily they can forget the Golden Rule and the Ninth Commandment, "Thou shalt not covet—" etc. These are conditions which parallel the days of the old water barons who controlled the water courses in the West

100 years ago, and when cattle ranchers could not pay the exorbitant price they asked for water, their cattle died of thirst. As long as Section 20 of The Municipal Act remains as it is, these conditions will continue to exist. Under the Act, at the present time, there is no protection for the owners of land in the annexed area and especially for the farmers. There is no protection for the small home owners whose property could depreciate because of industrial rezoning in the area. It is, in fact, expropriation without compensation, and it enables builders, real estate agents and land speculators to make a "killing." The transcript of the Ontario Municipal Board Hearing for the Hamilton Saltfleet annexation, will prove that outside the civic officials, and one or two indirectly connected to the city, who presented briefs in favour of annexation, the majority of the evidence for annexation came from people who were in a definite position to make money out of the "land grab."

Many people stay away from these hearings because they are unable to get up and express themselves in public even though they are violently opposed to annexation.

And that brings me to another touchy point. A large number of people both in the City of Hamilton and the Township of Saltfleet, asked me to oppose annexation on their behalf, for a variety of reasons, but, by and large, the main reason was that they feared increased taxes which they could not afford.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the many requests, and my willingness to act, the Municipal Board ruled, after receiving objections from the city solicitor, that I could not speak on anybody's behalf, other than my own, as a private citizen. Had these people hired a lawyer, he would have been able to speak for them and cross-examine witnesses, yet a member of this House, whose responsibility and duty it is to work in the interests of the people he represents, was denied this right. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that anybody the people choose to represent them before the Ontario Municipal Board, regardless of his pro-

fession, should have the same rights and privileges as a paid lawyer.

Past experience has shown these people residing in a number of areas annexed to the city some 5 years ago, that the roads and local services are far worse than they were when they were looked after by the township, as was given in evidence at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing.

Yet these people have to pay increased city taxes for worse conditions. I suggest, first, the municipality annexing should be made to buy these lands at the going market price, or, secondly, the farmers—and I have received a number of letters concerning this—should receive a fixed assessment, to compensate them for the imposition and restriction. Thirdly, the city should guarantee to find an industrial buyer for the land immediately. Under the present legislation, the mighty can "gobble up" the weak, without compensation. The foundation of the Act may be sound, as the hon. Minister stated a few days ago, but it appears to me the superstructure of the Act could certainly stand some repairs, and I respectfully suggest to the hon. Minister that this be taken under advisement during this session, and that the Act be amended to give the people in the area to be annexed a vote on the matter. I submit, when we stop trusting the people, we are heading for dictatorship.

For the past year I have been gathering information on what I consider one of our major problems and one upon which opinion is unanimous among the people I have the honour to represent, and that is, it is time something constructive be done to reduce the highway traffic accidents.

Last year 1,082 deaths were reported from accidents, and at the rate we are going it is a fairly "safe bet" that it will exceed 1,100 in 1954, unless something is done now.

My colleague, the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) mentioned in the House last year that it is human nature to have the urge to speed. That urge, I might add, is fostered by the automobile industry, in their advertising

campaigns to sell power, power and more power to the public.

The Department of Highways, thanks to our accident-conscious hon. Minister, has a safety campaign under way all over the province, stressing that "speed kills," and statistics prove this to be so. Our budget, I understand, for the safety campaign is in the neighbourhood of \$200,000 per year.

On the other hand, the automobile industry spends millions of dollars through radio, newspapers and television advertising, trying to "sell" the public on high-powered cars, and "power" means just one thing to the public—speed. Such slogans as "this year we have the greatest power-house on wheels" or "powered for modern driving" or "behind that grill is 235 horse-power," "new engine of tremendous horse-power," "our car has been accepted as the official pace-setter for the famous Indianapolis Speedway," "buy it today and you have a car with real speed" or "our new model has broken 165 stock car records," are constantly read and heard. Some car manufacturers advertise that they have a car that is "almost automatic," "You just have to sit behind the wheel and drive," etc.

On television they now show pictures of standard production line cars doing 90 miles per hour on curves and 110 miles per hour on the straight-away. Add to this tremendous campaign all the thousands of car salesmen also selling speed, and it is not very difficult to understand why we are having so many accidents in which speed is a factor, or the direct cause.

During the Canadian National Exhibition, I spent two evenings in the Automotive Building going from one automobile display to another, asking questions as to why cars are manufactured with such high horse-power, when the speed limit was 50 miles per hour. One sales representative said: "We had to increase our horse-power because our competitor came out with one model at 205, so ours was then increased to 210." Another sales representative told me it was for modern driving, and I reminded

him the speed limit was 50 miles per hour and he replied: "Who drives at 50 miles per hour today? Just a few old 'fuddy-duddies.'" Another salesman said: "If we did not drive over 50 miles per hour, we would be taking the thrill out of driving."

There were other answers to my questions, but all along the same line as the ones I have just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, just as long as we are faced with high-pressure advertising campaigns put on by the various automobile manufacturers, we will continue to kill hundreds and eventually thousands of people in Ontario every year. This "rat-race" of the automobile manufacturers for power and more power, is actually a race which will eventually end in death. Incidentally, the latest car on display is a 300 horse-power model.

It is another question of Mr. John Q. Public being "caught right in the middle" again. He helps pay for his provincial safety campaign, through taxes, and he also pays for a counter-campaign to sell high-powered cars included in the price of the car he purchases. The net result is that we are having an ever-increasing safety problem, in spite of the fact that our Highways Department is building dual lane highways wider and straighter which are supposed to be the ultimate in road safety.

Highway No. 401, the dual lane highway from Highland Creek to Oshawa, has the worst accident record in the province, in spite of the fact that short, sharp curves and short-vision hills have been eliminated. Yet, in spite of all our precaution, the death toll continues to rise. Speed and bad judgment are the main factors. Bad judgment enters into it, because people generally are not qualified to drive at high rates of speed, although unfortunately most of them think they are.

I have heard many suggestions for stopping traffic accidents, by controlling speeds of cars—which I personally do not believe would be a bad idea—and employing more highway police in white cruiser cars, and to institute driving courses in our schools.

I am firmly convinced that whatever action is taken will have to be drastic if we are going to save lives, but when 1,082 citizens are killed in a year, and another 25,000 are injured, many of them crippled for life, then I say it is time for action, regardless of however drastic it may be, or regardless of whose business it may interfere with.

At the rate cars are being put on the road today, and increasing number of visitors and taking into consideration the new roads we are building, the actual road space per car on the highways is getting smaller and smaller every year, so that it is imperative we act now. If we continue at the present rate of accident increase for the next 20 years, it is quite safe to say that practically every person in the province will be affected, directly or indirectly, by a death or accident to their relatives or friends.

And speaking of the number of injured in traffic accidents brings me to a point I believe will interest the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips). One of the problems we have heard debated at great length in this House is the question of hospitalization, and the lack of hospital accommodation required for our sick. Actually, we have more hospital accommodation in the province than we need, to take care of our bona fide sick cases. The trouble is we have not enough room to take care of the bona fide sick cases and our accident victims. When doctors apply for a hospital bed for one of their patients say, on a Friday, they are invariably told, "there are no accommodations available." Yet every week-end, anywhere from 5 to 25 accident victims are admitted to the very hospital which told the doctor "no accommodation was available." It is obvious that hospitals have to keep beds available for a number of emergency cases, which they know from past experience will occur during week-ends.

One accident victim often occupies a bed for from 3 to 6 months, and with 4 or 5 victims in a crash, one accident could quite easily result in a hospital bed being occupied from 300 to 400 hospital days. In a 3- or 4-months' period,

which is quite common for an accident victim, 10 or 12 gall bladder cases, or the same number of pneumonia cases, could have used the same bed, but because of an accident they all must wait, and only the most urgent cases can be accepted.

Ninety per cent. of all our bona fide sick cases admitted to hospital stay less than 3 weeks. The average stay in Ontario is 9.23 days. This is an era of new drugs in connection with hospitalization. Actually we should economize in the heavy tax burden everybody is carrying today instead of spending more money.

By eliminating accidents, we are in effect doing the same as building hospitals and beds, and there is no question but it would be much cheaper. If we cut our accidents by one-third, we would have more hospital beds available in Hamilton than we would actually need for the bona fide sick cases.

I know if we had an epidemic which took more than 1,000 lives a year, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) would have medical experts from all over the North American continent, if not from all over the world, working on a solution to halt the epidemic, who would continue their efforts until the epidemic had been successfully conquered. Yet we kill over 1,000 citizens a year and the figure will be growing year by year, but up to the present time, we have not come up with any workable solution to reduce the number killed. I will admit, that on paper, our theoretical figure of the number killed per million miles of travel has been reduced, but in terms of cold bodies going to the morgues, the number is increasing.

I believe it should have been the responsibility of the automobile industry to give leadership to this important matter of accident prevention. Although at times they do make token efforts, with what they call "safety campaigns," they seem more interested in making money by selling cars by this "rat-race" for power. The 210-235 horse-power cars are now known as the "bankers' hot rods." In fairness to one manufacturer,

who by the way is located in Hamilton, Mr. D. C. Gaskin, president of the Studebaker Corporation, has openly spoken against excessive horse-power and has stated today's 200 horse-power automobiles will someday be instruments of death in the hand of a person who buys them second hand and cannot afford to keep them in repair.

The automobile industry in the United States, from which we take our leadership in car manufacturing, seems to be working on a research programme for the purpose of designing cars for crash survival. In other words, they are not doing anything to eliminate the cause of the crash, but are working on devices to protect the occupants in a car when a smash-up occurs. Such things as safety belts, foam rubber cushioning and windshields which are released under certain pressure are some of the devices being experimented with. It seems they will do almost anything, so long as it does not interfere with their selling points of "power" and "speed."

In a nationally circulated magazine, a copy of which I have before me, is an article dealing with the automobile industry, entitled, "What is new in cars?" and the first word following that title is "speed." Why should we have cars on our highways which will do 100 or 120 miles per hour, when our highway speed laws only permit 50 miles per hour, at the same time, when our roads are not designed for high-speed traffic, and the majority of the public are not capable of operating cars at a high rate of speed?

I firmly believe, as I have stated before, that cars should have controlled speeds, either by means of a gear ratio or governors or by some means which would limit a car to a maximum speed of 60 miles per hour, and I suggest "60" because the extra 10 miles may be required to get a driver out of difficulty, although you usually find that the only time that a burst of speed is required is when a driver has got himself into difficulty, because he has exceeded the speed limit. I believe the records will show that trucking companies which

have governors on their trucks have a very low accident record.

I believe it would also help to curb the stealing of automobiles, as thieves would not be so inclined to steal a car that is governed to 60 miles per hour, when special emergency cars, such as police cars, have unlimited speed. There have been a number of stolen-car chases in the past year, varying from 80 to 120 miles per hour, some involving a running gun battle with law enforcement officers, and in some cases our enforcement officers have been killed or injured in these chases as the result of a crack-up.

Frankly, I believe it is time we stopped being so smug about this whole ghastly matter, and admit that a number of us do at times exceed the speed limit—inadvertently perhaps—but nevertheless we do speed, mainly because we do not realize the rate of speed we are travelling. I understand from safety prevention authorities in both Canada and the United States that this is called "speed blindness" and is becoming an ever-increasing problem.

I realize my suggestion will not help me win a popularity contest among the big car owners, who love to speed down the highways at 70 or 80 miles per hour or for that matter with the automobile industry. But frankly that is not my purpose. The people of Wentworth, whom I represent, are more interested and concerned with the ever-increasing number of highway accidents and fatalities, and it is on their behalf I am bringing this to the attention of the hon. members of this House.

Originally, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask the government to consider a Royal Commission to investigate this important matter. However, since hearing the opinion of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) on Royal Commissions, I hesitate to do so, but I strongly urge this government to appoint a Select Committee with full powers to study this question and bring in necessary recommendations, which will tend to reduce accidents, regardless of how drastic the recommendations may be. I

suggest the committee should enquire into the question of the differential speed limit of 10 to 15 miles per hour between cars and commercial vehicles, which I suggested in the House last year. I have just read in the local papers that Quebec has adopted this provision in their Highway Traffic Act.

Secondly, the passing of legislation to make it illegal to sell a car which is mechanically defective.

Thirdly, more strict licencing of drivers.

Fourthly, increasing the minimum age at which licences may be issued.

Fifthly, legislation to make it unlawful for trucks to operate without rear bumpers.

Sixthly, making it compulsory for all vehicles to have signal directional lights, and driver-education courses which I believe should be made a mandatory course in our high schools, as it is in some of the states of the United States, which plan, I understand, is meeting with great success.

There is one other phase of safety concerning our Highway Traffic Act I would like to mention and that is the lack of legislation making it illegal to pass railway protective devices. Every year motorists are killed because they ignore warning signals and try to beat a train across a crossing. 20 were killed in Ontario in January. This is the case when in order to tie in the race you usually forfeit your life, and at the same time endanger the lives of the train crew and passengers. If there was a heavy penalty for this folly, I feel quite confident this practice would cease. Hamilton police, I understand, charged a number of motorists for crossing against warning signals in Hamilton, but they were all able to "beat the charge," simply because there was nothing in the Highway Traffic Act to prohibit it. Warning devices should be placed in the same category as our flasher lights on the highways.

By the same token, I believe there should be a much heavier fine against

railway companies which obstruct traffic for more than 5 minutes, or when warning devices are in operation for more than 5 minutes at a time, unless they can show mechanical or electrical failure.

The question of the 20 mile-per-hour speed limit crossing railway tracks is not at the present time being enforced, and I would suggest to the hon. Attorney-General that it should be enforced on all of our highways, and that all policing agencies in Ontario should be reminded that such legislation is in the Highway Traffic Act, and should be strictly enforced.

Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for speaking at such length on this problem, but to the people I represent and to myself, this is the most important and urgent problem to confront the government, and I believe it should receive top priority in the government's deliberations—that is, to appoint a Select Committee. Certainly in the past, committees have been appointed to enquire into far less serious matters.

May I respectfully request that this be given the government's immediate attention?

MR. J. P. ROBARTS (London) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves the adjournment of the House.

He said: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the committee appointed to enquire into lake levels will present its report, which I think will be somewhat voluminous.

Following that the House will consider Order No. 24 on the Order paper of today, "The Dairy Marketing Act." It is desirous of sending that bill to the committee as soon as possible.

When consideration of that bill has been completed, we will proceed with the addresses on the amendment to the reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 of the clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 3, 1954.

Standing Committee on Standing Orders , final report	335
Township of Scarborough , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Beckett, first reading	336
Ross Memorial Hospital , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Letherby, first reading	336
City of London , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Robarts, first reading	336
City of Ottawa , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Morrow, first reading	336
City of Niagara Falls , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Jolley, first reading	336
Royal Botanical Gardens , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Connell, first reading	337
Town of St. Marys , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Edwards, first reading	337
City of Peterborough, No. 1 , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Sandercock, first reading	337
Town of Oakville , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Hall, first reading	337
Town of Fort Erie , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Jolley, first reading	337
City of Hamilton , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Connell, first reading	337
St. Michael's College , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Roberts, first reading	337
Hamilton Foundation , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Connell, first reading	337
Home for the Friendless and Infants' Home , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Connell, first reading	337
Township of Sandwich West , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Murdoch, first reading	337
Sudbury Community Young Men's, and Young Women's Christian Association , bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Fullerton, first reading	337
Child Welfare Act, 1954 , introduced by Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	337
Annual Report, Department of Public Welfare , presented by Mr. Welsh	340
Planning and Development , Mr. Warrender	340
Report, Select Committee re Lake Levels in Great Lakes , Mr. Villeneuve, Mr. Myers, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Child, Mr. Murdoch, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Salsberg	345
Motion to Adjourn , Mr. Porter, agreed to	361

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very glad to welcome today students from the Brantford Collegiate Institute, George Harvey Vocational School in Toronto, and particularly pleased are we to have the members of the Kiwanis Club of Niagara Falls, Ontario. We welcome students to our assemblies whenever they find it possible to come, but this is really a unique occasion to have such a splendid representation from one of the great service organizations of our country, and of the world, the members of the Kiwanis Club.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): I beg leave to present the third and final report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Dempsey, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presents the Committee's third and final report as follows:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient:

Petition of the Corporation of The Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association

praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the Association to Sudbury Young Men's Christian Association.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass validating certain employees' retiring allowances, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of The Home for the Friendless and Infants' Home praying that an Act may pass dissolving the said corporation and authorizing the transfer of its assets to Hamilton Hospital Associates Inc.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of London praying that an Act may pass confirming an Order of The Ontario Municipal Board annexing part of the Township of London to the said city.

Petition of the board of the Royal Botanical Gardens praying that an Act may pass enlarging the membership of the said board.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws classifying and regulating tourist establishments.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of St. Marys praying that an Act may pass confirming a by-law of the town regulating a fixed rate of taxation for farming lands in the said town.

Petition of the Corporation of The Ross Memorial Hospital praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership of the board of governors to 17 members, and for other purposes.

Petition of Argue Martin, Q.C., Frank P. Goldblatt, et al, praying that an Act may pass incorporating The Hamilton Foundation.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of Scarborough praying that an Act may pass providing that the council of the township shall be composed of a reeve, a deputy and six councillors and providing for the method of its election.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass confirming the purchase of certain lands for industrial sites by the city.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass increasing the membership of the Ottawa Transportation Commission, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of Sandwich West praying that an Act may pass terminating the corporate existence of the Town of Ojibway and restoring the lands contained therein to the said township.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement between the Corporation, Canadian National Railway Company and The International Bridge Company.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Oakville praying that an Act may pass authorizing the council of the corporation to issue local improvement debentures; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of St. Michael's College praying that an Act may pass empowering the college to confer degrees in theology including honorary degrees.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the names of the following hon. members be added to the lists comprising the committees designated:

Mr. Hunt: Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Murdoch: Committee on Government Commissions.

Mr. Hanna: Committee on Government Commissions.

Mr. Yaremko: Committee on Labour.

Mr. Letherby: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Game and Fish, Committee on Lands and Forests, Committee on Printing, Committee on Travel and Publicity, Committee on Education.

Mr. Connell: Committee on Mining.

Mr. Hall: Committee on Mining.

Mr. Nixon: Committee on Mining.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

THE TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

MR. H. E. BECKETT moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ROSS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

MR. L. LETHERBY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF LONDON

MR. J. P. ROBARTS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

MR. D. H. MORROW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

MR. A. JOLLEY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ROYAL BOTANICAL GARDENS

MR. R. CONNELL moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Royal Botanical Gardens."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF ST. MARYS

MR. J. F. EDWARDS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF PETERBOROUGH, No. 1

MR. W. E. SANDERCOCK moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough, No. 1."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF OAKVILLE

MR. S. L. HALL moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Oakville."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF FORT ERIE

MR. A. JOLLEY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON

MR. R. CONNELL, in the absence of Mr. Elliott, moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE

MR. A. K. ROBERTS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting St. Michael's College."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HAMILTON FOUNDATION

MR. CONNELL, in the absence of Mr. Elliott, moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Hamilton Foundation."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HOME FOR THE FRIENDLESS AND INFANTS' HOME

MR. CONNELL, in the absence of Mr. Elliott, moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Home for the Friendless and Infants' Home."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TOWNSHIP OF SANDWICH WEST

MR. W. MURDOCH moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SUDBURY COMMUNITY YOUNG MEN'S, AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

MR. J. A. FULLERTON moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Sudbury Community Young Men's, and Young Women's Christian Association."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CHILD WELFARE ACT, 1954

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to consolidate and revise The Children's Protection Act, The Children of Unmarried Parents Act, and The Adoption Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill for first reading, I feel I should give some explanation to the hon. members of the House with respect to the content of this legislation.

As the title indicates, it is a consolidation and revision of The Children's Protection Act, The Children of Unmarried Parents Act, and The Adoption Act, all of which will be repealed and superseded by this new Act, which will be entitled, "The Child Welfare Act, 1954."

There has been a feeling for some years there should be a complete revision made of the existing legislation in connection with child welfare in this province. Great strides towards improvement in the protection of children coming under these Acts, and in the supervision of our child welfare. It was felt necessary to make a complete review of the existing Acts, and revise them, all of which has been done, and is included in this new Act.

I might say there has not been a revision of the Child Welfare Acts in this province in over 60 years, since these Acts came into effect. It was felt necessary, in order to complete and bring about the new legislation that all parties concerned with child welfare should be brought together and given an opportunity to express their views in connection with the improvements which should be made.

In the first instance we established an informal committee which was comprised of Mr. Goff, Secretary of the Children's Aid Societies for the Province of Ontario, representing as he did the Association of Children's Aid Societies; Mr. Frame, Welfare Administrator for the City of Hamilton, who has had many years of experience in welfare and could bring into that committee, the municipalities' point of view in connection with child welfare, and we also brought in Miss Jackson, superintendent of the Simcoe Children's Aid Society, as the lady on the committee, and also as a member of a society which represents a cross-section of a particular part of Ontario which might be considered representative of both rural and urban interests.

This committee sat almost continuously for a period of over one year and interviewed people engaged with child welfare, not only in the societies, but also the people engaged by and connected with the municipalities, and they also studied legislation in effect in other jurisdictions outside the Province of Ontario. I want to pay tribute to this committee and the officials of my department who worked with them, for the work they have completed and which we hope has resulted in a Children's Welfare Act which is at least equal to, if not better than, any piece of legislation of this kind to be found in any jurisdiction.

We do not say this is the last word, because we never reach perfection in any particular piece of legislation, but it will be our intention after this Act is in effect, to hold further sittings and consider progressive improvements from time to time on behalf of the neglected children of this province. I think it is right to point out to the House that this Act is not only a consolidation of existing Acts but that new principles have been brought into the Act which, we feel, are for the betterment of child welfare in the Province of Ontario.

I do not propose this afternoon to go into this in detail, but only to point out some of the more important principles and policies which have been incorporated.

We feel it is important there should be a very close relationship between the Children's Aid Societies across this province, and the municipalities which share to a great extent the major part of the cost of child welfare in the province, and also our Child Welfare Branch, working through and with the municipalities, and the Children's Aid Societies in connection with child welfare.

The Director of Child Welfare, of the Department of Public Welfare, will be the director charged with the administration of this Act. We have deleted any reference to "superintendent" as found in the old Act, or "provincial officer," as was designated in the old Act. In this Act the Director will refer to the Director of Child Welfare. We are giving

some assistance to the Children's Aid Societies by the introduction of a new policy of giving some financial assistance to the societies in the districts, in view of the work they are doing on behalf of the province in connection with neglected children in the unorganized districts. We will set up, by regulation, ways to prescribe special assistance to societies in the districts which need additional assistance, due to the fact that it is not possible for them to carry on the work they are doing, because they do not have the sources of revenue from private subscriptions which are available in other areas.

We are incorporating in this Act for the first time a principle in connection with child neglect, which will include incompetence on the part of parents, as well as emotional neglect. It was felt this was advisable because we have cases from time to time where, through emotional neglect, and incompetence on the part of parents, a child's welfare is adversely affected, but it has not been possible in the past to convince a court there was actual physical neglect.

Under the new Act a section has been incorporated which will limit the period of temporary wardship. There has been a practice in some jurisdictions for children to be taken in, and temporary wardship was given. The tendency was for that temporary wardship to be extended from one month to another for 6 months, and perhaps a further 6 months and then a further period of wardship was granted. In the interest of the child it was felt advisable that the full period of temporary wardship should not exceed 24 months. We felt that after 2 years, the court should be in a position to decide whether a child should be made a permanent ward of the society or should be handed back to the parents. That is in the interest of the child.

It has been the practice for discharge of wardship to be made by the societies. We change that in this Act, and the wardship can only be terminated by a judge of a responsible court.

The age limit for guardianship has been reduced from 21 to 18 years. We felt that in most cases there is no neces-

sity for retaining guardianship over a ward until he or she is 21 years of age, unless there are special circumstances in the case of that particular ward. We have made provisions in this Act whereby the ward can be transferred from one jurisdiction to another. The present practice is that a child might be resident in one area, say the Parry Sound District, and yet might become a ward of the Toronto Children's Aid Society. And, as a ward of the Toronto Children's Aid Society, there has been no provision for that child to be taken back to the municipality which has financial responsibility for the maintenance of the child. In other words, a child might be a ward in a jurisdiction where the per diem rate is \$2 a day and yet he will be charged back on a municipality where the cost per diem might be only \$1.50 per diem.

Special provincial aid will be extended to towns and villages in the districts and provisional counties which find themselves faced with large expenses for maintenance of wards. We shall be able to assist them at provincial level. In the past this has only applied to towns and villages in territorial districts. We have found two or three instances where towns have been financially embarrassed, due to the large number of wards which have become their responsibility. It will now be possible for us to assist these towns at the provincial level.

We are providing under this Act that an application must be made to a judge in order to establish per diem rates before February 15th in each year. If an application is not made before that date for a change in rates, or to establish new rates, then the rates in force will remain in force until the following year. This is to assist municipalities in assessing their budgets early in the year. In the past they found themselves embarrassed by having applications made for a change in rates any time in the year when a society may have seen fit to apply.

For the first time we are introducing in this Act the right of a children's society, or municipality or any interested person, to appeal in connection with the

wardship of a child, providing that the appeal is made within 30 days of the time the judgment is handed down. We feel it is in the interest of the child, of the parents, and of all concerned, that there should be recourse to a Court of Appeal in connection with wardship. We propose to extend the same rights and protection to all religious faiths.

We propose in this bill to make it an offence to leave children under 10 unattended for an unreasonable length of time, and we provide a suitable penalty.

We also provide in the bill to extend the natural relationship of an adopted child. As hon. members are aware, at the present time an adopted child has the same inheritance rights as a natural child from the adopting parents. But that does not hold true in regard to a grandchild, or an inheritance from grandparents or other relatives. In this bill, a grandchild who is adopted, without being mentioned in the will, will automatically inherit the same as a child born naturally. We feel that this is being fair to the child, and that it does not interfere in any way with the wishes of anyone expressed in a will. I may also say that the succession duty people have been consulted on this, and the Succession Duty Act will be amended accordingly.

In case there should be any sharp practices or black marketing of babies in the Province of Ontario—and we are happy that there is none, or, at least we are under that impression—but in case there should be we are inserting a section into this Act, a provision for very stiff penalties to be imposed upon anyone convicted of accepting any payment or reward in connection with an adoption.

I might say that most jurisdictions in the United States have this provision to protect children.

After all, we are more or less dealing in human flesh, and we feel we should have penalties which will protect children who might become victims in connection with any adoption which did not have the approval of our own Child Welfare Department, and also of the

various Children's Aid Societies under our jurisdiction.

HON. R. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the 22nd annual report of the Department of Public Welfare for the fiscal year 1952-1953.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

MR. WARRENDER (Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, there is something to which I would like to call to the attention of the hon. members. This morning the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) met a delegation from the Eastern Ontario Associated Boards of Trade. There were about 28 or 30 men and women altogether who came to the hon. Prime Minister, and had a very interesting discussion. They are concerned about industrial development in their area. This in spite of the fact that the Department of Planning and Development has already been doing quite a good job for them.

They are in an area roughly forming a triangle from Pembroke to Kingston to the Quebec border and back to Pembroke. They pointed out there had been some talk about decentralization, and they wanted to see more of it.

The hon. Prime Minister made it clear that one of the policies being followed by the Department of Planning and Development was toward the decentralization of industry. We believe in that, because we know that an industry going to a small community can do very much to tone up the economy of that community, by helping with the assessment, hiring employees and by the creation of greater purchasing power. It, therefore, follows, generally speaking, as I said, that it keys up the whole tone of the economy of that community.

So there is a policy already in force, whereby we agree on decentralization. But the delegation was also concerned about those parts of the province with which they had to do, and they made the point they would like the provincial government to do more to assist them.

The Department of Planning and Development has been trying to do that for all parts of the province, and, as a matter of fact, an office was opened in Chicago because of the great number of calls coming from the Midwestern states. The business we have had come through that office has been overwhelming. We cannot actually say that as a result of this we have attracted an industry from the Midwestern states to Ontario, but we can say we have been very active in getting a great many industries located in the Province of Ontario.

We do not tell them to what part of Ontario they should go. But we analyze their product carefully, we consider also where they must get their raw materials, and the labour force which they will require, and we also have to consider the market which should be readily available. All these things have to be taken into consideration, and we have agreed to help this Eastern Ontario Associated Boards of Trade.

While they were speaking, it occurred to me this was a very appropriate time to announce to hon. members what the Department of Planning and Development has had in mind for some time, many details of which have already been worked out. That is an over-all regional plan for the whole Province of Ontario region by region. We have not yet worked it out thoroughly, nor have we thoroughly defined the regions which will be drawn up, but there will be, at the most, eight of them. Those chiefly concerned with these regions are going to be called to Toronto, or a convenient spot, and we shall meet those representatives, members of the planning boards, industrial commissioners, and others interested in the development and planning of our area, and we shall try to help them take a long-range view of the things which seem to be needed in this great Province of Ontario.

As I have said, this area, whose representatives were here this morning, is the area we have chosen for our first conference. We have already set the dates. As a matter of fact, we hope to have these people here in Toronto on

May 11th, 12th and 13th, at the King Edward Hotel. We have space arranged and are ready to go on with the first regional conference.

Generally speaking, we have a two-fold objective, one, at the provincial level, broad, orderly regional development with optimum land use involving general designations for heavy industry, light industry, agricultural areas, and so forth.

Secondly, at the local level, more specialized zoning and planning of community lay-outs.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we feel the direct benefits will be many, including more informative municipal campaigns for the attraction of new industry, whereby types suitable to a municipality and which a municipality could absorb, would be analyzed, and, secondly, the designation and demarcation of urban problems and rural or agricultural problems, at the municipal level.

Thirdly, the optimum land use, labour force use, raw material use, and the relation of industry to markets.

Also, equalization of assessment as an objective for residence, business and industry in all municipalities, along the line of the recommendations of the Provincial-Municipal Relations Committee, in its report of December 19th, 1952.

We also hope for closer working relations between transport officials and local officials in the matter of intra and inter-area development.

Mr. Speaker, I think that will give to the hon. members of the House the broad picture which we hope to present to the first regional conference, and we do hope, as the result of it, there will be the opportunity of looking into the future, and seeing what can be done to further industry, and also to provide industry for our growing population, as we feel that perhaps many hon. members will think something should be done, and perhaps something should have been done a long while ago. We also hope to discuss the question of potential industrial areas for regional development, which we feel sure will occur in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time, which I think is appropriate, to announce the first regional conference, something which has never been attempted before, and I hope that out of this conference we will have the opportunity of considering these areas, region by region. We are in hopes that a little later perhaps direction will come from the government in regard to these areas over the province, so they may all be helped by a utilization of the many resources we have here.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) whether, in view of the fact that a deputation of the Boards of Trade of the eastern townships, which appeared before the hon. Prime Minister this morning, came to ask assistance primarily in solving the acute unemployment problem which has beset the textile industry, whether the hon. Prime Minister, or in fact, any hon. member of the government, would care to inform the House what, if anything, the government has done to bring about any relief for which the deputation asked.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the relief asked for by the deputation was along the lines about which the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) has spoken, the diversification of industry, and the substitution of other industries to take the place of the one which has been so hard hit in that area—the textile industry.

Of course, we cannot escape the fact that there are other industries which may also be affected in the Province of Ontario, such as the gold industry. This is an attack on a broad front, not a palliative, not an aspirin tablet, such as might be suggested by the hon. member for St. Andrew as a remedy. It is an over-all cure.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): The remarks by the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Warrender), Mr. Speaker, bring to our minds certain prophecies which were made at the time the Department of Planning and Development was

formed. The hon. Prime Minister has said this is an attack on a broad front—

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: We thought, in former days, the activities of this department were to be attacks on broad fronts—

HON. MR. FROST: They have been.

MR. OLIVER: I think, Mr. Speaker, seriously, we can all pretty well agree that up until now the net result of the department's activities—and I am not placing any blame on the hon. Minister by this particular reference—but the net result has been pretty well to make the large centres larger, and bring only a very small measure of relief to the outlying areas, which really need these new industries.

I am quite aware of the complexities of the problem; I am quite aware of the difficulties which stand in the way, and I am hopeful that what the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) has suggested today, will be beneficial in bringing in not only a master plan, but a master plan which will work, for the people and the areas outside of the large metropolitan districts.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, if the large metropolitan areas are growing larger, it is not by any design on our part. There is a very active campaign underway for the decentralization of industry throughout the length and breadth of the province. But when industry comes to us, we cannot say, "You go here" or "You go there." All we can do is to endeavour to guide them, and by not directing them, they cannot come back and say, "You advised us definitely to go to one spot, and it did not work out."

Our object is to assist and guide them, but we do not tell them where to go. It is only by coincidence that many of the larger centres are growing larger, and I think the reason may be due to the fact they have the ready raw material, greater labour forces, and a more ready

market, and many of the essentials which will inevitably result in the further growth of the metropolitan areas.

Our policy is, and has been, one of decentralization.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, perhaps I may be permitted to refer to the remark by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). I would ask him to compare the Ontario of 1954, with the Ontario of 1944, when the Department of Planning and Development was formed, and would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to look at the mighty development of this province in that 10-year period.

MR. OLIVER: With which the Department of Planning and Development had very little to do.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition is like Rip Van Winkle; he has slept for 20 years.

MR. OLIVER: Ontario has gone ahead in spite of this government.

HON. MR. FROST: No, sir; onward with this government.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, here, there, and all over.

MR. SALSBERG: In that case, they are responsible for the slump.

HON. MR. FROST: Despite the grumblings of dissatisfaction which come from the hon. members sitting opposite, may I ask them to remember the House will be adjourned tomorrow, out of respect to the late hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey), whose funeral will take place tomorrow afternoon.

The committees of the House will carry on as usual.

In regard to the Orders of the day for Friday, when the House will convene at 2 o'clock in the afternoon; there will be consideration given to any of the bills on the Order paper, subject to this; if any hon. member, the hon. Leader of

the Opposition or the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) desires that any bill be held over, I shall be glad to acquiesce.

There will also be a continuation of the addresses on the amendment in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the order might be that, first, we will have the addresses on the amendment to the reply to the Speech from the Throne, followed by consideration of the bills on the Order paper. If there is anything of a nature which requires explanation, or which is contentious, I would be glad to agree to have it held over.

For today, Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to adopt a procedure which is a little unusual; but, after all, we are in the year 1954. Instead of calling the next Order, which is "Presenting reports by committees" which would afford the opportunity to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) to proceed with the presentation of this voluminous and no doubt fine report, I should like to call Order No. 33, Bill No. 68, with respect to the dairying industry, after which I would ask that we revert to the presentation of reports by committees.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how urgent it is that Bill 68 be moved on to the committee, but I think the hon. Prime Minister will agree that this is a very important bill.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: It is the amalgamation of nine Acts which have been on the Statute Books for many years. It introduces a number of new principles, and deals with a very controversial subject. May I say to the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, that I have not had an opportunity to look at the bill, as it only came on my desk about 15 minutes before the House met. I do not think this House should be asked to give second reading—which is, in reality, an endorsement of the principles of the bill—until we have an opportunity of looking into it, and ascertaining whether we are in agreement with the principles involved.

It surely would not hold things up very much to have this bill delayed until at least Friday, when we shall have had the opportunity of looking into it, and I would ask the hon. Prime Minister not to proceed with this bill today, unless there is very real urgency for so doing.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the desire is to bring this bill before the committee where it can be given the most thorough consideration, and the suggestion to advance the bill at this stage is to enable that to be done. I think an explanation given by the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) of this bill at this time, would closely follow what was said by him the other day.

Mr. Speaker, this could be held over, but if it is, it will mean a delay of representations which are to be made in connection with it.

I can quite understand the statement by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that he feels adequate time has not been given to consider the matters involved. May I assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that our idea is to give the hon. members of the House, the members of the dairy industry, and others, every opportunity to consider this bill. That is the purpose of asking that it be advanced today.

I think it could be done. The hon. Attorney-General tells me a bill can be referred to a committee on the first reading, but it is not usual. As I say, I imagine the remarks to be made by the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) will be closely related to what he said last Friday, when the bill was introduced.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition insists, I will acquiesce, and hold the bill. On the other hand, I can assure him that our intention would be to send this bill on to committee, and there leave it for 3 or 4 weeks, and after the Agricultural Committee has thoroughly considered it, the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be at liberty to give it his utmost consideration.

May I say to the hon. members of the House, and to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that we feel this bill is a

safe step, but it is not a step which commits us to any specific future act. It provides the framework upon which action may be taken, as circumstances and conditions dictate, with the full co-operation of the industry.

I appreciate the position in which the hon. Leader of the Opposition finds himself. I will agree not to press second reading of this bill. Perhaps we might do it this way, if he agrees; proceed with second reading, and then the bill will go to the Agricultural Committee and there remain shall I say, for at least 3 weeks before it is reported, in order to provide the greatest opportunity for full consideration.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), that we are not following the proper procedure in sending this bill on to the committee without having a debate.

The hon. Prime Minister made a suggestion which I think is a good one. If it is possible to legally send this bill to the committee after first reading, that would be a very fine procedure.

In the past, we have discussed these bills, in fact, the entire debate on any bill has been on second reading, but the practice now, Mr. Speaker, since we are referring these bills to committee on second reading, it automatically shuts off all debate which should take place in the House.

If the bill can be referred to the committee on first reading, and then come back to the House, we can have the general debate, and I think that would be a more satisfactory arrangement, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: I am quite satisfied to do that, if the hon. members opposite are in agreement. If so, I will move the necessary motion to refer it to the committee, and be returned to the House later for consideration, on second reading.

I move that Bill No. 68 be now referred to the Committee on Agriculture

for consideration, and that the rules of the House in that regard be suspended.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, on the motion: I have no objection, except to raise a rather important point in regard to the responsibility of the House. I would like to elaborate on that by saying it is conceivable that a bill could be defeated on second reading, when the principles of it are under discussion, and then there would be nothing to send forward to any committee.

If we resort to the method of forwarding a bill to a committee after first reading, we are really delegating a degree of responsibility which this House has, to non-elected people, who would come and express opinions on a bill which we might, in our wisdom, decide no longer existed, and therefore, there would be nothing upon which to express an opinion.

Under ordinary circumstances when a bill goes to a committee, the citizens of the province may come and express opinions, and it could conceivably be that they would be expressed in regard to a matter which we might decide should not be referred to the committee at all.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that this procedure is the one which is followed in regard to all Private Bills. A Private Bill may go to the committee, and subsequently be defeated, or amended, in the House.

In regard to this particular bill, the idea is to afford the hon. members the opportunity of securing the judgments of the best people available in connection with the problem, which is a very difficult one.

If the Agricultural Committee does not report this bill, I am satisfied the House will never pass it. In the alternative, I am satisfied that the consideration the committee will give to this bill, will improve it, and will extend the knowledge of the people as to what is meant by the bill, and when it comes back to the House, the hon. members

will have a better opportunity for debate. If at that time there are points which are in issue, we can give them more intelligent consideration.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glenarry): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to study the matter of lake levels in the Great Lakes and waters affected thereby.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the report I have just tabled is a detailed and comprehensive study of our terms of reference, which has been made possible only by the keen interest and co-operation of many people including lakefront residents, municipal officers, civil servants of the Governments of Ontario, Canada, the United States and of some of the State Governments bordering the Great Lakes; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish on behalf of the Lake Levels Committee to express to all who have co-operated in the work of this committee, our sincere appreciation.

I also wish to pay tribute to the contribution made by Dr. G. B. Langford of the University of Toronto as consultant, and also to every member of this committee. From the day of our first organizational meeting to the very last, this committee worked in harmony—our only desire being to bring to this House a unanimous report which we hope will clarify to all the hon. members and to the interested public the complex and difficult problems involved in shore protection—problems made more acute by the recent high water levels in the Great Lakes.

I have appreciated very much the opportunity of working with the hon. member for Grey South, the Leader of the Opposition and also with the hon. member from Ontario, a member of the CCF Party as well as my own government colleagues and I do want to single out for special mention the committee's sincere appreciation and gratitude to Mr. H. F. Crown of the Conservation

Branch of the Department of Planning and Development who acted in the capacity of secretary to this committee and made my task as chairman very pleasant indeed.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

During the winter and early spring of 1952 the levels of the Great Lakes rose to such an extent that serious damage was done to the shoreline and in many cases to buildings and homes. In addition some areas bordering on the Great Lakes were flooded, with the result that hundreds of residents were driven from their homes and in many cases these were destroyed or made uninhabitable.

Following this widespread damage, many representations were made to the Ontario Government requesting protection against a similar occurrence in the future and to assist in repairing the damage which had been done.

Accordingly, the Government of Ontario, realizing that high lake levels may repeat themselves in the future, considered that it was both expedient and necessary to review its powers to deal with this problem. Therefore, on March 28th, 1952, the Legislature of Ontario appointed a Select Committee to study these matters.

The terms of reference for this committee set out 6 specific items for inquiry and consideration. These, with the sections in which they are dealt with in this report, are as follows:

- (1) The causes of the variations of water levels.

Section 5—Factors Affecting Lake Levels, sections 4, 5, 6.

- (2) The effect of such water levels on shore erosion, silting and conservation generally.

Section 4—Factors Affecting Shore Erosion, section 4.

- (3) The present method of control of water levels.

Section 5—Regulation of the Lake Levels in the Great Lakes, section 7.

- (4) Under what jurisdiction such controls operate.

Section 5—Regulation of the Lake Levels in the Great Lakes, section 7.

- (5) To study and report on the laws of Canada or any jurisdiction fronting such lakes and which affect such levels, erosion, silting and conservation.

Section 6—Jurisdictional Aspects of Shore Protection.

- (6) The means presently adopted in the various jurisdictions to cope with the problems mentioned in paragraph 5.

Sections 7-12—Shore Protective Measures.

The committee has been impressed with the lack of fundamental information that is available on the processes of shore erosion and the application of effective means for its control. Throughout its study the problems of shore erosion and inundation have been considered in the light of all the other uses of water of the Great Lakes, some of which have national and even international significance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do want to stress the fact that our study of these terms of reference and the recommendations that have been evolved, have been guided by a cardinal principle of resource management—the greatest use, for the greatest number of people, for the greatest length of time. In other words, we have considered the use of the waters of the Great Lakes in the light of navigation, hydro-electric power, water supply and sanitation, recreation, fishing, and at the same time having in mind the interests of the riparian owners along our Great Lakes shoreline.

Just to revert to that, Mr. Speaker, it is of great significance to know that through the canals at Sault Ste. Marie, both Canadian and American, twice as much shipping has been recorded passing through these waters in one year as has been recorded going through the Panama Canal.

The Hydro-Electric Power System is of economical importance to this province. The development on the St. Marys River, the Niagara River, and the proposed St. Lawrence River certainly must be considered.

There are 107 municipalities bordering the Great Lakes, whose water, either all or in part, comes from the lakes. Some 63 municipalities use the lakes, or its waterways, for the discharge of their sewage systems.

One thing which is even more important, and which this government or future governments will have to consider, is the fact that within 25 miles' distance from the shoreline of Lake Huron to the City of Kingston, which is situated at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River on Lake Ontario, there dwell today $2\frac{1}{2}$ million people. Recreation is of great importance. We have now adopted the 5-day week, and facilities for public parks are becoming more pronounced from day to day. Therefore, that is an item which must be considered.

Last on the list, the fishing industry, is an industry of \$6 million magnitude, made by commercial fishermen in these lakes.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is by no means an easy task to visit areas suffering from erosion and inundation on the Great Lakes and then to sit down and make an impartial analysis of the technical information available to determine the responsibility for this damage. Having satisfied ourselves that the responsibility for this erosion and inundation lies predominantly with the vagaries of nature and very little with men or with governments, it is most difficult to formulate recommendations that will lead to an orderly and sound solution of this problem and yet be within the financial ability of our province to undertake.

ORGANIZATION AND METHODS

In studying a subject of such a technical nature as the causes of the variation of lake levels of the Great Lakes, methods of control of lake levels and shore erosion and the jurisdictional

responsibilities involved required that the committee obtain sound technical advice. Accordingly co-operation and submissions were received from senior officers of our own departments of government, namely the Attorney-General's, Lands and Forests, Highways, Public Works, and Planning and Development. Similarly discussions were held with officials of the Dominion Departments of Mines and Technical Surveys, Transport, and Public Works. The many years of experience of the State and Federal Governments of the United States of America with regard to shore protection problems was made available to us. The committee spent 2 days at Chicago with the division engineer of the Great Lakes Division of the United States Corps of Engineers. Here the committee discussed the problems arising from high lake levels and the part played by their Federal Government in shore protection from erosion and inundation. The Corps of Engineers were most courteous and obliging and toured the committee along the Great Lakes shoreline of the States of Illinois, Wisconsin and Indiana to show the types of protective measures employed in these states and how these measures were financed. From observations made by the members of the committee, it was the consensus of opinion that many hundreds of thousands of dollars were simply poured down the drain and had little or no remedial effects in many instances.

In order that we may have a picture of the state participation in this work the committee visited the State of Ohio and were guests of the Shore Erosion Division of the Ohio Department of National Resources. Along the Ohio waterfront we observed the efficiency of practically every type of beach protective work known. On that occasion we were also privileged to participate in a conference with the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association at Toledo, at which time valuable technical discussions were held on many aspects of shore erosion and inundation as it pertains to the Great Lakes.

Having equipped ourselves with a

minimum amount of fundamental information on the problem of shore erosion and inundation, the committee visited every section of the Ontario shoreline where damage was of such an extent that local public opinion was aroused. In many cases we were able to pass on to municipal representatives and property owners information on the effectiveness of protective measures and their costs. In some cases, we were able to point out the municipality's responsibility in zoning these areas subject to erosion and flooding from building purposes, and in all cases we were able to let the people who have suffered damage know that this committee of the Legislature was cognizant of their problem.

ANALYSIS OF THE REPORT

The topic matter of this report is presented in 7 divisions, namely:

- (1) Physical Characteristics of the Great Lakes.
- (2) The Great Lakes in Ontario's Development.
- (3) Shore Erosion and Inundation.
- (4) Lake Levels.
- (5) Jurisdictional Aspects of Shore Protection.
- (6) Nature of Provincial Participation.
- (7) Lakeshore Protective Measures.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to cover all of this report in detail because other members of our committee will deal with various phases of its contents later in the debate. It was my intention to highlight some important points and I would respectfully suggest that the hon. members of this House read and especially study the parts of this report under the headings of:

Shore Erosion.

Lake Levels.

Jurisdictional Aspects of Shore Protection.

Nature of Provincial Participation.

Our recommendations are summarized in the yellow pages at the front of the report.

In this report are:

7 Original Maps

25 Plans and Diagrams of Shore Protective Structures, and

64 Selected Photograph Illustrations of Problems Connected with our Terms of Reference.

Mr. Speaker, our committee was fortunate in having the services of Mr. J. W. Murray, a civil engineer with the Conservation Branch of the Department of Planning and Development who made a study and brought together engineering data on shore protective measures.

This section of this report is the first of such a publication in this province. It contains the plans, specifications and costs of 24 different types of shore protective works and comments have been made on the conditions under which each is most effective. This section will be of particular interest to lakefront municipalities and riparian owners in the province and it is the hope of the committee that this section of the report at least will be made available to the public.

SHORE EROSION AND INUNDATION

I would like to draw your attention to the map following page 21 which shows the relationship of the physical characteristics of the Ontario shoreline on the Great Lakes to erosion and inundation. It is estimated that, of this total of the 3,000 miles of Ontario shoreline on the Great Lakes, approximately 670 miles are affected in varying degrees to erosion and inundation. On pages 21-30, your committee has set forth cases where accurate data on rates of erosion are known. These rates of erosion have varied from less than 1 foot per year to 21 feet per year depending on the level of the lakes.

It has been made very clear to the committee how little information we have on the factors affecting shore erosion and shore build-up. Little is known on currents in the Great Lakes and how they affect the shoreline. For instance, the Corps of Engineers at Chicago advised that, in one of their

studies on the Illinois waterfront, the offshore currents moved as high as 90,000 cubic yards of beach-forming material per year.

Studies of lake currents, particularly the littoral currents, have been lacking in the Ontario waters of the Great Lakes and it is of fundamental importance in the design of sound beach protective measures that they be undertaken immediately.

Your committee therefore recommends:

That since studies of lake currents have been lacking in the Ontario waters of the Great Lakes, and since an understanding of these currents is of fundamental importance to sound beach protective measures, and since the gauging and soundings of the Great Lakes is now being carried on by the Dominion Government, the Government of Ontario through the Department of Planning and Development enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada to undertake studies of currents in the Great Lakes.

There is a similar dearth of data on the effect of dredging lake bottoms and beaches and conflicting evidence was submitted to our committee, a summary of which is found on pages 32-36. We have been careful to study the policies of the American States bordering the Great Lakes and have found wide variations of policy. We have, therefore, recommended:

That the Beach Protection Act be amended to provide that everyone who wishes to remove sand or gravel from the beaches or beds of the Great Lakes be required to obtain a licence, in order that the province may exercise control over all of these operations. Page 38.

That studies be made by the Department of Planning and Development to determine the minimum depth of water and the minimum distance from shore that dredging operations can take place without harmful effects, and that studies be conducted on all existing and proposed dredging

operations to determine their effects on shore erosion. Page 39.

That the Beaches and River Beds Act of 1912 be repealed. Page 39.

LAKE LEVELS *

I think what I am about to read is the crux of the whole problem. You will find in Chapter 4 our findings on the causes of variations of lake levels. These data are all from the Precise Water Levels section of the Dominion Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and have been thoroughly checked by officials of this department. I want to say at this time that only when precipitation is persistently above average or persistently below average for a number of years does it raise or lower the lake levels. Excessive precipitation in only one year following a period of average or below average precipitation has little, if any, effect on the levels of the Great Lakes, as much of the water is retained in the soil, and the natural storage areas of small lakes and swamps. Similarly only one dry year following years of average or above average precipitation has little effect in lowering the lakes as the land will deplete its storage into the Great Lakes to maintain their levels.

A combination of precipitation and evaporation is the major factor causing variations in lake levels. During the period from 1890 to 1951, the average annual precipitation on the Great Lakes drainage basin was 31.18 inches. Table No. 8 shows the total precipitation for each year in this period and the amount it was above or below this long-term average. From 1900 to 1936, the total of average precipitation in the form of rain or snow would have been 1,154 inches; however, the total of actual precipitation in this period was 28 inches less than this amount. In 1936, and in the 4 years previous, all the lakes, except Superior, which is artificially controlled, were experiencing levels considerably below their averages. Hon. members will recall that everybody at that time was complaining about the diversion of water into the Chicago Drainage Canal.

From 1937 to 1947, a 10-year period, both inclusive, the total of average precipitation would have been 343 inches; the total actual precipitation was 16 inches greater. In 1947, high stages were being experienced on all of the Great Lakes.

The high stages of 1947 were followed by average precipitation in 1948 to 1949, and again excessive precipitation in 1950-1951. During these 2 latter years alone, there was a total of 10 inches of precipitation higher than the 1890-1951 mean of 31.18 inches. The result was that in 1952 the lake levels rose to elevations even higher than the high stages of 1947, and in the case of Lake Ontario, higher than any previous record.

It is interesting to note that during the two years 1950-1951 the precipitation on the Great Lakes drainage basin of 298,000 square miles averaged 17 per cent. above the 1890-1952 average; and from a layman's point of view one can readily understand that with such a large surface, heavy rainfall would easily produce levels that high. In the same 2 years the loss of water to evaporation from the drainage basin was 8 per cent. less than average.

May I say the following has not been given to us as official, but from studies it has been indicated by competent technicians that, under favourable conditions in a dry year, it is estimated that a body of water like Lake Erie could lose as much as 3 feet of its depth due to evaporation in one year; therefore the effects of evaporation and precipitation are of considerable importance in the final analysis on lake levels.

Your committee attaches considerable importance to the above data, and submits that this combination of persistence in above mean precipitation that has been building up since 1937 and accentuated in 1950 and 1951, together with a decrease in the past 2 years of 8 per cent. in the amount evaporated from the drainage basins, is undoubtedly the major cause of the 1952 high water stages on the Great Lakes.

Much has been in the press about the

effects of the artificial factors affecting the levels of the Great Lakes. Mr. Speaker, you will find on page 59 a summary of the combined effects on each of the lakes of:

- (i) The Long Lac and Ogoki Diversions.
- (ii) Lake Superior Regulation.
- (iii) Chicago Sanitary Diversion.
- (iv) Gut Dam and Channel Alterations.

I want to particularly stress that the net effect of these artificial factors is measured in fractions of inches, compared to the natural factors which cause variations as great as 6 feet.

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED POWER DEVELOPMENTS ON THE LEVELS OF LAKE ONTARIO

In the early part of our inquiry in 1952, the committee were deeply concerned over the proposed method of regulation of the flow of the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River to meet the requirements of power and navigation.

During the summer of 1952 the Governments of Canada and the United States requested the International Joint Commission to report on all factors affecting the levels of Lake Ontario. The International Joint Commission accordingly appointed top hydraulic engineers from both countries to study these factors, including Gut Dam and the proposed method of regulation of the flow of the upper St. Lawrence River.

The International Joint Commission has not at this date reported on this reference but at its final hearing at Hamilton in November, 1953, General McNaughton, the chairman of the Canadian Section of the Commission, stated most emphatically that the commission is directing its efforts to obtain the best system of regulation of the levels of Lake Ontario for *all* the users of this water and for those with riparian rights. The committee has implicit confidence in the personnel composing the International Joint Commission Board

and feel that in their wisdom and judgment, they will arrive at a satisfactory solution to this complex problem.

JURISDICTIONAL ASPECTS OF SHORE PROTECTION

Mr. Speaker, the jurisdictional aspects of governments on the problem of shore protection have received much consideration from the committee. We have found that the State and Federal Governments of the United States provide for 2 bases of participation:

- (i) Through research programmes.
- (ii) Through construction and maintenance of protective structures on public property only.

Your committee wishes to point out that, although each of the states bordering the Great Lakes has a very much less shoreline frontage than has Ontario, and that the problems of erosion and inundation are in most cases more acute by reason of the greater density of population and of shoreline development, and that they have tax revenues in excess of this province, it is most significant that not one of these states has established a policy of spending public money on the construction of protective measures for private lands.

Mr. Speaker, you will find on pages 79-82 a very important section of our report, dealing with the use of municipal zoning by-laws to limit the damage caused by erosion and inundation along the lakefront. Our Municipal Act and Planning Act gives the municipalities power to zone and regulate the development of land within their municipality. They are also empowered by these statutes to prevent development of lake-shore property until adequate protective works have been installed.

In many sections of the Great Lakes people have ignored nature's past performances and have built on lands that are naturally subject to inundation.

In the course of the committee's inspection of seriously affected areas, instances were noted of building actually in progress with the lake lapping at the

doorstep. The Statutes of Ontario make no provision whereby those who, in spite of these immutable laws of nature and our records of them, build on unprotected land that is within the zone of the natural ranges of lake levels and this committee is strongly of the opinion that no such provision should be made and feel no indemnification should be made out of public funds to redeem their poor investments.

At Long Branch, only a short distance from here, at one time the homes were constructed primarily for summer cottages but quite understandable, housing conditions being what they are in the city, these people winterized their homes and used them all year round. We have seen what a great storm in winter can do. It demolished some 28 homes completely, it piled up on the shore for a width of 20 feet flat, round stone to a depth of 30 inches or more. This damage was caused by a severe windstorm from the east.

We cannot control the actions of Providence, one never knows when such storms may occur. I use that simply as an example.

Afterwards, the local municipal authorities passed a by-law putting into effect a law which is already on the Statutes prohibiting any building there. The result is one which perhaps any local council is confronted with under the same conditions; in spite of that by-law, individuals saw fit to construct homes there and in one particular case, during our visit, the owner was quarrelling with municipal officials who would not allow him to live in the premises so constructed. The by-law was enforced, he was not allowed to live in the home he had constructed himself and from then on it would appear there was no more new construction, because unless they spent a great deal of money on protective works, it was utterly impossible to assure those homes reasonable protection.

Your committee therefore recommends:

That wherever on the shoreline of the Great Lakes in Ontario land is subject to such erosion or inundation

as in the judgment of the Minister of Planning and Development makes it unsuitable for private development, the Minister be empowered to restrict or prohibit the use of such land until suitable protective works have been installed.

and

That wherever on the shoreline of the Great Lakes in Ontario the use of land is restricted or prohibited because of the threat of erosion or inundation, the municipality or the Valley Conservation Authority, if such has been established in the area in which such land is situate, be empowered to acquire these lands for park, recreation, or protective purposes, and that power be given the municipalities and authorities to expropriate such lands and that suitable legislation be provided.

The employment of adequate shore protective measures depends on the following factors:

(i) The relation of the cost of protection to the enhanced value to the riparian and adjoining lands.

(ii) The degree to which it is in the public interest to protect the shores of the Great Lakes.

Inasmuch as erosion and inundation on the Ontario shoreline of the Great Lakes has in some years caused widespread and serious property damage and loss, this committee is of the opinion that the Provincial Government should have an interest in its abatement. The degree of this interest is contingent on whether the land is of a private or public nature, and is tempered by the fact that Ontario has approximately 3,000 miles of Great Lakes shoreline on the mainland alone. In formulating recommendations the committee has studied the policies of the Great Lakes States. Each of these states has but a fraction of the length of Ontario's shoreline, and yet no state has spent public money on the installation of lakeshore protective works on private lands.

This report has brought together facts on the costs involved in adequate shore protection. Some measures such as

concrete breakwaters will cost up to \$500 per lineal foot of shoreline protected.

This report has also emphasized the urgent need for fundamental data concerning engineering aspects of protective measures, and for knowledge of lake currents and beach-forming processes.

I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to page 146 of the report wherein we have set out the details of a particular case where the government of this province in 1951 carried out an engineering survey of the protection requirements for 8,000 feet of shoreline at the Village of Long Branch on Lake Ontario. The estimated costs for the protection of this section was \$464,000. Although the type of structures recommended was among the least expensive, the municipality was unable to proceed with this work.

The committee is of the opinion that participation by the Provincial Government in shore protection should initially be limited to conducting studies, amassing information and publishing data on all aspects of shore protection, and it is recommended:

That for the purpose of obtaining information regarding the effectiveness of shore protective structures, all persons who are desirous of constructing protective works along the shores of the Great Lakes file written plans with the Minister of Planning and Development of such works and that no protective works be undertaken until such plans have been so filed.

and

That owing to the lack of published data on the effectiveness of various types of beach protective measures and the conditions under which each is most efficient, the Department of Planning and Development correlate and publish all pertinent available information.

Having in mind the desirability of protecting lakefront property that has a reasonably intense public use, the committee recommends:

That where a municipality or group of municipalities own lands on the shores of the Great Lakes and connecting waterways which are used by the public and are prepared to undertake part of the cost of protecting these lands from erosion and inundation, the Provincial Government may grant financial assistance for the construction of approved remedial measures.

In connection with the construction of beach protective measures there is a great need in the province to have information on the effectiveness of various types of protective structures under different shoreline and lake current conditions. The committee feels that this need can be most effectively met by constructing various types of protective works on Provincial Government properties at selected points on the Great Lakes where erosion and inundation is a problem and it is therefore recommended:

That for the purpose of demonstration and experimentation protective works be constructed on Provincial Government properties at selected points on the Great Lakes and connecting waterways where erosion and inundation is a problem.

The regional nature of shore protection problems generally requires that protective measures for one particular property must be considered in relation to its effects on adjoining properties. The committee has witnessed cases where the protection of one property has been rendered ineffective by the lack of protection on the adjoining properties. Cases have also been noted where the protection of one property has accelerated the erosion of adjoining properties. In view of the regional requirements of effective shore protection measures it is therefore recommended:

That where on the shores of the Great Lakes a group of contiguous, privately owned properties are considered to be an operating unit by the Minister of Planning and Development, and where the majority of such landowners petition the municipality

for assistance in planning remedial measures, the Minister of Planning and Development on the application and recommendation of the municipality may make a survey and prepare a plan and report indicating the type of protection required and the approximate cost involved.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, your committee has dealt with every aspect of its terms of reference and is submitting to this House a report which we hope will be most useful to the people of this province. We have attempted to set forth a basis for provincial participation in shore protection that would be compatible with the fiscal responsibilities of the government of this province. I commend the study of this report to every hon. member of this House.

MR. R. M. MYERS (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I came from the work of the committee with a great affection for all its members and an immense admiration for our efficient and very tactful chairman.

My part on the committee has been to deal with the historical aspects of the Great Lakes. Before I comment on those aspects, may I say I was amazed at the number of people who came before the committee expecting the government was about to grant them compensation if they had suffered at all from erosion. It might perhaps be timely to say a few words about the history of the Great Lakes.

The forerunner of our present Great Lakes system was Lake Iroquois, which began to form about 25,000 years ago.

At the beginning of the glacial epoch, all the eastern part of the continent was 2,000 feet or so higher than is at present the case; and although there were a few well-defined rivers, there were very few lakes.

During the last ice age, Canada and the northern part of the U.S.A. were covered by an ice cap one or two miles thick. The weight of the ice depressed the land until much of it was below the level of the sea. At that period, much of what is now Lake Ontario was an arm of the sea.

After a time, the climate changed and the ice began to melt and retreat. The melted water formed a lake known as Lake Iroquois, the outlet of which was to the south—at one time by way of what is now the Hudson Valley—at another time by the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers.

As the weight of the ice cap was removed, the depressed land rose and the Great Lakes began to form. The outlet to sea for all this water changed from time to time with the rising land and difference in flow. At one time the outlet was the Trent River—later on the French and Ottawa Rivers—and the St. Lawrence came into being about 16,000 years ago. The Great Lakes reached their approximate present form and levels 5,000 years ago.

The beaches made by the sea when it covered what is now Lake Ontario are now 600 to 700 feet above sea level because of the fact that the land rose with the removal of the weight of the ice cap—and this rise still continues, the rate of rise at Kingston now being about one inch every hundred years.

The Great Lakes always have been, now are, and will continue always to be unstable—in fact instability is a quality of all lakes, large or small. The erosion this committee viewed has been going on for thousands of years, and doubtless will continue to do so for a long time to come, although man-made works can doubtless slow down the process.

In conclusion, I shall read a short passage from the diary of Mrs. Jameson written in 1836 and contained in a book entitled *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*. It is a delightful volume, and is in the Legislative Library.

A wide space between the building lots and Lake Ontario has been preserved, very properly, for a road or esplanade, but I doubt very much whether even this will be wide enough.

One of the most curious and inexplicable phenomena connected with

these immense inland seas is the gradual rise of the waters; and even within these few years, as I am informed, great part of the high bank has been washed away and a carriage road at the foot of it along the shore has been wholly covered. If this process goes on, and at the same rate, there must be a solid embankment or quay raised as a barrier against the encroaching waters, or the esplanade itself will in time disappear.

That is the condition which existed in 1835 and it is the condition as it exists today.

May I say in concluding my remarks that the very nature of the Great Lakes or any lakes large or small, is instability. As long as we have lakes we will have erosion and it is well for the people who live on lakes to remember that passage. Thank you.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer for one or two moments to the City of Toronto and how the Lake Levels Committee Report affects the shoreline of Toronto Island.

The average height of the water in Lake Ontario between 1860 and 1952 was 245 feet. These measurements, Mr. Speaker, are quite important, and the reason for them will become evident, particularly in the case of Toronto Island. Some 245 feet and a few odd inches was the average over that period of time. The highest level occurred in 1952, during flood waters, when the water rose to 249.12 feet. The lowest was in 1934, when the height was 242 feet, so in short Lake Ontario from 1860 to 1952 has fluctuated between 242 feet and 249 feet, with an average somewhere in between, at about 245 feet.

In relation to Toronto Island—this is one of the most important points—no part of the island is higher than 249 feet and yet Lake Ontario itself, in 1952, rose to over 249 feet. At one time, Mr. Speaker, Toronto Island was one long sandbar, joined where the Eastern Gap now is, to the hook or a part of Scarboro. In 1860, or thereabouts, there was a great storm which created a gap.

and after much dredging and taking away of sand at that entrance, a water entrance was driven right through the sand bar. There never was what is called in Toronto the "Eastern Gap" before. It was the result of a freak of nature.

In approximately 1881, there was a report by the Federal Government in relation to the Department of Public Works recommending that that Eastern Gap be closed, but that report was never acted upon. The important point is this, as the report indicates—and I may be going somewhat beyond it—but the effect is that one of the greatest problems facing Toronto Island now in relation to inundation by high waters is due to the fact that the Eastern Gap exists, and I will show hon. members photographic proof in a moment, to which I would ask them to turn.

At one time there was a lateral flow through the gap itself, that is, the water flows along Toronto Island from the east to the west, and carries great quantities of sand, which built up sand bars and wide beaches, which protected Toronto Island. The following is not found as part of the recommendations of this committee because it was not part of our reference to consider it, but in connection with it I wish through you, Mr. Speaker, to plead to the Federal Government on behalf of the City of Toronto—or in any event the part that affects my riding, for my riding borders on the eastern part of the Gap—that the Eastern Gap be closed to navigation for this reason, that out of the Eastern Gap every year 40,000 tons of sand are dredged by the Federal Government, to keep the gap clear. If that 40,000 tons, which seeps into the gap, were to be carried along the beach of Toronto Island, I respectfully submit—and I think the evidence will bear me out—that there would not be the inundation of that land, which occurs every time there is high water.

There are more than 3,000 people living all the year around, in over 600 houses on the island. It is not a question of just a summer resort. There is a great need for that housing, and when the water rises to above 249 feet, which

is the height of the highest section of the land, it is quite clear that even if it is a foot or two below that, people are walking on soggy ground.

In 1926, the Joint Board of Engineers said that if the water went above 248 feet in Lake Ontario, it had reached flood level. Now in 1952, as I say, it went over 249 feet and there was a tremendous flood level created as far as Toronto Island is concerned. I submit if the sand were not dredged out of the Gap and the Gap was closed, Toronto Island's problems would be considerably lessened.

Would hon. members of the House do me the favour of turning to page 31 of this report, and they will see a photograph which immediately precedes page 31. This is an aerial photograph of the Eastern Gap and hon. members will note the map, which it immediately follows. It shows how the sand drifts into that channel and chokes it up, and why it must be dredged out. As I said before, the photograph comes immediately before page 31, that is, the photograph appears on the right-hand page.

My very small contribution in dealing with this matter, Mr. Speaker, is to make that recommendation and, in closing, to thank the chairman of this committee for his example of humility, kindness and leadership, which he gave this committee. I think we are all very grateful to him. He is indeed a very fine man. A great honour was conferred upon me, and it was a great pleasure for me to have been permitted to be associated with hon. members of all Parties of this House, on that committee, and I am very grateful to the government for allowing me to sit on the committee. I feel I have learned much about the problems which face all the residents along the borders of this lake, and I sincerely hope the recommendations which have been given so much attention by this committee, may merit some consideration by this honourable House.

MR. A. J. CHILD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in joining with my colleagues in reference to the report, I would like to say I am very pleased to

have had the opportunity to sit on this particular committee. I believe we can be considered one of the most travelled committees in the Legislature. We covered pretty well all the territory between Gut Dam in the St. Lawrence River to the Ogoki Diversion in the Lake Nipigon area, at the Head of the Lakes. We also covered the area between Buffalo and Chicago on the American shore, discussing with officials and residents in all of those areas the various problems and the results of some of the protective works which they had installed.

I am very pleased also to say that since the committee was formed, we have not had any complaints of high water, although possibly I should mention that Mother Nature has been working with us very well.

The pressing demands which were made on the International Joint Commission, and which were supported by the public who were affected, seem to have had considerable influence, and the commission saw fit to set up a Board of Engineers to study, for a period of 10 years, the problem of controls which will go into effect at Iroquois, regulating the locks in the St. Lawrence River. This is to be worked in conjunction with the hydro development. This particular board—and I think it is very important that this be noted—will be able to put into effect the regulation governing the level of the lake, and this is over and above any influence which hydro may have. In the past, hydro has been subjected to considerable criticism in respect of their efforts in this respect, but once these locks are installed, it will be solely a matter for the Board of Engineers.

I think our second recommendation, regarding the Beach Protection Act, will be of great interest to people at the end of the lake, in the Niagara and Hamilton area. That was one of the points strongly brought out by residents in that area, who protested the removal of sand from the beaches and the dredging from the lakes. We were given many examples of how dredging operations, carried out even at considerable distance offshore, resulted in sand

bars—upon which these people had relied for many years for protection—in the event of storms being eventually washed away, or sucked away, as the case may be.

Most of us feel somewhat relieved in that area, as hon. members will recall it was the area around Hamilton which bore the brunt of the storm in 1952, when many of our home owners had their property washed into the lake. The figure of 245 feet, although not absolutely official, has been agreed upon and I strongly support that figure, in view of the fact the 92-year average, which my colleague just mentioned, works out to just 245 feet plus the odd-inch. Being at the end of the lake, we receive the brunt of the storms, and the water quite frequently rises to a height of an extra 2 or 3 feet. Had the water level been set at a much higher figure, say, 246 or 247 feet, it will be easily realized that we would then have a water level at that particular point somewhere in the neighbourhood of 250 feet, which is far above disaster level.

Once the level is set, it will enable us to put into effect protective projects which will, we hope, be successful in building up our shores again, both as an added measure of protection and for recreational purposes. Most of the people there, at the present time, I believe, are looking forward to better St. Lawrence control regulations, which have been very unsatisfactory. They have put in various types of protection, but unfortunately due to the variation in the lake levels during the past few years, they find that one year they are completely lost in water, and a few years later they may be so far out that they are receiving very little good from the protection to their property.

I would like to say in conclusion that I am very happy to have been associated with a very unique and fine report. I believe it is about the only one of its kind with such a wealth of information which will be available to the people when they are in difficulty.

I would like to join with my colleagues in congratulating our chairman, who gave us very good leadership. It has

been a pleasure to have worked with him.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee appointed to study the lake levels in our Great Lakes, I want to add a few words to what has been said by the others, and to express my appreciation to the chairman of our committee, the hon. member for Gengarry (Mr. Villeneuve). I think the success of any committee depends on the action of its chairman, and I know that the little success which I think this committee had, can be attributed to the capable and vigorous manner in which the chairman carried out his duties, and conducted the meetings and public hearings.

Two years ago, when the House was in session, newspaper pictures were passed around and we found that tremendous damage had been done in Ontario at that time by erosion and inundation.

In my riding of Essex South, Mr. Speaker, the Point Pelee onion marsh of approximately 600 acres was entirely inundated by the high water in Lake Erie. Some 40 homes, as well as farm buildings, were completely surrounded by water to a depth of 4 feet. Farm implements, seed potatoes, and fertilizers stored in the barns were completely ruined. And it was felt, at that time, that the flooded ground would be in no condition to produce a crop that year.

Along the shore of Lake St. Clair to the north, conditions were equally serious, and many high-class residential areas were completely flooded.

The high water, combined with March winds, was biting large chunks from the shoreline around the entire country. To a greater or lesser degree, the same condition existed along the shores and properties adjacent to the shores of all our Great Lakes.

This Select Committee was appointed as a result of the damage, and went into the matter of lake levels very thoroughly. We realized, as one of the hon. members has mentioned already, that erosion and inundation are not new problems,

but they are problems which have been with us for a long time. I think once we made up our minds we were going to try to gauge the effect of nature, we must be prepared to face the vagaries of nature also.

In Essex County, our committee called meetings in the City of Windsor, and in the southern part of the county, in the Township of Mersea, and, as in other places, all the people interested, as well as municipal officers, were invited to the meetings to express their views, and to give us any practical advice they may have gained from past experiences with high water.

Mr. Speaker, one fact which stood out more than any other in all our meetings was the blame which was placed on the Ogoki diversion, and the Gut Dam for the high levels in our lakes, but from all the information we were able to obtain—and our inquiries and studies, as I say, were quite extensive—we found that the real factors affecting lake levels were evaporation and precipitation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in Essex County, since our committee met there, steps have been taken to fight this high water. In Mersea Township, around the onion marsh, which I mentioned, they have just finished building a sea wall which, I think, will protect them for a long time in the future. To the north in Essex County, around the shore of Lake St. Clair the municipalities have finally realized that when water comes over and onto their land, and the land is low, the only way they can get it off the land is to pump it back into the lake, and they are doing that, since they have started. I am sure they will be able to tackle this problem much better in future.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, with our terms of reference and our recommendations in this volume, and with the 6 chapters dealing with descriptive and technical details, and the 6 chapters dealing with lake shore protective measures, the 35 maps and diagrams and the 23 tables which we have included, this single volume contains more information than has ever been published at one time on this subject before.

Hon. members who served on the committee will know what a lot of work it was, and I do hope that some day in the future this will be ordered to be printed, so that the information may become available to all those who may be interested.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario) : I would like to compliment the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) on the able way in which he presented the report to the Legislature. It was a pleasure and a privilege for me to be associated with him and the other members of the committee. I am quite sure of one thing: It was a committee which was entirely non-political, animated by a sincere desire to do a good job for the people of Ontario.

The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) mentioned that the level of Lake Ontario in 1953 was 249.2 feet. Mr. Speaker, that was the year in which the Select Committee was appointed, and the significant fact to notice is that the level of the lake has decreased since that time. The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) was much too modest to refer to that.

On the question of erosion; the committee was greatly impressed with the protective measures undertaken both by individuals and municipalities. A large amount of money has been spent however on protective structures which were quite ineffective. No thought had been given to the location of currents or prevailing winds. Consequently in a very short space of time those structures toppled into the lake.

I think the committee will remember that during our visit to Chicago, we found the city had laid a stretch of sidewalk along the lake front about 12 feet wide, for a distance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, which had cost the people of Chicago \$1½ million. It was laid in 1951, and the committee was there in the fall of 1952. In that year the whole thing was a heap of rubble. It had collapsed and gone into the lake. We saw much evidence of public and private money being wasted in building different structures. And, therefore, I would like

to stress, Mr. Speaker, the recommendation which was read to the House by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve), appearing on page 88, that the department should secure the services of experts, so people could submit plans, and obtain approval of their projects from people with some knowledge of engineering.

Mr. Speaker, we were in complete agreement with some of the representations made by people with property on the lakefront which was suffering from the effects of erosion, and the high level of the lake as it was in 1953. At the outset, it was quite evident these individuals were opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and to the Ontario Hydro Commission's project, because they feared these would aggravate their difficulties. But I am pleased to say that with the sympathetic attention given to the problems of these people by General McNaughton, the chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, their fears have now been allayed, and I am sure that the other members of the committee would like to join me in paying tribute to a very able gentleman in the person of General McNaughton. I do feel that Canada and Ontario are well represented by a person of the calibre of General McNaughton.

MR. H. A. BECKETT (York East) : It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to join with other members of the committee in extending thanks to our worthy chairman. He certainly showed great leadership, and "cracked the whip" and made us work hard. I would also like to express appreciation of our worthy secretary, Mr. Crown, who did very valuable work for the committee. I want to tell the hon. members something about Scarborough Township. Possibly you do not know where it is. It is at the eastern end of the City of Toronto, and extends 10 miles along Lake Ontario. Quite a bit of it has gone into the lake in the last 10 years, and that is one of the points on which the committee has expressed its views.

If we had had a Planning Board prior to 1946, it would have created a green

belt along the shores of Lake Ontario. We then, perhaps, would have preserved those lands and avoided the situation which has grown up in the last few years, as a result of which quite a few houses have slipped down the bank into the lake. We are now trying to remedy that situation. As a matter of fact the Township of Scarborough is considering today a local improvement scheme whereby we could build groynes out into Lake Ontario, charge a percentage of the cost to the township as a whole, and the balance to the properties which will be directly affected.

Unfortunately it is difficult at this time to get contractors to take on the work. That is due, not to high water, but to low. When the water was high, the contractors were able to bring their barges in and unload the rock which weighs, they say, from 4 to 6 tons, to build groynes in the lake. So that scheme is not being proceeded with at this time.

Scarborough Township and its famous Scarborough Bluffs are perhaps a little different from much of the shore line of the other lakes. When I was a boy I used to swim in Lake Ontario off Scarborough Bluffs. I want to tell hon. members, many years ago, there were sand bars about 200 yards out in the lake, and as the hon. member (Mr. Macaulay) said about the lake level at Toronto Island, a large part of that island was, in fact, built up from sand from Scarborough Bluffs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. BECKETT: As a result, the waves, instead of breaking on the sand bars, now break at the foot of the cliffs. This has been going on since 1910 when two great sand suckers came out every day and sucked up the sand from the Scarborough Bluffs, and took it away, and built up the island. The washing of the waves at the bottom of the cliffs has tended to take away all the trees and the protection we had on those banks. We have had very great erosion along Scarborough Bluffs. Hon. members must remember that the Scarborough Bluffs extend for a distance of 10 miles.

The formation starts at water level by the City of Toronto, creeps up to 300 feet about half way down the shore line and then drops down to a low level again, and it is a big problem to try and protect such a shore line. Some form of protection, if it could be worked out, might be provided by the planting of trees or shrubs. As a matter of fact, one man at the lake has planted poison ivy which has tended to conserve the soil, and prevent it from slipping into the lake.

There is a legal matter in connection with the construction of groynes. There was a case recently reported in the *Ontario Weekly Notes*, concerning a man who strung hydro wires from the mainland, over to Stoney Lake. He did not get a permit. A plane struck those wires, and he was sued for damages. The Supreme Court held that he had caused an obstruction to navigable waters, and I would say that the construction of groynes is something that juts out into navigable waters. That is a question to be looked at very carefully from the standpoint of getting proper permits, and even if you do get a permit, you still might be liable for damages.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think that this report is well worth consideration and study and that a great deal of good will come out of it for the benefit, not only of those who live along the shore, but for all the province.

There was one feature which came out of the sittings. One day we were told that the earth was tilting, and that the tilting of the earth had the effect of raising the water level. The gentleman who told us was asked, "What difference does it make if you live on the axis or a little removed from it?" His reply was, "No matter where you live, everybody tilted now and then."

Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to serve on the committee and I hope that a great deal of good will come out of the discussion.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): In common with the other hon. members who have spoken in this debate—if I may call it so—I would like to commend the chairman of the

Select Committee for his fairness in dealing with the matters under discussion.

I have only one or two comments to make. This is rather natural, after all, in view of the debate which has taken place on this committee's report. I would recall to the minds of hon. members the fact that when this committee was appointed, there were two or three factors, and special conditions in operation at that time. There were floods in some sections bordering on the Great Lakes, down around Windsor, and in various parts of the province, and I think the government felt at that time a committee should be appointed, and that it should study the matter from all aspects and from all angles.

There was, on the part of many people who have suffered damage, a feeling that the Provincial Government or the Federal Government, or a combination of the two governments, should in some way indemnify them for the losses they had sustained.

In the committee's examination of this problem we were unanimous in the decision that no government, either provincial or federal, could be expected to come to the financial aid of those who might suffer from the elements in respect of their houses or other property.

Anyone reflecting on that for a moment will perceive, I think, that it would just be impossible financially for any government to indemnify against losses of that kind. And the committee, I think, was strengthened in their decision by the fact that in the United States, where the density of the population is greater than it is here, and where the ability to pay is perhaps just as great, if not greater than obtains in this country, the authorities at government levels do not pay for damage of this kind unless it is damage to public or government property.

So I think we can accept at this time, as the decision of the people in this province, that we could not be expected to indemnify these people who suffered damage from storms and erosion.

I just wanted to make one other point. I think the government has a responsibility, and an opportunity, through the Department of Planning and Development, to advise people who live along the shore lines of our lakes as to the appropriate type of protection they might employ against the rushing waters of Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, and other lakes. At the present time there is wide variation in the methods used in trying to fight off the water of the Great Lakes by people who live along these lakes and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars, have been wasted by people who own property along the lakes, in building some sort of a cement or earth structure, without any knowledge as to whether it is the appropriate type of structure, one capable of holding off the water and protecting their property. I would say to the government and to the House that the Department of Planning and Development has an opportunity here, and a field for exploration and experimentation, and it can, I think, by using the resources it now has in its possession, put itself in the position of being able to advise the people along the lakes of this province as to the best type of construction, and the best methods they can employ to protect their property.

In the United States, as one hon. member said this afternoon, we found evidence of varying types of structures, and in most cases it was evident they were not effective. I think we in this province could render a great service by putting our Department of Planning and Development to work on government property which borders on the lakes, and having it construct various types of structures, in order to decide which would be the best type to meet particular conditions.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned I have not only enjoyed working on the committee, but I feel that in the report tabled today there is an abundance of information, and that among the recommendations made, there are those which the government can accept with benefit to the people of this province.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I am sorry I cannot start by saying I enjoyed working with the committee and that it was a pleasure to have been on it, because I was not on the committee.

If I rise now it is only because I was the only one who was opposed to the appointment of the committee, and I feel I should say just a couple of words—not to inject an unpleasant note. I do not think I will do that, and I certainly have no desire to—I enjoyed, as did every other hon. member, listening to the report given by the very affable, friendly, and universally-liked member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve), the chairman of the committee.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I did slip up on one or two occasions on the precipitation data in some areas. But I will see the hon. member privately, and get the correct figures. I may say I was not the only one. I sent a note to the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) and asked him to help me with the figures I missed. But he was as helpless as I.

I believe, as do all hon. members, that the result of the work of the committee can be of some value, and I rise to appeal to the government to utilize whatever is constructive in the report, to make it worth while. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that when this committee was appointed, I was the only member who voted against its appointment, not because I had any objection to the committee, but I maintained that there was nothing the Governments of Canada nor Ontario needed to know, which could not be ascertained right there and then.

On that matter of lake levels, I suggested that all the relevant material facts and data were in the hands of the two governments, but this House thought otherwise, and the committee was appointed and they have done their duty, as do all hon. members of this House, when they are appointed to committees.

There is, of course, a question as to why this report, which was ready a year ago, was not presented earlier but I imagine, there are some very high politics involved, and I am not going to embarrass anybody by stressing this question. However, it is a question.

The report was available exactly a year ago, and it is not the fault of the committee, nor of its chairman, that we and the public at large were deprived of the valuable contents of the report. But, as I said before, this is a matter of high politics, and I am not going to press the government on that score.

I can only say this, Mr. Speaker, that aside from the valuable contents of the report, it contains a very definite lesson for us. That is this: When you are in a government, and faced with a situation such as this government faced two years ago, when hundreds and hundreds of property owners—lake shore residents—were clamouring for help because their houses had been inundated, and had been partially or totally destroyed—when you face such a situation, there is a way out, and to paraphrase an old saying, Mr. Speaker, I think we could say that when you face Hell because of high water, you appoint a committee to study the high water. Then you await until the high water has receded, and the old levels re-established, and even the cries of the people who suffered die away.

And so I hope, Mr. Speaker, the report will not be pigeon-holed. I hope the labour of the members of this committee will not have been lost, but they will be of some benefit in bringing protection to people to whom we have failed to give protection in the past.

I felt, Mr. Speaker, that these few words ought to be said on this occasion.

HON. MR. PORTER moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.45 of the clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, March 5, 1954

Due to the death of Mr. William B. Harvey,
late member for Nipissing, no session of the
Legislature was held on Thursday, March 4.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, March 5, 1954.

Standing Committee on Private Bills, third report	365
Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Fishleigh, Mr. Dempsey	366
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nickle, agreed to	377
Administration of Justice Expenses Act, bill to amend, third reading	377
Coroner's Act, bill to amend, third reading	377
County Courts' Act, bill to amend, third reading	377
Crown Attorneys' Act, bill to amend, third reading	378
Insurance Act, bill to amend, third reading	378
Jurors' Act, bill to amend, third reading	378
Magistrates' Act, bill to amend, third reading	378
Mechanics' Lien Act, bill to amend, third reading	378
Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital, bill respecting, reported	378
Town of Fergus, bill respecting, reported	378
Town of Mimico, bill respecting, reported	378
Sao Paulo Light and Power Company Limited, bill respecting, reported	378
Frontenac High School District, bill respecting, reported	378
Town of Palmerston, bill respecting, reported	378
Territorial Division Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	378
Operating Engineers Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, second reading	378
Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	380
Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	380
Parents Maintenance Act, 1954, Mr. Porter, second reading	380
Bees Act, 1954, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	382
Agricultural Societies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	382
Plant Diseases Act, 1954, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	382
Livestock and Livestock Products Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	383
Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	383
Municipal Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	383
Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	383
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	383

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1954.

2 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very glad to welcome the students from the Jesse Ketchum School, the Central Technical School, the Port Hope High School, and the Stratford Teachers' College.

We welcome those who may be the teachers of those who are in this Chamber this afternoon, and we are glad to have them come to our city, and to attend the Legislature, as it may give them some idea of how the laws of the province are made, and how we try to carry them out, even though perhaps with some of them we do not entirely agree.

We are very glad to have these students as our guests here today.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Nickle, I beg leave to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Nickle, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presents the following as the third report:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments.

Bill No. 16, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Bill No. 26, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the government.

The *Globe and Mail*, on the 4th of this month, carried a news item which was headed "Ontario To Back Consumers' Plea For Gas Import."

The news item reads, in part, as follows:

Ontario Government representatives will go to Ottawa early next week to support the Consumers' Gas Company's application to bring United States natural gas to Toronto, it was learned at Queen's Park yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the government whether, in view of the importance of this intended action on its part, they do not think it would be more appropriate to take this House into its confidence, since the House is now in session, and bring the government's definite policy on the natural gas question to the House, before going to Ottawa to support a measure which may not coincide with, nor be helpful, in the long run, toward achieving an objective which the majority of the House may hope to achieve.

Doesn't the government think, before committing itself by going to Ottawa

in support of the Consumers' Gas Company's application, it should not ignore the House but should at least attempt to ascertain the sentiments of the hon. members of the Legislature in regard to this question?

I will leave the answer for the government, instead of my answering them.

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member can answer the question himself, I do not know why he asked it—whatever the question may be. I do not know what the question is.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if the spokesman for the government does not know the question, I will have to repeat it.

MR. SPEAKER: We have had a long and involved question once, and I am sure the hon. members of the House do not want to hear it again.

HON. MR. PORTER: I will attempt to answer the mixed statement and question, as best I can.

MR. SALSBERG: It was not mixed at all; it was very clear.

HON. MR. PORTER: In the first place, there has been no decision made to go to Ottawa next week in regard to this matter. If any appointment is desired in Ottawa next week, we shall be quite ready to go and discuss any questions in connection with the gas pipe line with the federal authorities there.

I may say the decision as to whether gas shall be imported from the United States to assist the Consumers' Gas Company to build up a natural gas market over the next 3 years, which will put them in a position to absorb a large quantity of Alberta gas when the line is completed—within the next 3 years—is a question, and the decision will only be made by the Ottawa Government. The Ottawa Government has complete jurisdiction as to whether gas should be imported into this country or not.

Our position at the moment is simply that we have, in collaboration with the Ottawa authorities—the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is charged with this problem—made very exhaustive enquiries into the possible markets for Alberta gas, once the pipe line is completed, and I may say at this stage it is quite apparent that during the intervals between the present day and, perhaps, 3 years hence, it will be essential, in one way and another, to build up as large a market as possible in eastern Canada for the consumption of natural gas. It is a question as to whether that can be done from resources within this province, or whether it may be desirable and essential to provide for some importations during that period.

We have made enquiries which have been of a considerable breadth, and of an exhaustive nature, and are prepared to lay all the information we have before the Ottawa Government, in order to assist them to come to some definite and practical conclusion in the matter.

MR. SALSBERG: When will you lay it before the House?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know that this is the proper time to debate this matter. It is a matter of information for the Ottawa Government, which we have agreed to obtain and supply.

MR. SALSBERG: Why not inform the House of your policy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: We would like to know the government's policy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. J. P. ROBARTS (London): Mr. Speaker, in rising to join in this debate, I would like to add my congratulations to those by other hon. members in this House, to the mover and seconder of the motion, and on the

very excellent speeches which they delivered.

I would like also to congratulate the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby) on his election, and to add my personal welcome to him, upon being admitted to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the very wide latitude, as far as subject matters are concerned, when speaking in this debate, which is permitted to the hon. members.

I have read the address delivered by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, and I found several points which I considered to be of great importance, and of interest to the residents of my riding of London, particularly to that great area of Ontario, commonly referred to as "Southwestern Ontario."

The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) assisted me in one of the points which I would like to impress upon the government, when he referred to a forecast for a new parks policy in the province, and he referred to an area, known as "The Pinery." I think I may be able to give this House a little more information in regard to that part of Ontario than the hon. member for High Park.

The Pinery is a stretch of property on the eastern shore of Lake Huron, extending from Grand Bend in the north, to Port Franks in the south, and is the last piece of land deeded by the Crown to the Canada Company in the last century, and which was sold by the Canada Company to various settlers. As I say, Mr. Speaker, this is the last remaining piece of property of that grant.

The property itself is quite valueless for commercial uses; it has been burned over several times, and is covered with scrub and sand, but it does represent the final stretch of shoreline left, from the Bruce Peninsula southerly to Sarnia on Lake Huron.

It is my opinion—as I know it is an opinion held by many hon. members from Southwestern Ontario—that the government would be well advised to acquire this property, and hold it as a public park, on behalf of the industrial

and rural inhabitants of Southwestern Ontario.

We are anticipating, Mr. Speaker, a very large increase in population in that part of Ontario. In fact, the population is increasing every day, and if this property is permitted to be subdivided and sold in lots of 50 or 75 feet frontages on the lake, I maintain it will be lost to our people forever, and I think we owe it to the present industrial population, and that which we shall have in the future, to preserve at least some of this heritage, which should be made available to be enjoyed by all our citizens.

The London Chamber of Commerce sparked this move in the first place. I have attended many meetings with various municipal bodies, and I know the hon. members for both the Lambtons, Middlesex North, Middlesex South, and Huron, at one time or another, have endorsed this project, and I am sure I am speaking on behalf of those hon. members when I say I do hope the government will see fit to do something about this area, before it is lost for all time.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed also in the speech delivered by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, reference to the development of the hydro-electric scheme in the St. Lawrence Seaway. I realize the hydro-electric scheme has nothing to do with the waterway, as such, but I think it is part and parcel of the same project, and I am very happy to see that they are proceeding with it. I feel the seaway will make a tremendous difference to Southwestern Ontario.

Eighteen miles south of London, we have a place known as Port Stanley, which has had a long and varied history in connection with Southwestern Ontario.

Last year, there was constructed on the dock side of Port Stanley, 5 grain elevators, which shipped soya beans, coarse grains, and wheat for export by water.

I understand there are another 12 going to be constructed this year, and it appears to me this will provide a new

era for that part of Ontario. After all, if we could ship from Port Stanley directly to Hamburg and various ports in Europe, the saving in transportation charges is going to be immense, and I can foresee that the port of Port Stanley will serve the very wealthy and rich counties of Elgin, Middlesex and Kent and I can also foresee that in due course the St. Lawrence Seaway will lead, in the same manner, to an immense increase in the shipment of products from Southwestern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate I would feel very remiss in my duty if I did not pay tribute to this government, to the government in Ottawa, and to the many far-sighted men in my City of London, in connection with the construction of the Fanshaw Dam. During the last 3 or 4 weeks we had a series of flash floods in London in the Thames River. I remember very well in 1937, which was the last time we had serious floods in London, watching people leaving their flooded homes by boat, and afterwards seeing them shovelling silt out of their front windows. I saw houses where every stick of furniture was lost, besides household goods and clothing, and I know, professionally, that the flood has affected the real estate market in that area of London ever since.

That flood in 1937 was caused by heavy snow falls combined with very heavy rains, and rising temperatures, and we had the same situation in London during the last few weeks. The city engineer of the City of London, and some of the experts from the Department of Geography at the University of Western Ontario, have stated had it not been for the Fanshaw Dam and the control exercised over the flood water, we should have had a similar situation this year.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that in terms of money and in the avoidance of discomfort and human misery, the Fanshaw Dam has paid for itself and will be there for a long time to come. It might be of interest to hon. members to know that the large lake which has been formed by this dam is being put to a

very wide recreational use. It is covered with sail boats in the summer time—no power boats are permitted—and in the winter it is used for skating, and, I believe, there was some ice boating there this past winter. It is proving to be of tremendous benefit for the whole area of Western Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few moments on a subject which I consider to be of general interest to the whole province. It does not concern my riding particularly, but I feel this is a problem we are going to have to face. The problem is simply that of our older citizens who are forming an increasing percentage of our population. According to the *Canada Year Book*—hon. members will excuse me if I read—in 1881 there were 15 adults in the province for every person aged over 65. Today there are 7 adults to every person over 65, and by 1971 it is estimated there will be about 5 adults to every person over the age of 65.

This in itself is certainly not a problem. In fact, I would consider it to be a matter for general congratulation that the medical profession, and the research activities generally, have been able to control disease, and that you and I are going to be given the opportunity to live a good deal longer than our parents and grandparents did. In addition, the death rate, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has declined from 16.3 deaths per 1,000 between 1921 and 1925 to 8.6 deaths per 1,000 in 1952. So hon. members can see the death rate is decreasing, preventive medicine is making strides, and we are gradually developing population living to a greater age.

That in itself is not a problem, but the problem which arises is the question of the employment of these older people. To illustrate my point, between the years 1946 and 1953, the number of workers over 65 in the labour force increased by 9 per cent. During that same period the members of our population aged over 65 increased by 31 per cent., which means an increase in the number of people not gainfully employed. These figures are taken from the commercial letter of the

Canadian Bank of Commerce for the month of February, 1954.

The next question is: Why are these older workers not acceptable to industry generally throughout Canada? This is a problem which has been given a tremendous amount of study in the United States because their number of older people among the population is much greater than ours and they realize this is going to be an extremely serious question. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a great many of these older workers are caught, in what I might call, an "actuarial vise." In other words, actuaries set up a retirement scheme to which the worker and industry contributes. According to figures, and according to actuarial plans, the worker must retire at the age of 65, otherwise he will disrupt the complete scheme. It does not matter whether he is able to continue working or not. In order to fit into the pattern he must retire at that age. Another reason for this development, I believe, goes back to the depression days of the 30's when there was continuous pressure to get rid of the older workers in order to provide jobs for the young men, coming along and supporting families. That idea has carried over to the present time and, of course, in our economy today it is quite false.

There are several other prejudices against the older worker. Many employers say that an older worker is not adaptable to new techniques, that he cannot learn fast. Employers believe that an older worker tends to be absent more than a younger man, and they also feel that he is more prone to accidents. Various research projects have proved every one of these prejudices to be absolutely wrong. As a matter of fact, the only place that a young worker is superior to an older worker is in a job requiring brute physical strength, and 9 times out of 10, an older man has enough know-how to overcome that disadvantage as well.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when these men are in the prime of life and are able to go on and work for another 8 or 10 years, that they should

be permitted to do so. Instead they are forced to retire on a pension that invariably means a pretty sharp drop in their standard of living. Apparently we are always going to have to live with inflation, so we can expect that no pension will be worth as much as it was originally as the years go by. Thus we have the spectacle of our older citizens forced to spend the declining years of their lives not gainfully employed, with nothing to do, and living on a much reduced income. All in all, it is a relatively sad picture.

The next question, of course, is what can be done about this. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we must arrive at the point where we will treat these men as individuals, and not as mere ciphers. It may be there are men aged 65 who should retire for physical reasons, but if a man is able to work, and wants to work, I say he should be permitted to work. It may be that a man who continues to work could not expect certain benefits past a certain age. He may lose hospitalization and other insurance benefits, but he should be permitted to continue to work—to earn his living—and feel that his pension might be that much higher when he needs it, because he did not use it until his youthfulness was really at an end.

I am afraid the alternative will be that the ever-increasing section of our population which will not be employed in a productive capacity. Nobody can deny that this group is becoming larger and larger every year, and I am sure that as time goes on, they will become an increasing burden on our taxpayers, and they themselves, as I have pointed out, will be living rather unhappy, mal-adjusted lives. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the government might be able to take the lead in some action on this matter, because the retirement age for civil servants is 65. It seems to me that everybody wants to suggest that Select Committees of this House be appointed, but in all seriousness, I say that this whole question does merit very close examination and that such an examination could be made by a Select Committee of the House. Such a committee could collect

information which would be of tremendous value to private industry, because fundamentally this is where this situation will have to be corrected.

What little research I have done has revealed to me nothing but misconception on the part of industry as to the position of the older worker, and such information would be of value both to the government, with its own large labour force, and to private industry, providing the information was disseminated. We might then be able to "scotch" once and for all, the idea that a man's usefulness ceases when he reaches the age of 65.

MR. H. F. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine): I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will pardon me if I wander a little in my speech this afternoon, because I am making a speech now that I was supposed to be making next Thursday.

It is good to be back in this Chamber. It is good to be back with all the hon. members, including the opposition, because we are all such a friendly group here. Men are like boys, I suppose. Men are just boys who have grown up.

I have listened with great interest to the hon. members speak on the great developments in their ridings, gold mines, pulp mills, uranium mines, hydro developments, etc. Well, not a thing has happened in Woodbine riding, except we have more termites this year than we had last.

MR. SALSBERG: That is a matter for the government.

MR. FISHLEIGH: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) says that is a matter for the government. I have tried and tried, and when hon. Mr. Kennedy was Minister of Agriculture I wrote to him, and he very kindly put me in touch with a Professor Osborne from the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph, who went back to Guelph after promising to try and procure enough money so as to isolate two houses infested with them, but as yet I have not heard from him. I have contacted the present hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) but to date, no action has been taken. It seems, according to the professor, there

are many kinds of termites, but they all live on cellulose material or dead wood. The Woodbine variety is one-eighth of an inch long, and red in colour. They live underground, and when they hit the air they die. They go up a wall in a small tube of clay about the size of a lead pencil. Once in the house it is almost impossible to exterminate them. They can eat the floor away. Occasionally they leave a little sawdust on the basement floor, if there are millions at work.

How they got into Woodbine riding, nobody knows. It is thought they came there in sand thrown off as ballast from some foreign ship. The professor told me that once a year the termite colony sprout wings and they have one queen, and they take to the air and follow her. I suppose that is the way they got here. Let us suppose that the queen takes off from Woodbine with her billions of followers and starts circling Ontario and she looks down and says: "What city is that down there?" and the boy termites say: "Why, that is Ottawa!" The queen says: "There is a great deal of dead wood down there. But there are too many Liberals." So they go circling round, and then she looks down again and she says: "What city is that?" The boys say: "Why that is Lindsay, where the hon. Prime Minister lives." The queen says: "Boys we are going down." Zip, zip, zip, and they land in Lindsay. They eat up all the churches and the city hall.

Do you think we would get any action then to destroy termites? Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that we would get a little action in Woodbine riding? Why Mr. Murdock told me you could make your speeches here, and nothing would be done about it. It took me 2 years to learn he was absolutely right.

Talk about bridges disappearing in the north country. Why in Woodbine the termites almost destroy houses.

I am now going to bring to the House one or two new suggestions, though I do not suppose anything will be done about them. One is the quality of Canadian bacon sold to the Canadian public. When the hon. members' wives cook it in the morning, the smell is so

bad you lose your appetite. It has been in cold storage so long there when you eat it, it tastes of saltpetre.

I fear if we keep serving this bacon to the public, in Canada, it will soon get tired of eating bacon and eggs, and will just eat eggs.

The other day we had some very fine bacon for breakfast, and I asked my wife whose make it was, and she told me it came from Denmark. What do you think of that? Canadians ship thousands of pounds of bacon abroad, but they have to send to Denmark if they want good bacon. I think it is time we investigated these storage places to find out how long the bacon is kept there and how it is cured, so the people of Ontario can have their own bacon.

I could give a long discourse on how to raise pigs because I was on a farm in days gone by, and one of my chores was to raise pigs. We had a litter of pigs, and it was my job to fill the trough. There was only room for 4 pigs to eat, and we had 6. We had a man to do that work, but he quit, rather than make a new trough a little longer. It became my job to feed the pigs. It is remarkable the amount of swill a young pig can eat, and feeding them really keeps a boy busy after school. And pigs are not easy to raise as you would presume.

If a pig's tail sticks straight out, that pig is not very well. That is probably due to black teeth. If your pig has black teeth that is probably due to bad feeding—too much swill and not enough hard grain. In order to get rid of the black teeth, you have to get the pig on its back and then two or three people have to keep it on its back, which is no easy job, while the black teeth are pulled out. After the black teeth are gone, the pig will have a curly tail again, and be restored to health.

That was my experience raising pigs on the farm.

MR. SALSBERG: I think it is easier not to eat pigs at all.

MR. FISHLEIGH: There is another subject which I think should be taken up by the government. Far too many

people in Ontario and Canada are going to Florida every winter. It seems to me that Ontarians are becoming soft and are "hot-house flowers." All winter long people have been asking me "Have you been down?" A fellow asked me that, waiting for an elevator, and I said, "No, darn it, I am going up." You cannot do any business in Toronto because people are either going or coming back from Florida—wearing themselves out. I do not propose to stop this nonsense because it is healthful for the very old, but it seems to me that to counteract this outflow we should develop our own assets here and promote Ontario.

What could be prettier than the Blue Mountain at Collingwood? The skiing and other winter sports, the sun on the snow. It is invigorating to young and old—a perfect health resort. The government should promote a hotel up there and other places. We should have Americans coming in here by train, by plane and by bus to ski. Glamorize it—spend a little money! I had an advertising man tell me that for \$1 million he could make 75 per cent. of the men wear bow ties. When I was growing up I used to eat about a peck of apples a week. There are as many vitamins in an apple as an orange, but through advertising, Sunkist people have made Canadians the largest consumer of oranges per capita in the world. During the war the women said, "You can take everything away from us but oranges." As a result, the apple orchards of Ontario are not what they used to be. I believe that Ontario should be promoted for *winter* tourists. If it is nice here in the summer, it is just as nice in the winter. This tourist business would go a long way to rehabilitate Bruce and Grey Counties, both of which have 6,000 less residents than they had 50 years ago.

Speaking on housing, I will agree that Bill 80 opened up large tracts of land for housing. The building of the by-pass highway also opens up isolated territory. I believe that the Ontario Government has been extra good to Toronto, and I hope the people in this great city realize the important part the

government has played. Housing is entering another phase. Just after the war homes were built by small builders who built 5 or 6 a year. Later this was stepped up to 50 per year. Now, we have the entry of large English and American builders who are undertaking 500 or 600 per year, such as the Trust Steel Co., The Taylor Woodrow Co., with Swiss apartments such as at Church and Yonge Streets, and large 14-storey apartment houses.

This company, one of the largest in England, is planning now to build a plant for making electricity with atomic energy. It is to be the only plant in the world which makes steam from atomic energy—enough to generate light for a city of 60,000 people.

Housing has changed, and also apartment houses. We have huge Swiss apartments going up between Church and Yonge Streets, just north of the Arena Gardens, 18-storeys high. We have nothing in this country to touch the appearance of these Swiss apartments. They do not even have basements in them. They say, "We would not have our women go down in the cellar to do their washing. They must do it upstairs where there is light." They have the lower apartments efficiently turned into rotundas, where you can sit and chat with your friends.

The whole complexion of building and accommodation is changing, and it changed still more last night. I heard while in a hotel, that a man had \$300 million to invest under the National Housing Act in mortgages in Canada. The only problem was that the money is coming from the United States. He is taking this problem up with the authorities, but he loses 3 per cent. If he could stabilize that, so that after 20 years, when the money fell due, he would not lose the exchange, he would invest the money in Canada.

It is unfortunate at the present time, in this respect, that our money is at a premium. If it could be stabilized, we would have all the money we need, and money is the only thing which is holding up housing today. There is no money available for housing. The country is

expanding so rapidly that there is no money for housing.

Money could be made, I know, but that would be inflation, and would throw our whole economy out of kilter. So it is uneconomical and impractical to have inflation, and we will have to make some agreements so that people bringing funds in will be protected.

MR. SALSBERG: Government mortgages.

MR. FISHLEIGH: Government mortgages is another form of inflation, in the sense that you are just borrowing money and paying it back.

At the present time the demand for housing has changed from \$30,000 and \$25,000 class of homes to about \$12,000. People want homes today at about that figure. The demand for the other class has been filled, but there are thousands of people still coming into this city at the rate of 10,000 a month.

I remember when I was on City Council, we had a motion to stop people coming in. We were going to stop them at the station and send them back to whence they came. We made such a laughing stock of ourselves, we had to stop it, and since then we have let as many come in as wanted to.

That is the reason for conditions as they are today. We have seen people flocking into this city. It seems impossible to secure accommodation for so many people.

The demand now is for the \$12,000 home, Mr. Speaker.

If any hon. member has an old house, now is the time to sell it. An old house, on a 17 foot lot, 35 or 40 years old, can be sold for \$12,000 or \$13,000 and the vendor can then go to the outskirts, and buy a brand new one, on a 40 foot lot, with all the modern facilities they are including in new homes now, for the same amount of money. The only difference is, one is in the city and closer to transportation, and the other is further out. Rent control has caused that condition.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: How wide is that lot?

MR. FISHLEIGH: A 40 foot lot. A 40 foot lot is wide enough for anybody, because the extra cost of a larger lot, means they have to pay another \$500 for the lot, and the purchaser would much rather have an old car or a TV set, than the extra 10 feet which the government is trying to force upon him.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I agree with you, 100 per cent.

MR. FISHLEIGH: Good. I was going to go off on a tangent, and I am very thankful I did not have to do it. The point is there are hundreds of people in the city needing homes. I feel sorry for the young man with a large family. No one wants him in their apartment house, and no one will rent him a home. He cannot save enough money to make the large down payments required. Consequently, what happens to him is this:

An agent will advertise an old down-at-the-heel house with an outhouse, worth about \$7,000 for \$12,000 with \$1,000 down, and the poor fellow has to live somewhere, so he buys the house. The vendor immediately discounts the mortgages and buys a brand new house with all the conveniences for \$12,000. As a matter of fact, this also applies to almost all old houses. You can sell a 35-year-old semi-detached house, on a 17 foot lot, for \$12,500 in the city, and buy a brand new home on the outskirts for the same money. This is due to the rent controls, as you have to pay extra for possession. In the United States, when controls were removed, the older houses went down in value, and I believe the same thing will happen here.

In regard to the second mortgages which the Provincial Government instituted after the war, to benefit the returned men—Ontario has not lost a cent on them. I said last year that they should be reinstituted, and I say so again! I had many phone calls and a number of letters expressing the hope that the government would take action. The need is still great. We read in the press of fires, and then it is divulged that 4 and 5 people were living in one room.

There are many people who say a new house is no good. Actually, a new house is a better house, in my opinion, today than the house built 30 or 40 years ago. They did not have the inspection they have now. Today, houses are inspected by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, by the township or city in which they are built, by the mortgage companies, and so on. A house today is well inspected, and the working men today do a much better job with better materials. They have proper plumbing, oil heating, good shingles and so forth. The workmanship is much better, and all-in-all today you get a much better house than you did 30 or 40 years ago.

A year ago I recommended the government institute land assembly, and sell the land at a profit to the builders. At that time I sent copies of my speech on this matter to a number of people who should be interested. Now that we have land assembly, I have had a deluge of people condemning me for it. Some are our own hon. members here today; others are my own partners, who claim land assembly will ruin our business. My reply was that I had to put the people of Ontario first, before my own personal profit, and the land assembly scheme is the only answer to mass housing. I do believe that the lots should sell at a profit and the profit applied to fire halls, police stations, etc.

Malvern is 20 miles from the centre of the city, and you would have to build a city the size of Guelph and put in all the facilities. According to Mr. Gardiner, you could sell the lots for \$200. That is utterly impossible. Those lots will cost \$3,000 when we consider all the services must go in. They will have to be paid for now, or in 20 years' time, but the cost is there. The Thistletown proposition is much better because it is closer to facilities, and can be developed more cheaply as you do not have to build fire halls, a city hall, public libraries, or such things which are necessary in a modern city.

Regarding 40 foot lots, I would like to say a word on this subject. Builders do like 40 foot lots. They are trying to force 50 foot lots and a master plan on

Scarborough. The reeve out there wants to have a sewer put down in Highland Creek, and the Mayor of Metropolitan Toronto said: "No sewer, unless we have 50 foot and 60 foot lots and the master plan."

They do need a master plan out there so far as roads are concerned. I will admit, but when it comes to subdivisions for industry, a man from the United States wishing to establish an industry might go out and look at a farm and say, "I will take that, it is just what I am looking for." They will arrange for sewer, water, and roads, and although the farm might have been zoned as "residential," they go to the local planning board and change it to "commercial," and everybody is happy because it is changed immediately.

However, if they have to go to the Municipal Board to have it changed, it takes so long to put it through that the prospective purchaser buys some place else.

In North York they have a master plan which was put on before the Metropolitan Council was set up. They made all the land industrial so that the builders could not build houses — if they built houses they would need schools. All this will have to be changed.

They might not want gas stations on Yonge Street, so they put through a by-law that gas stations must have lots 200 feet in depth, and they know, "there is no such animal." They do not make lots that deep as a rule, so there will be no gas stations.

I read in the paper recently that Dominion Stores had been stopped from building a large marketaria at the corner of Dufferin and Lawrence Avenue, because a small shopping centre one-and-a-quarter miles away learned that this corner was not zoned for commercial purposes. The reeve of the township found it was very cumbersome and difficult to take it before the Municipal Board to have it changed. As a result, the Dominion Store has been stopped temporarily until the zoning by-law is changed.

These are cases where zoning by-laws

and master plans do not always work, and I think we should leave Scarborough and the eastern part of Toronto to work out their own salvation, so far as industry is concerned. However, as I said before, so far as roads are concerned, a master plan is vital.

But the Metropolitan Council will succeed. It took 100 years to build the Toronto City Council to the efficiency it has today, and it will take many years to weld the Metropolitan Council into an operating body, but its efficiency will attract industries from all over the world. The City of Toronto, in my estimation, is very well managed. The Welfare Department, the Works Department, the Parks Department, are very well managed, and it will take the Metropolitan Council a long time to reach the same efficiency which has been worked out over many years at the City Hall. There is no reason why, as time goes on, it should not work out, and I believe it will.

Before closing these remarks, I wish to draw your attention again to the poor acoustics in this Chamber. The press boys have to lean forward striving to hear what is said. The children who come and sit in the gallery only stay a few minutes as they cannot hear. During the inaugural my wife and daughter sat in the corner over there and they could hardly hear a thing. You will remember I advocated a speaking system to be put in this Chamber several years ago, similar to the one in the House of Commons, London, England. What has happened? The Liberals in Ottawa installed the same system in the House of Commons. It is very difficult to hear the hon. Prime Minister when he sets the date of the next meeting, and considering the amount it will cost, I think we should have speakers in this Chamber. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a loud-speaker of his own. Everybody can hear him. Those of us who had the privilege of hearing the service at the Coronation in Westminster Abbey heard every word the Queen said. Once again may I impress upon the government, the necessity of loud-speakers in the Chamber.

In closing, I would like to say that the hon. Cabinet Ministers and the employees of the Province of Ontario have done a very fine job. We have a surplus of \$58 million from a total revenue of \$350 million. It is a very large amount. That is not due to "back benchers" like myself, but the efforts of the employees of this great Province of Ontario, at Queen's Park. They all work hard and have done a good job. It is also due to the efforts of the hon. Cabinet Ministers, some of whom work even to the detriment of their health.

For my part, I wish to thank them most sincerely for a job well done.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate on the Speech from the Throne, first of all, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the address, both of whom I consider made very able speeches.

I want to compliment you, Mr. Speaker, on the manner in which you conduct the proceedings of this House. There is no doubt about it, I believe you are really "tops" in the position you occupy.

I do not want to take up too much time. I was called out in a hurry, and had a great many things to attend to, and had no time to prepare any data, but I would like to say a few words about the riding in which I live.

In 1945 I was elected to this House. At that time, the riding I came from was neglected. Roads were in a deplorable condition; only 5 per cent. of the people had hydro, and everything seemed to be in bad shape. However, today things have changed so much with the good help of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) who has seen fit to give us plenty of good roads, but we still need a few more, which I do not want him to forget. However, he has done very well, all-in-all.

I would like to say something about hydro in my riding. I worked with hydro 35 years ago. In the good old days there were no such things as trucks. We had wagons and sleighs. If we had heavy materials to move, we

either had to load it on to the wagons, or build sleighs of our own to transport the material.

I know something about it because I have followed it closely for a good many years, and the changes which have come about in the building of plants have been terrific as you can appreciate, when you see the way they build them today, as compared to the way it was done long ago. In those days, everything was done by hand, but nowadays a tank will come in with loose cement, and it is dumped, and is picked up and whisked across the river quickly and easily. In those days it was hard on the fingers handling the material, but the improvements have been terrific.

When you see, as I have seen, the growth of hydro, you appreciate the work which has been done. Many of those men who were there 35 years ago, are still carrying on, and I want to say a good word for them.

I would like to mention Forgan, Mitchell, etc., those fellows whom I consider to be the best construction men in the world. They have given their lifetime to this job, and deserve a little commendation from someone, because too often they are unnoticed there, and I think someone ought to say a few words on their behalf.

Young men go up there, and take a great interest in their work, and the first thing you know they are old men, are broken down, and no one to say anything on their behalf or the work they have done. So a word here should be spoken in their behalf. These men are the best in their trade, and could command the highest wages on any project, any place, and I think the hydro has been lucky to have them.

I want to say a word about the progress of hydro in my own riding. When I came here, there were only 5 per cent. of the people with hydro, and now we are up to the "Jones" and there are 55 per cent. who have hydro. We are getting on an equal footing with the rest of the province, and I feel very happy about the whole situation.

I want to thank the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) for what he has done.

There is more to come, but I know we can count on him. I know he can do it.

I also want to say a few words in favour of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). I have had deputations come to me about labour, and they all assure me the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) handles them well. They say he is a "comic" with them, and laughs with them, but does something about it, and they go home with a good taste in their mouths and everything is fine. I could speak of every other hon. Minister but I will confine my remarks to those whose departments affect my riding the most.

I think the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) is a very commendable Minister. It is a pleasure to see the way he takes care of the old people, the children, and the disabled. We do not have very many complaints about his department, and I think he is really keeping abreast of the times.

I will not say too much about the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). We all know him very well in my riding, and it is not necessary to mention his name but very little. He has always been a friend of our section of the country.

Possibly, in speaking about the different members of the Cabinet, I may have missed some of them, but those of whom I have spoken, are the ones to whom I like to give a little praise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I do want to mention. I have been accused by one of the newspapers of calling Toronto "Hog Town." I was called a "pip-squeak politician." I do not even know what it means. This came from the *Globe and Mail*, and if I were to make a guess as to the meaning of "pip-squeak," I would guess it was an insignificant sort of fellow, who does not amount to very much. I have been accused of making this "crack" by Frank Tumpane—and I will name the gentleman. I do not think he is entitled to say what he did about me. I do not, and never did, like the words "Hog Town," because I live in Toronto for at least 75 per cent. of the time, and I like

Toronto very much and think a great deal of it.

But I do feel the people in Toronto think they belong to a privileged class, and that our government should not give them more privileges than anyone else, and should not give them a larger subsidy than is given to other places. In fact, Toronto gets twice the subsidy the people in my riding get in my own town. That looks a little peculiar to me. I do not see why the people of Toronto deserve this.

This very building in which we are sitting at the moment is assessed by the city, and the government pays taxes on it, and yet we have a million acres of land in Renfrew County, also owned by the government, which has sold the timber, and acreage for tourist resorts, on which the government has paid no taxes.

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, which concerns the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, the vice-chairman of the Hydro Commission (Mr. Challies). In my riding we have 4 large power plants, 2 of them supplying a considerable portion of the power available, and they have been assessed at \$40,000. But, the Hydro Commission itself assesses them; they do not allow our assessors to do that.

In the meantime, when they are doing any constructing work, what they do to our roads is a shame, and if it were not for the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) who provides the necessary funds to repair the roads, they would be in very bad shape.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the people of Toronto are a privileged class, and I am sure that they are well looked after. I should think that every seat in Toronto would be occupied by a "Tory" because there is no doubt the government is leaning over backwards to help them.

I will not say very much more, Mr. Speaker. But I never have had it explained to me why the City of Toronto should get \$4.00 as a subsidy, while the other parts of the province only get from \$1.50 to \$2.00. I have been told by different people that there are more poor

people here. I doubt that very much. I do not think there are any more poor people here than in my town, comparing the populations.

I would like to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate all they are doing for me. Conditions are on a much higher plane. We are very happy down in my riding about the way things are going. The people are satisfied. We all come here to do a job, and we appreciate the consideration and the help we get from those whom we contact here. After all, we are all here on the people's business. As a matter of fact, I think I have a large Liberal vote in my riding. The opposition sent a representative to Ottawa with a majority of between 2,000 and 2,500, and I came here with the same majority when it was my turn, so there must be a number of Liberals who voted for me.

MR. SALSBERG: Or a number of "Tories" voted Liberal.

MR. DEMPSEY: Yes, that is true. Perhaps some of the hon. members may think there is something wrong down there, but I do not agree.

I want to congratulate the government on the way they are carrying on the business of the province today.

There is one person I would like to mention.

We had a man who was born in my riding, by the name of "Art" Mills, who apparently has become mixed up in something concerning the roads, and one headline appeared, saying that he had stolen \$5 million.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that he was always a well-respected citizen of the Town of Renfrew, and neither myself nor many people down there, believe that he ever stole \$5 million or even \$5,000.

I do not think a man should be publicly condemned before the entire story is told. I was told the other day by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Wardrope) that the whole contract only amounted to \$12 million, so I will say that "Art" Mills was "quite a man," if he stole \$5 million. I do not

believe any newspaper should "blast" anybody before they know all the circumstances.

What will happen to this man, Mills, if he is found not guilty? Even then, his family will have to take all the "dirt," which he has to take, and all the insinuations about his father being in jail, and other things of a like nature, none of which is very nice. I believe, in my soul, that "Art" Mills did not steal \$1 from anybody. I know that he has had plenty of opportunities to go "crooked," but he would not do so.

I would like to defend Mr. Mills, and I do hope that his reputation will be "whitewashed," and I would like to see the department take him back, and even give him a better job, because he has come "through the mill" the hard way. The people to whom I have spoken are unanimous in thinking he did not do anything.

I was sitting in my hotel the other evening and a man came in and sat down beside me, and he said: "Is this not awful about 'Art' Mills?" He said: "I was with him on the Alaska Highway, and I did not go up there for my health. I went up there as an inspector of culverts, and I thought I would try a bit of bootlegging, and I offered Mills \$50 for a bag of sugar to make a little brew, and he said: 'Get away from me; I am not selling any sugar.'"

I will conclude now, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to thank the government of the day for what they have done for my riding, and I assure you I cannot make very many complaints.

Once again I thank you.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston), moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

The following bills were severally read the third time, passed, as intitled in the motions.

Bill No. 34, An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Expenses Act.

Bill No. 36, An Act to amend the Coroner's Act.

Bill No. 37, An Act to amend the County Courts' Act.

Bill No. 39, An Act to amend the Crown Attorneys' Act.

Bill No. 42, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Bill No. 44, An Act to amend the Jurors' Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to amend the Magistrates' Act, 1952.

Bill No. 46, An Act to amend the Mechanics' Lien Act.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Roberts in the chair.

THE TORONTO EAST GENERAL AND ORTHOPAEDIC HOSPITAL

House in Committee on Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 2 reported.

THE TOWN OF FERGUS

The House in Committee on Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting the Town of Fergus."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 4 reported.

THE TOWN OF MIMICO

The House in Committee on Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Town of Mimico."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

SAO PAULO LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY LIMITED

The House in Committee on Bill No. 15, "An Act respecting the Sao Paulo Light and Power Company Limited."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 15 reported.

THE FRONTENAC HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the Frontenac High School District."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 1 reported.

THE TOWN OF PALMERSTON

The House in Committee on Bill No. 29, "An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 29 reported.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the committee rise and report certain bills without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills without amendments, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

THE TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act to amend the Territorial Division Act."

He said: All these bills will go to the committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE OPERATING ENGINEERS ACT, 1953

HON. MR. DALEY moves second reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend the Operating Engineers Act, 1953."

On section 1.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr Speaker, I would like to have the hon. Minister tell us if he intends to send this bill to the Labour Committee.

HON. MR. DALEY: I had not intended to, Mr Speaker, because it is such a simple bill. It is to make more certain regarding two little points in the new bill, which was approved last year, and which went through the committee at that time, at which the operating engineers and others were present.

These two items are simply to clarify the provision dealing with re-examinations, that is, where an operating engineer fails on his first examination, the intention is to make sure he is given another chance.

The second provision is to secure the certificates which were held before this Act came into being. We do not want them discontinued, and we feel that an operating engineer, who possessed the required qualifications, still remains an operating engineer.

That is all there is to this bill, and I see no point in sending it on to the committee.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not want to take up much of the time of the House, but there is a matter of principle involved here.

Last year, when the engineers bill was passed and sent to the committee, the union of stationary engineers was not aware of the bill which was before the House. It was found the department had notified the head of the union in the province, who failed to notify the local organization, with the result there was a great deal of ill feeling engendered, not directed toward the government, nor the Legislature, but amongst themselves.

We had to agree, as a result of that, to postpone action on the bill, to give the union an opportunity to study it and bring in their recommendations. I think that is a good, sound principle with a bill of this character, even though it may not be too important, that we give the union every opportunity to acquaint themselves with the contents of the bill,

and give them an opportunity to appear before the Labour Committee and express their opinion.

I would strongly urge the government to agree to that procedure.

HON. MR. DALEY: What the hon. member says is partially correct. There was a group last year, during the formulating of the bill, which came in later and intimated their particular group did not know of it. Therefore, we held it up. At a further meeting, they came in and were satisfied. So the bill is, as I say, a complete bill. We might really have gone along without correcting these two little things, but I wanted to be sure there was no possible chance anyone could take a man's certificate away from him, and that he would not be placed in an unfortunate position if he failed on his first examination.

MR. SALSBERG: Did the unions know about it? Were they made aware of the bill?

MR. DALEY: I cannot say.

MR. SALSBERG: If that is the case, why should we not notify them now and give them the opportunity to appear?

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I have to take some responsibility when I bring bills in here, and I am advising hon. members that all there is in this bill is what I have intimated. There is no change in principle. There is no necessity for any further debates.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: I have not spoken yet, I have only asked questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I will rule the hon. member has entered into this debate, and has certainly spoken.

Order. It is the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

MR. SALSBERG: No.

Motion agreed to.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 55 intituled, "An Act to amend the Department of Municipal Affairs Act."

MR. SALSBERG: Is this going to the committee?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 57 intituled, "An Act to amend the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act."

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. PORTER: Bill No. 57 will be referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

THE PARENTS MAINTENANCE ACT, 1954

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 58 intituled, "The Parents Maintenance Act, 1954."

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the bill. I am a bit worried about it. I have had some experience with this bill on another occasion, when it was amended. The history of this Act is one of continuous amendments which tend to increase the powers of the government, and its agencies, to coerce members of a family into doing something which they feel they cannot do, or punish them for failing to do what they claim they are unable to do. The original Act, which came into being in 1921, was very simple. It specified, and I am quoting, that: "A parent shall be deemed to be dependent, when, by reason of age, disease or infirmity he is unable to maintain himself."

That was the definition at the time. The purpose was to make children responsible for the maintenance of parents in those circumstances. Later, in 1936, an amendment to the bill was

brought in which added the words: "Or where he is destitute."

Mr. Speaker, I recall distinctly appearing before a committee of the Legislature, and arguing against the amendment. I pointed out that the enactment of the amendment would result in a great deal of hardship to many younger members of families in the province. I was not the only one, Mr. Speaker, who argued against the amendment. There were other groups represented before the committee, who pointed out the same fact—that it was designed to force younger members of a family to assume responsibility for their parents during the period of depression and mass unemployment.

And I recall full well the Minister of Welfare at the time replying to me, and to others, with an assurance that the government had no intention to enforce the law against such persons as I mentioned. Our experience, however, was that they did enforce it, precisely in the manner in which we feared they would.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, was that in a home where a father was unemployed, a young boy or girl would be compelled to contribute a share towards the maintenance of the home, if the boy or girl worked. And I stand before this House and speak without fear of contradiction when I say that this piece of legislation resulted in scores, if not hundreds, of youngsters leaving their homes, often with the approval of their parents, because of the strict manner in which the law was enforced. It was quite common under that Act for a girl earning \$10 or \$12 a week to be asked to contribute towards the maintenance of the family, that it left very little for herself.

MR. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Why should she not?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) asks why should she not. I want to remind him that it was precisely the groups for which he is supposed to speak in this House, who opposed this provision. It was bad because it left

that young boy or girl almost nothing on which to keep themselves in a position similar to that of other young boys or girls who were working. Otherwise their parents were denied relief. And very often the children left home rather than continue to work. It was much too strict, and I am much concerned lest the further amendment we are dealing with should result in undue hardship on people who are least able to bear it.

On grounds of principle, I do not question the correctness of a measure, about the responsibility of a member of a family taking care of other members, when they need it. Of course, that is what is done. Most people are decent and most people do the decent thing. There may be a very rich person who can afford to take care of his parents, but may refuse to accept that responsibility. But it is not a person who usually gets the law after him. My recollection, in the period of unemployment, was that it was the young worker who had the law after him, and that will also apply in the future.

I am especially worried about this amendment because it comes at a time when we are faced with rising unemployment in the province, and it almost looks as if the law is being tightened up to provide the authority for stricter enforcement of what appears, on the surface, to be a very innocent and just sort of legislation. It is meant to force. I suggest again, those in lower income brackets to take on more than they are able to bear for the maintenance of their parents, before relief and other assistance is given, and I am not in favour of the amendment.

HON. MR. PORTER: I wish to answer the criticism by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). I do not know whether he has read section 4 of the bill . . .

MR. SALSBERG: I have.

HON. MR. PORTER: . . . which provides that:

where a parent is dependent, information may be laid before a justice of the peace and the justice of the peace

may permit an examination or may issue a summons against one or more sons or daughters and that if during the hearing it appears that the parents are dependent and that one or more sons or daughters have sufficient means to provide in whole or in part for the parents, the judge or magistrate having regard to all the circumstances of the case may require the payment of a sum not exceeding \$20 a week.

Mr. Speaker, if as the hon. member suggests, the principle of this bill is sound, I must say that he can have no objection, because the word "destitute" is included. If it is the proper thing in our society to impose some responsibility upon children of parents, who can afford to contribute to the support of their parents, I do not know why there should be any exception, just because the parents are destitute, and not ill as a result of disease or infirmity.

The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has made some broad statements about cases with which he is familiar, which occurred some years ago. Of course, like many of the broad statements which the hon. member has made, it might be well if we had the opportunity of examining some of these cases in detail to see of what they consisted.

The principle of the bill is a sound principle which has been on the statute books for many years and has served a good and a sound purpose.

MR. SALSBERG: A harmful purpose.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member has spoken on the second reading of this bill, and has no further right to speak to it.

MR. SALSBERG: The "hon. member" will be governed by Mr. Speaker and not by the hon. Attorney-General.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am submitting that is the rule with regard to second reading.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister is not even the House leader.

HON. MR. PORTER: That may be.

MR. SALSBERG: Remember it.

HON. MR. PORTER: I will remember it. The hon. member will do well to keep quiet.

MR. SALSBERG: It is hard when you speak.

HON. MR. PORTER: There are other words I could use which have not as many syllables as "keep quiet," but which are not quite parliamentary. This bill involves a sound principle, which no Legislature should shirk. It has served a useful purpose in a number of cases in the past, and when the amendments, as they are, and the general revision are passed, I would expect they would serve an equal, or even more useful purpose in the future.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. PORTER: This bill will be referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

THE BEES ACT, 1954

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 59 intituled, "The Bees Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to, second reading of the bill.

THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 60, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act."

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Minister if this legislation was asked for by the agricultural societies?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: It is in conformity with their desires in this respect?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes. This was discussed in Agricultural Committee last week.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT, 1954

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 61, "The Plant Diseases Act, 1954."

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry and I apologize for rising again. I want to say a word or two on the bill. I have a right to, but I have been getting on my feet too often.

Regarding the nurseries which are dealt with in this bill, I am sure that I will be expressing the sentiments of a great many people when I say that the average person is not protected sufficiently against "fly-by-night" nursery operators who sell plants and seeds which are advertised as "miraculous, astounding, and 'flabbergasting'." The innocent purchaser sends \$1.00, \$2.00 or \$3.00, and gets packages of seeds or bulbs, which turn out to be the very opposite of what were advertised.

I am ready, in this instance, to support the government in instituting some control over the operation of such companies.

There are undoubtedly reputable well-established concerns in this business.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We get the same thing in connection with mining stocks.

MR. SALSBERG: Many can be relied upon. It is the firms which usually advertise by the use of the catchiest phrases, and with the most promising pictures. The innocent person, usually at this time of the year, sees those pictures and falls a victim. I have done it on a few occasions. You send your money and get in return something which does not live up to any of the promises made.

Either the Association of Nursery Operators will exercise some control in

the matter of advertising, or the government should introduce some legislation which will provide a degree of protection to the public which I think is now lacking.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member may have been fooled. I am sure the hon. members of rural ridings would not be.

MR. SALSBERG: I am speaking of city people.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 62, "An Act to amend the Livestock and Livestock Products Act."

MR. OLIVER: Is this bill going to committee?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes, they are all going to committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS QUIETING ORDERS ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend the Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend the Municipal Drainage Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Before the adjournment, I would like to make doubly sure that when these bills come back, we will be able to speak on them. We have permitted them to go to the different committees, but it is understood when they come back and are reported by the committees, we can debate them again. I think that was understood some time ago.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister made that statement.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That assurance was given by the hon. Prime Minister the other day. We will be able to consider them, clause by clause, at that time.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.52 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, March 8, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, March 8, 1954.

Report of Select Committee on Reform Institutions, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Morrow, Mr. Downer	387
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Nickle, agreed to	415
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	415

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Motions.

Introductions of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I wish to make a statement in connection with the alleged irregularities in construction contracts in the Fort William division of the Department of Highways.

I wish to inform the House that search warrants were executed by the Ontario Provincial Police at 10.30 a.m. this morning at the business premises of the following contractors: Tomlinson Brothers Limited, Hacquoil's, Hewitson Construction Company Limited, H. J. McFarland Construction Company Limited, Bergmann Construction Company Limited, and Wolfe Construction Company Limited.

The examination of the books and records seized is being made by Messrs. Clarkson, Gordon and Company, under the direction of the Provincial Auditor.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I would like to ask the government at this time when it intends to convene the Committee on Public Accounts, so that the committee may

organize and busy itself with the conduct of the business with which it may decide to deal?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Accounts can, of course, be called by any member of the House, including the hon. member for St. Andrew. However, it is our intention, in any event, to convene the committee within a few days at which time the Provincial Auditor will be available to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I desire to table answers to Questions 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 24, 25 and 27.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister if he could expedite the tabling of agreements between the province and the federal government in relation to the Trans-Canada Highway?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: That was asked for, and it would help the House, as a whole, if it could be tabled.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, it will be.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to study the problems of reformation of delinquent individuals,

and all phases of custodial questions, and the place of reform institutions therein.

Mr. Speaker, I hasten to express on behalf of the Select Committee on Reform Institutions, appreciation to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. members of this House for the confidence reposed in the committee.

Personally, I wish to express appreciation for the privilege of association with the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Oliver), the Leader of the CCF group (Mr. W. J. Grummett) and all members of the Select Committee on Reform Institutions, and for their valuable contributions of professional knowledge, business experience, constructive interest and co-operation.

The hon. members of the committee (other than myself as chairman), were indeed an excellent selection of hon. members, especially well qualified for the duties involved by their professional qualifications and associations in daily life, in which they have earned distinction.

Each member was assigned to a definite responsibility for which he was very well qualified.

Upon entering an institution for inspection, a study was made and a report furnished to the committee after such inspection; the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) on "farm administration, hogs and beef"; the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) on "dairying and general farm practices"; the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) on "lumbering"; the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), a barrister and solicitor, on "discipline and segregation"; the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), also a barrister and solicitor, on "commitments and sentences"; the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Leavine), a medical doctor, on "medical and dental services and diet"; the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), an Anglican clergyman by profession, on "spiritual matters, release and reformation of inmates"; the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Johnston), because of his experience in the Active Army

Provost Corps, was assigned the duty of "custodial care and punitive aspects"; the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Pryde), due to his experience in his own line of endeavour, as well as his other business experience, was assigned "quarries" and "industries"; the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Morrow), who is a school principal, was assigned "education, vocational training and recreation"; all of whom are recognized leaders and authorities in their own fields of endeavour.

All members of the committee interviewed each member of the staff in each institution, and also a number of inmates. We inspected the institutional buildings and equipment, and looked into the cause of riots, where same have occurred.

To the hon. Minister of the Department of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) I wish to express my appreciation, as well as that of the committee, for his interest, his co-operation, as well as that of his department, and his friendly attitude, impartiality and non-interference with the work of the committee.

To the Deputy Minister, I wish to express our appreciation for his co-operation and contributions of detailed knowledge of the department. The committee would have me congratulate the hon. Minister on his good fortune in having such an experienced officer, one who at all times has been noted for his loyalty to his hon. Minister and his department.

The committee would have me thank the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) for his co-operation and the valuable assistance of Mr. Magone, Q.C., Mr. Common, Q.C., and Mr. Coughlin. The hon. Attorney-General correctly interpreted the wishes of the committee, and anticipating its recommendations, increased the personnel of his staff of probation officers. He has very rapidly increased the staff since the committee commenced to function.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has had a "free hand." There has been no interference or direction from the hon. Prime Minister of this province, and

I am delighted to present an unanimous report. Copies of the report will be placed on your desks after the completion of the explanation.

I am pleased to inform the House that all meetings of the Select Committee were public, open meetings, other than when examining inmates, and in the preparation of the report. We advertised in the daily papers asking any organizations or persons who wished, to appear. Some availed themselves of the opportunity, and presented briefs and various viewpoints.

My sincere thanks to my colleagues for their loyalty, co-operation and unselfish service and efforts for many days—yes, and many nights. We spent long hours in our work, and many of the hon. members devoted their time to the work of the committee, to the detriment of their own personal affairs. Some were able to attend nearly every sitting. We regret it was not our good fortune to have others as often as we would have liked, but I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members, that throughout all our hearings never, at any time, under any circumstances, was there any partisan colour, discussion or decision.

The motion for an investigation by a Select Committee moved by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has been justified, and the affirmative decision of the Legislature for an inquiry, we believe, was well merited.

Appreciation is justly due to our very efficient secretary, Mr. Bruce Byrnes, and to our *Hansard* reporter, Mr. Ralph Sturgeon, for their good services and co-operation. It was their efforts and co-operation which made possible the presentation of this report on time today.

The committee would have me express appreciation to the John Howard Society, Elizabeth Fry organization, Canadian Council of Churches, Salvation Army, and the organizations of the Roman Catholic faith, and many "after-care" associations, which it was our good fortune to contact. They presented briefs and rendered us a great service,

and their attendance at our meetings was greatly appreciated.

I would like at this time to express sincere appreciation of the goodwill, co-operation and kindness we received at the hands of the officers of several American institutions. Also, to give thanks to another group seldom heard of, that is to former inmates of our institutions who came forward of their own free will to express appreciation of treatment they had experienced in our institutions. We gave them every evidence of willingness to listen to what they had to say, and we were glad to have their contributions.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we wrote to every hon. member of the House for his opinion, asking if there was any institution which we should inspect in his riding. For the response which members made to this request, and for their co-operation, we are grateful. A great and valuable service has been rendered to Ontario by the press. The city and provincial papers kept the public well informed on the subject matter of our endeavours.

Mr. Speaker, the committee inspected 3 training schools operated by the department, 5 Roman Catholic training schools, 4 industrial reform schools, 3 industrial refuges (Roman Catholic), 1 industrial refuge at Mercer, 4 reformatories, 8 district jails operated by the department and 22 of the 45 county and city jails. We were at the Don Jail, we were at Hamilton, and also had the happy experience of going through the Peterboro City Hall and seeing the splendid facilities in that city. Some of these institutions we visited a number of times. Delegations of our committee visited 10 institutions outside of Ontario: Quebec, New York State, Michigan, Ohio, Detroit, Pennsylvania. Delegates also visited the Toronto police courts, and the detention home on Jarvis Street. The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), while in England for the Coronation, made an inspection of a number of institutions in the Mother Country at his own expense. All the officers of our institutions were examined separately so that no officer suffered

the embarrassment of his senior officer being present.

As we walked through the corridors, I met a number of inmates who could call me by my first name. I met a number of persons in prison who expressed their desire to see us. When they did so, the secretary listed their names and they were called. When they came before the committee, some were given a cigarette and put at their ease. One man stayed for 1½ hours while we listened to his story. We told them they were free to complain or to discuss any matter which was on their minds.

Mr. Speaker, like others on the committee I was deeply stirred on many occasions to see young boys and girls starting out in life with one strike on them. There were some with more. In our jails, industrial farms and reformatories the committee saw young men, middle-aged men, aged persons—all somebody's sons and daughters. And often we remarked to one another as we saw them filing out to work: "Yes, but for the Grace of God, there go I." That was the mental attitude of your committee. Never at any time in any circumstances in any institution we inspected was there a jeer, a groan, or a resentful attitude. Not a discordant note was expressed by any of the inmates. They were glad to see us and to know we were looking into conditions in the institutions, and many of them, of their own free will, expressed appreciation of the treatment they were receiving.

The committee was honoured, through the good offices of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) to attend a conference with Chief Justice McRuer. We had the benefit of the views of a number of judges, magistrates and sheriffs and some recognized authorities on penology.

The women's organizations have taken a deep and constructive interest in all matters pertaining to the problems of reform. As a committee we appreciate their interest. We gave consideration to the various ideas they presented. When hon. members receive the report they will, on examining the index, see the many different avenues of our approach to the problem. There are recommenda-

tions throughout this report. Hon. members will find for convenience there is a recapitulation in the back of the report which will, I believe, save time in getting to the recommendations.

Some people may be concerned with the cost of this investigation. The cost of effort, the cost of time, and energy and the financial cost of the inquiry are, I submit, infinitesimal as compared with the cost in dollars alone that has been caused in a number of instances by inmates' destructive demonstrations and the damage to property and even to human life which they cause. The committee held 153 meetings, many since the House opened. Some of the meetings, when out of town on inspections and examinations, lasted from early morning until late at night. We examined about 400 witnesses. We attended the convention of American Prison Societies. While in Toronto, we had the benefit of attending a conference with various committees, with the clergy, and with the After-Care Association. We invited them to hear an address given by an outstanding world authority on penology, the Rev. Martin Tinker of England.

May I say, with all the emphasis I can command, Mr. Speaker, that it is not our intention in this report to suggest for a moment any personal criticism of the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) or of any former Minister, nor of the government or of any former government. Further, we do not claim to know all the answers to this major problem. Our report is submitted respectfully as a constructive, critical analysis of the department. Any criticism in the report is based on the three words "Is it fair?" The committee interpreted the terms of reference to mean that the House wanted an unbiased, honest examination of the department. That is what we have striven to put before hon. members. Twenty-five years have elapsed since the last examination of the department. The present report contains 142 recommendations and a tribute of appreciation for the commendable achievements of the department, such as the two reformatories at Mimico and Brampton and the

industrial farms at Guelph and Burwash. The reformatory at Brampton, Ontario, is outstanding, in the opinion of the committee, and of anyone who has ever visited it. The Alexander G. Brown Clinic for the Treatment of Alcoholics at Mimico, created under the present Ministry, enjoys a highly creditable record of achievement in salvaging our human resources. Brampton is a notable achievement, as is the clinic at Mimico, and both institutions can be claimed as outstanding. They are portents for national good, reclaiming and restoring to society the nation's greatest asset—human resources. There is also a comforting measure of confidence due to the present Minister, who is also a Minister of the Gospel as well as of the Crown, a man who by service in Her Majesty's Forces knows well the prisoners' view, for he has himself been a prisoner of war. For courage and bravery in the field he received the highest decoration the Crown can bestow, the Victoria Cross.

Mr. Speaker, we, the committee salute the Minister as a great soldier, and a man of courage and valour. We also salute the former Minister and the governments down through the years who have been responsible for the finance and administration of the department. Our past is a heritage, the future is our responsibility.

In our travels, Mr. Speaker, we found no evidence of political domination or motivation in the management of any of our institutions; no evidence of inhumane treatment; no evidence of brutalities; no persecution; no oppression; no holes, no pits and no dungeons for punishment.

I well recall one recidivist who claims acquaintance with me. He has a record of 37 convictions. He asked to come before the committee at Burwash. He said: "I have been coming here for years. You are leaning over backwards in providing comforts here. No one is afraid to come, and many do not want to leave."

Mr. Speaker, there are two schools of thought about treatment of prisoners, both tending to go to extremes, and

neither of which your committee believes, in the extreme, to be correct. One group stresses rigid preventive treatment to the last letter. The other is composed of social idealists with ivory-tower ideals and theories impractical to carry out. Such policies, if applied to inmates, would turn our institutions into rest homes. In some cases, the committee thinks that to a degree in some places they have, indeed, succeeded in having them turned into rest homes. Reasonable punitive treatment, we believe, is essential, but it has tended, in some cases, to be palliative to the detriment of reform.

A reasonable measure of both policies, administered with common sense and measured by experience can provide good results.

Ontario cities and counties have a number of antiquated pre-Confederation jails. However, the housekeeping is good and the meals sufficient. The province operates 8 district jails which are outstanding as compared with the county jails. They are well ventilated, the housekeeping excellent, and the meals good. Mr. Speaker, the committee believes that the idea of industrial farms is sound leadership and that more farms are urgently needed—farms that have plenty of arable land. Some of the industrial farms have only improvised buildings, converted army huts. The idea is sound, but the accommodation is not what it might be. Burwash—and we believe that institution is ably governed—should cease to be known as an industrial farm, and be designated and operated to house only recidivists and the non-reformable type, with sufficient hours of labour imposed on the inmate to constitute a good honest day's work. Henceforth, that place, your committee recommends, should be known as "Burwash Provincial Prison." Hard labour is almost a forgotten term. I remarked to a magistrate one day, "You never hear of a sentence now carrying the words 'Hard labour'." He said: "That is right, you don't." I said: "Perhaps it is all right. I do not know if we could give it them if you did order it." In other jurisdictions, like those in the United

States, they have put up costly buildings established and especially designed for the purpose.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is no jurisdiction that the committee knows of that surpasses Ontario's institutions for food, well prepared, excellent as to quality, sufficient and plentiful in quantity. No institution surpasses Ontario's for the physical care of its inmates or provides greater educational opportunities for trade training, and more humane treatment, maintenance of the decencies of life as far as they can be accorded to incarcerated persons. The prisoners in Ontario institutions are treated as persons by the department, whose sole desire is to create wholesome conditions of social life in our training schools and reformatories.

One of the causes taxing the accommodation in our institutions is juvenile delinquency. Your committee examined every possible avenue to determine the cause, and the possible cure, but we do not offer a complete solution, and the report does not claim to have any panacea. There are many people crowding our institutions who began committing offences while juveniles, many of them long before they reached maturity. There is, we believe, a regrettable lack of any procedure to deal adequately with adolescents.

We believe youth is a good time for reform. A campaign to impress the parents with their responsibility to their children would, we believe, lead to a great deal of good. Having been mayor of this city for 4 years in the dark days of depression, I know how homes are shattered by hardship. Law-abiding people had to live in conditions of the utmost want and distress. We had a Welfare Department and I remember well going into the hostels and being with men who had served overseas. They were housed in separate hostels. I have travelled across the rails from Sudbury to Chalk River in the work camps. When I think how law-abiding citizens had to struggle to get a living in the days of the depression and see today even the prisoners are living a great deal better than the many law-

abiding personnel were living, on relief, I am bound to reflect how times have changed.

We have conditions where parents do not assume responsibility. In some cases parents have been attracted to lucrative fields of employment, and the mother is employed and the children are running the streets. Another factor which contributes largely to juvenile delinquency is the housing shortage—families have to live, eat and sleep in one room, or too few rooms. Another factor is the severance of church connections and the lack of spiritual guidance which parents should give their offspring. We have gone through great changes. Years ago a family went to church as a family. In the next decade the children were sent there. Now nobody seems to care whether the children go or not.

The factors which produce juvenile delinquents, who help to fill our institutions, include amongst others, shattered homes, widowed mothers or mothers who are receiving mothers' allowances, and forced by the high cost of living to take part-time employment. The welfare costs of various kinds paid by this province to those in homes broken by the incarceration of a parent, run annually to about \$250,000. A breakdown of that figure shows: direct relief by the municipalities, more than \$200,000; mothers' allowances and Department of Welfare costs \$40,000 annually.

Another contributing factor to juvenile delinquency, we believe, may be referred to as educational deficiencies. "There are some boys who just will not go to school; they are unable to assimilate an academic course. Your committee believes if they had an opportunity to work at a trade or skill which required the use of their hands, they could be held for the time required to enable them to complete their education.

Other causes of delinquency which came to the attention of your committee, are the comic books which glorify crime, and depict a flagrant disregard for law and order; radio and television programmes which feature fictional crime of a serious nature; the pinball

machines; and gambling with all its attendant evils. While I cannot elaborate fully upon it now, I think it is high time we gave closer supervision and inspection to vending machines and the type of products which they are offering for sale. Without going into the subject further, I would point out that in states not far distant, a sub-committee witnessed what is being sold in slot machines, and I may say that we do not want it in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I shall give only the highlights of our recommendations; and, if I may, refer hurriedly to but a few of them.

First, there is the division of responsibility as between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario regarding the housing and custodial care of prisoners. The basis of division—which has not been revised since 1859—provides that prisoners sentenced to 2 years less a day shall go to the jails, and for 2 years or more, to a federal institution. It is of interest to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1953, a total of 4,870 inmates in Ontario reformatories and industrial farms were convicted for offences under the federal statutes; and of such federal offences, 3,515 were indictable and 1,355 were non-indictable. On further investigation, it is shown to be a fact that, in 1953, 23 persons were sent to provincial institutions with a definite sentence of more than 2 years. They receive for the first offence 2 years less a day; 2 years for the second offence; and then the third, fourth and so on, which may aggregate 10 years, and yet they go to an Ontario institution. Had the sentencing magistrate or judge said they were to get 2 years or 3 years, the prisoners would have gone to a federal institution; but by the way the sentences were imposed, the prisoners became a provincial responsibility.

It may be of interest for the hon. members to read the Archambault Report of 1938. It is not included in the report of your committee, but I have an extract from it here.

The Archambault Report, of 1938, recommended that:

The Federal Government take over the administration of all prisons, the provinces retaining only a sufficient number to provide for offenders against provincial statutes, prisoners on remand, and those serving short sentences.

Mr. Speaker, what an exodus of prisoners we would have, if that recommendation were ever implemented.

In a brief presented to the hon. Minister of Justice, we recommended a division of responsibility. The committee informed the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Attorney-General that we proposed to go to Ottawa. The committee went to Ottawa and was graciously received by the hon. Minister of Justice, who gave us an attentive and kindly hearing. We presented many matters which we thought should receive consideration, and he has invited the committee, at its earliest opportunity, to file a brief, which he in turn will hand to the federal committee which has been appointed to look into the matter of penal reform.

I turn now to the subject of "divided authority over the inmates in our own institutions." I would point out, Mr. Speaker, we have the right to grant parole to prisoners serving an indefinite sentence; however, we have nothing to do with tickets-of-leave or remissions of definite sentence. Your committee believes we should have control in our own institutions in its entirety. This question was discussed with the hon. Minister of Justice, and we believe if we can release those under indefinite sentence, we should have authority regarding those under definite sentence. To the credit of the Department of Justice of Canada, applications for tickets-of-leave are referred to the Reform Department of Ontario for an expression of opinion before such leave is granted. I think I am correct in that statement.

Further, we have recommended that in the case of an inmate receiving consecutive sentences, not aggregating more than 2 years, the prisoner should not become a provincial responsibility. We

have in our institutions habitual criminals, many recidivists, and many more who have served penitentiary terms, and some who have been in an institution on a number of occasions. I submit to those learned in the law that the Criminal Code—which I may say is difficult to understand on the question of habitual criminals—should be clarified. We believe a person who has served a term in a penitentiary, or who has been in one of our reform institutions for, say 3 terms, is not reformable material, and should not be permitted to contaminate those who may be reformed. We are asking for some provision as to the proper way of dealing with such persons.

I turn now to the recommendation of longer indefinite sentences. The governors of our Mercer Reformatory, our jails and industrial farms, tell us it is futile to sentence a person on a drug charge for 30 or 60 days. There is little more to be done than house him. As to the habitual drunkard, who turns up in court every few weeks, and whom we are virtually keeping, we are asking for a longer indefinite sentence. In that way, this type of person may be sent to a place where he can be put to work and completely “dehydrated” and get a new outlook before returning to society.

There are, in our institution at Brampton a number of splendid young men who are not there long enough to complete their training or to learn a trade. It is an excellent institution, and many of the chaps would like to stay on for a longer period of time. I know the hon. Minister is in sympathy with this recommendation; but as matters now stand, these prisoners cannot stay one minute beyond their sentenced time. We are making a definite recommendation that something should be done for the young man who wants to stay on in the institution in order to learn a trade or complete a reasonable measure of apprenticeship.

In passing, I should like to express the appreciation of the committee for the complete co-operation and response we received from organized labour, and its attitude toward the young people

who are taking their punishment in our institutions in giving credit to them on required period of apprenticeship.

Those learned in the law tell us there should be clarification and definition of “mental illness” and “insanity.” It is 80 years since last defined.

On the question of “time off for good behaviour,” I should like to point out that the man who is sentenced to jail for 6 months cannot get a remission of 1 day for good behaviour. We think he should be given the same consideration, and reward for good conduct, which is given to men serving their sentences in our industrial farms or reformatories.

I turn now to the recommendation of the “expunging of records,” but it is rather difficult to explain briefly the details as to how this recommendation can be implemented. Your committee agrees unanimously, as they do on every point, in the recommendation that where a young person, following conviction, has gone straight for a period of 5 years after his discharge, he should have his record expunged. As you know, that record now turns up against him many years after he has served his sentence. For instance, when he goes to get a job, or when his son or daughter suggest they take a trip across the border to the United States, he is faced with his record, and he knows there are certain things he cannot do. We think that encouragement should be given to him to “go straight.” This recommendation does not apply to people who have been convicted of major offences, but rather to those who have served time on minor offences. We believe that after good behaviour for a period of 5 years such a person should be given a clean bill of health.

The committee recommends there be established a central place of execution. I may say that we have not been flooded with applications from any hon. members that such an institution be established in their ridings. We discussed this matter at some length, and in our brief we are suggesting the Criminal Code be amended so that the matter of a central place of execution be left at the option of the province. In that way, a prisoner

condemned to death would not return to the place from whence he came, but go to a place designated as the central place of execution. The committee further recommends that if a central place of execution is established, it be in one of our existing institutions, and that a separate institution be not set up for that purpose.

As hon. members know, our jails serve many purposes; they are used as lock-ups, they are used by people serving sentences, they house persons on remand, they provide accommodation for mental cases; they even serve as a depot for persons being held by the Immigration Department for deportation. Your committee believes there should not be such a variety of uses for our jails.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in our brief to the hon. Mr. Garson, we ask for an enactment in the Criminal Code to make riotous conduct in a custodial institution an offence. At the present time, there is no legislation which deals with those guilty of riotous conduct. This should be regarded as a major offence.

Concerning the drug peddlers—those who cater to the unfortunate persons who are slaves to the habit and who are condemned for life—your committee believes there is no penalty too severe for those who traffic in drugs. We would like to see the Criminal Code provide a very severe penalty for that offence. Our recommendation, Mr. Speaker, and through you, to the hon. Prime Minister, is that these matters be studied, and that at the earliest possible moment, a brief be placed before the hon. Minister of Justice for further consideration.

There are a large number of recommendations in our report with which I shall not take time to deal now. They appear at the end of the report, and you can read and study them when the report reaches your hands.

As an encouragement to the Bramp-ton institution, which is doing such a splendid job, your committee, Mr. Speaker, recommends that that place cease to be known as a "reformatory." While the men who go there are sentenced to the reformatory, we think that

some name other than "The Ontario Reformatory" be placed on the gate.

The question of salaries has been a factor in the large turn-over of guards in our custodial institutions. In areas where private enterprise adjacent to an institution is looking for trained men, there is a constant drain on the institutional staff; and men often take jobs as guards, merely to tide them over until something else turns up. We think something should be done to provide more attractive salaries to induce help to remain with the penal institution and dedicate their lives to the work.

Your committee also recommends that where custodial officers have displayed great valour or bravery, in discharge of their duty there should be some departmental recognition of it, not in dollars and cents, but in some other way. We suggest that where a man wearing a uniform has shown exemplary service, some recognition, such as a chevron to be worn on his sleeve, should be given to him.

Burwash is a self-contained municipality occupied in its entirety by our own staff. Housing is a problem. A number of guards at Guelph drive many miles each day to and from their homes. Others get home at week-ends only. But housing is certainly a problem. They cannot pay the prices asked, and if they could pay, the houses are not to be had. This matter was discussed at length by our committee. We do not think the government should go into the housing business; we do not believe in that system; but we do think that representations should be made to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, or one of the building companies, whereby they could acquire land adjacent to these institutions. If this were not practicable, sell them a corner of our property to build houses of the type and price the guards could afford to pay. Sell to them on the condition that as long as they remain in the employ of the institution they can occupy that property, but when they sever their connection with the institution and wish to go elsewhere, the property would revert back to the vendor on terms agreed upon at the time of sale.

We recommend that reforestation work at Burwash be extended and that more arable land be purchased at various places for extended farm operations. We would like to compliment those responsible for the inauguration of these activities, which tend to take the pressure off jails and relieve the problem of idleness—the greatest curse to which these institutions are exposed. More farms, with good arable land, are urgently required. Temporary structures, in the form of army huts, have been utilized. It was a splendid idea, but we think that wherever possible these should be replaced with permanent structures. Such buildings should contain individual cells: Your committee is against the dormitory plan in adult institutions.

We believe our custodial institutions should be fully modernized with adequate appliances for safety, gang locks including fire alarm boxes where there is an adjacent civic fire alarm system. Another recommendation is the holding of periodic fire drills, which has not been the rule hitherto. There should be a definite liaison between the department and the civic and provincial fire inspection departments.

Also, chaplaincy facilities should be provided at all the major institutions. Referring to Guelph, the idea was mooted, not by the Minister, but by others, that the second dining room, which sometimes is not in use, should be converted into a chapel. To this suggestion your committee is strongly opposed, because when the institution is taxed to capacity it is better to have two dining rooms rather than to experience discontent among men who are waiting to get their meals and cannot be accommodated in the one dining room.

We think that the vacant hangar at Burtch might be used for the purpose of light industry. There are a number of men for whom no employment can be found, and are hanging around in idleness. As for medical attention, one is lucky to get a doctor to take on the care of any of these institutions on a part-time basis. If an inmate says: "I am a sick man," he just does not work. There is not any light employment. We

think at the hangar at Burtch, light industry could be started and everybody required to do something.

At Mimico there are a number of "hostel inmates." We think they should be taken away from the reformatory there.

We also recommend that the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic for Alcoholics be enlarged sufficiently to accommodate all inmate volunteers in the province who are likely to benefit from this treatment.

Also, that the Department of Reform Institutions sell all the vacant land there other than the clay deposit from which is made our bricks and tile. Vacant farm land is too valuable not to be used in that area, and we think that it should be disposed of.

Further, that the Department of Reform Institutions sell the Andrew Mercer Reformatory property when the time is opportune, and build another institution which would provide a section having accommodation of the cottage type to house inmates.

We further recommend that the buildings and land at the Training School for Boys at Cobourg be disposed of. They are costly to operate and unsuitable for the purpose for which they are used. Your committee believes that to replace this institution a new school should be built at Bowmanville to house both groups of boys at the one location and that the Cobourg property be sold.

For the incorrigible boy not amenable to the opportunities provided in the Training School for Boys at Guelph, we think recourse should be had to some type of industrial school such as they have in England, where a boy gets lots of exercise and employment under supervision in an industrial school.

The multiplicity of controls of jails and reform institutions, through the sheriffs, the Department of Reform Institutions, and the municipality, is not, in our opinion, conducive to their best management, and we recommend that control be taken over by the Department of Reform Institutions. The question of cost is one to be determined by the government.

As I remarked earlier, a number of jails across the province are antiquated, and little used. If the government were operating the jails, consideration could be given to the consequences of these conditions; and the municipalities would be brought to realize the necessity of some change if they had to contribute to the cost. A number of these places might well be closed.

Also, jails should be used to house only adult persons on remand and those serving short sentences.

The Department of Reform Institutions should provide better facilities for visitors. Jails and institutions have made the best use of the facilities at hand, but they are far from what they ought to be. The best facilities of this kind that we saw were in a jail in New York City, where the prisoner can sit in a cubicle, with an interviewer at one end, and shatter-proof glass between them, with a communicating phone. The parties talk to each other in private; nobody is listening, and yet there is absolutely no chance of passing contraband.

Complaints have been made by the clergy and others as to the facilities at the Don. On the other hand great improvements have been made in facilities for interviewing prisoners.

We recommend that the examination of incoming prisoners be more thorough, using, where practicable, such devices as the fluoroscope, to intensify precautions against the entry of contraband.

As regards mental cases, we note that it has become the habit of magistrates to look at the procedure outlined in section 25 of the Mental Hospitals Act in dealing with suspended mental cases. However, although "a safe and comfortable place" as called for in that section of the Act has been considered by some magistrates to mean to the jails. There are no facilities in the jails to care for mental cases, other than, perhaps, a bed or possibly a special ward. The Department of Health makes a grant of \$8,500, and the Federal Government a grant of \$1,500, for every hospital which will install a bed in a detention ward. We must encourage hospitals to extend this

provision, but they will not do it unless they get some consideration in the way of maintenance grant, which, I think, the department is considering. It comes to this: if you are sick from the eyes up, you go to jail; if sick from the eyes down, you go to a hospital. Section 35 of the Mental Hospitals Act supplies the answer. Mental cases can be remanded to the hospital for attention. The Department of Health is building such facilities as the outdoor clinic at the Ontario Hospital, on Queen Street.

Your committee is very much concerned about the housing of mental cases in jail. It is not fair to the person who is mentally ill, nor is it fair to the rest of the inmates. Another recommendation we are making is that there be established a full-scale reception centre where a psychiatrist and a doctor can examine those who go there. At Elmira, in New York State, they have a reception diagnostic centre, at which all first offenders there, of the ages 16 to 21—now being raised to 25—are given daily observation, and a 6 weeks' examination by a psychiatrist, a doctor, a chaplain, a school teacher, a guard—everyone on the staff—who, at the end of 6 weeks, sit around a board room and discussing the case and the best method of dealing with it. A measure of this kind, by diagnosis of the cause of offence and prescribing the remedy, will help to break down the influx to our jails.

As regards segregation, the department, to the limit of its facilities, is doing what it can, but the inadequacy of segregation facilities is a great handicap to successful operation. We believe particular care should be taken in the segregation of sex deviates—perverts, homosexuals—the mentally afflicted, drug addicts, and psychopaths. Certainly, these must be segregated, and we must keep the reformable type separate from the non-reformable types. At no time in these institutions should there be any intermingling.

We are against the policy of dormitories in adult institutions.

Idleness is one of the greatest problems the department has to meet. In the jails, particularly, there is nothing other

than housekeeping for the inmates to do. To give them due credit, some of the inmates have said: "Let us get something to do." There is, of course, the other types you have to take by the scruff of the neck and the seat of the pants to make them take a breath of fresh air in the middle of the day; they just want to lie on their bunks and smoke cigarettes.

We believe there should be an exploration of the facilities for providing hard labour. The department has a number of productive operations by which money is provided to offset the expenditure of operation.

One thing we are recommending strongly is that greater emphasis be placed on spiritual guidance in custodial institutions. We are glad to learn the Minister has investigated this matter and, I understand, is instituting a chaplaincy course of training in some institutions. A chaplain is now taking a special course. We cannot recommend too strongly that the chaplaincy services be extended.

We also urge that the police station is the place where, at the time of an arrest, the slightest evidence of illness or injury be immediately investigated by a medical doctor, rather than defer the examination until the party arrives at the jail.

A word as to security. There have been a number of escapes from the Don Jail; but since the committee started to function a steel mesh enclosure has been constructed alongside the front door. When the patrol wagon or other means of transportation pulls up to the jail it drives in the enclosure, which is locked, and there is no means of escape. In our journeys across the province, this was the only place where we saw an enclosure at the place of the reception or discharge of prisoners. This is a measure of security which, we think, should be generally adopted.

We are also asking in our report, Mr. Speaker, for the same opportunities to be extended to female reformables as are given to males, at Brampton.

We ask for the extension of alcoholic facilities, and consideration of the

lowering standard of the I.Q.'s for people, to enable them to receive treatment, so as to embrace a greater number. We are also asking for longer sentences for addicts in order to effect cures. We are asking for research into the problem of the sex deviates in other jurisdictions. In some institutions we were told the only answer to the problem they knew was "incarceration and throw away the key." Apparently, from our investigation, there is no known medical or surgical cure as yet. We do not believe that lengthy incarceration is the complete answer. We are asking the government to give consideration to the investigation by top-flight medical men, and scientists, to study the problem and endeavour to find a solution. We also recommend that sex offenders be given indefinite sentences.

One highlight of our report is in regard to probation. We are recommending a Commission of Correction be established, to be composed of 3 outstanding persons. Now probation is being extended, and ably administered by the Department of the hon. Attorney-General.

It is a growing service, as is counselling, rehabilitation and parole, under the Department of Reform Institutions. Then you have this recommendation for a reception diagnostic centre.

Your committee felt that a commission of 3 could well supervise the work of these services, and be established as a semi-judicial body.

Under the Department of Reform Institutions would be the functions of the counselling, rehabilitation, parole, probation, and the diagnostic centre. It is evident that the greater the measure of probation, the more parole may be diminished.

We are asking for a semi-judicial body, and we recommend there should be some provision for appeal from the decisions of the Parole Board, to some authority. At first, we thought the appeal should rest with the Minister, but later, we felt that perhaps it would be better if the appeal were heard by the Commission on Corrections, if one be established.

In further connection with probation: pre-sentence reports should be furnished in all cases of first offenders, before sentence is passed. I understand that when the committee started to function, the probation services were not large in number, but now have been stepped up to about 35 officers. Mr. Speaker, in and around Greater Toronto, there are roughly about 100 persons on probation, and it may be interesting to the House to notice that the costs have not yet been brought to the lowest degree of refinement, but, at the present time, for 44 cents a day you can supervise a person on probation.

Then, too, he has not the stigma on his name of having been in an institution; he is self-supporting, and is able to support his family.

On the other hand, if a man is convicted and sent to an institution, it will cost, roughly, \$4.00 per day for his keep, plus what it may cost for the maintenance of his family while he is incarcerated.

We think it advisable to endeavour to keep a number of people out of the institutions by placing them on probation.

We believe the Parole Board should not wait until shortly before the date a man is due for discharge before being interviewed, but he should be interviewed progressively, so when time comes for his hearing, and for their decision, they will be familiar with the case before them.

We think that after-care service should be intensified. Mr. Speaker, we made a study of this, and the ratio between jail reformables is about 30 per cent. as against 70 per cent. who are not reformable. In our provincial institutions, about 20 per cent are reformable, while the other 80 per cent. are not.

We recommend that the efforts of the rehabilitation officers in caring for the reformables should be intensified, and confined, in a large measure, to those who are considered to be reformable. The other 80 per cent. have had their chance; they have been given job after job; the department has endeavoured to secure work for them.

When it comes to one who has had several chances, he has worn out his welcome, and continued efforts on his behalf will serve no purpose.

The committee feels if a man has gone through the rehabilitation process once, and comes back as a recidivist, he should then be sent to some institution where punitive treatment will be provided. Of course, upon his discharge, he should be given after-care, meals and lodging for a reasonable time until he gets a job; this will help to put him back on his feet. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the efforts in regard to the 20 per cent, should be intensified. We felt that this group are well worth considering. We also believe that after-care and rehabilitation are definitely the responsibility of the Department of Reform Institutions, and should not be delegated to outside bodies, to be subsidized.

We recommend we continue to accept co-operation from volunteer organizations. If they succeed, well and good; if not, the responsibility then falls back on the department, and we believe it should take the responsibility of after-care, at the same time welcoming all co-operation from outside agencies.

Your committee found a condition in the north country, in and around Sudbury. The department is unable legally to provide people with transportation back to their homes, upon being discharged either from the institution or by the court. There were cases brought to our attention which came from as far as 300 miles from Sudbury, and upon discharge, there were no means available to return them to their homes. We feel it is to the everlasting credit of the Ontario Provincial Police, who assist in helping these people toward their homes as far as it is possible for them to go. But there are many people coming there from areas which are not accessible by highway. The railroad is the only means of transportation, and they have no money with which to pay their fares.

Then, too, some have been brought into Sudbury, appeared before a court, and found innocent. They are left penniless many miles from home. It is a

sad picture to see a man or woman standing on the street with no money in his or her pocket. There is only one thing you can expect. They will be coming back into custody shortly. Your committee feels there has to be some half-way care provided for these people. We firmly believe that a first offender, if placed on probation, is more likely to reform, and to stay out of further trouble, than go into an institution, and then have us try to make some effort to reform him.

In a word, we are recommending the tightening-up of our institutions; recommending an adolescent court, to deal with adolescents. We are further recommending in our juvenile institutions, the issue of tobacco be cut off. We think that a bit of pampering which can well be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have given you a rough outline of what is in the report. I earnestly recommend the report to the careful consideration by all hon. members of the House.

I would like to say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Prime Minister, that there are but two alternatives in dealing with reform institutions.

We studied the statement by the provincial economist, who gave a forecast of the next decade in regard to the school population. If the incidence of crime continues on the present basis, and the population increases as forecast, in another decade we will require 50 per cent. more accommodation in our institutions—or else. What is the alternative? The alternative is to take the pressure off the front doors of these institutions by stepping up corrective measures in regard to juvenile delinquency, for an extension of probation services, and matters of that kind.

May I say that in this province, one out of every 175 of the population is represented by a conviction, whereas, in the Old Country one out of every 1,259 of population is convicted. I want to make that clear. I am not saying that one of every 175 is arrested and goes to jail, because of that 175, many may have been in many times. We met an inmate at North Bay, whom I asked, "How

many times have you been arrested?" and he said, "Do not be silly." I asked him again, "How many times have you been arrested? Twenty?" and he said, "Oh, talk sense." I asked again, "How many?" and he said, "Figure it out for yourself. I have been in some jail every month of every year since 1929." A man of that kind, would, of course, constitute more than one conviction.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, if the same set of figures continue in the next decade we will require 50 per cent. more accommodation, or a change in our methods, and have fewer convictions.

There has to be a great awakening of people to a deeper sense of their responsibility to the church of their faith, to the state, and to the three levels of government; there has to be a restoration of the family circle, a greater appreciation of home life, which is really the backbone of the nation, and we have to realize that to a much greater extent, and to appreciate our freedom, and our opportunities. It is our opinion definitely that probation can be productive of greater results than incarceration, and any attempt for reformation and after-care.

Recidivists are a major problem. From 65 to 80 per cent. of the inmates are recidivists, and, therefore, are considered unreformable.

I gave you the figure a moment or two ago about the number of institutions. We believe that in order to further reduce the inmate population, there should be segregation, particularly of the psychopaths, of the reformables from the non-reformables, of the sex deviates and perverts, the homosexuals, the recidivists, and a complete segregation of the younger offenders from the older.

In this province, the counties and cities are spending \$10 million a year, in round figures, for custodial institutions, plus the welfare costs of direct relief to maintain the families of those who are incarcerated.

At the training schools, the costs amount to about \$4.00 a day for boys, and from \$5.00 to \$5.50 for girls. We feel that perhaps some of these girls—

while we believe in giving them good environment—may be acquiring habits and tastes which people in ordinary circumstances may not be able to afford.

If you look at the report by the hon. Minister, it will reveal the variations of costs in the operations of jails, running from \$2.90 per inmate per day up to \$12.90 per day. As I say, in the province, the counties and cities have spent over \$10 million in custodial institutions, and the department has received from farm and manufactured products, for use only in other government institutions, something over \$2 million—at least, that was the figure last year.

In the schedules attached to the report will be seen tables setting out clearly this information for you in detail. If the hon. members will study the schedules, and break them down into their various headings, they will see there is a great variation in comparative costs, which, in the opinion of the committee, calls for rigid budgetary control, and review. However the department is producing by its treatment either reformed or unreformed persons.

May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the hon. members of the House that human values cannot be measured by a dollar standard. The inmates should not be kept in idleness, but whether in an institution or on probation, facilities should be provided for work, so that the inmates, especially, will not be forced to spend their waking hours in idleness.

In only one jail in the Province of Ontario did the committee find facilities for work for the inmates, and that was in the Frontenac County Jail in the City of Kingston, where they are making cement tile for municipal use.

In closing, I would like to leave this thought with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the hon. Prime Minister: the jail farm at Langstaff has been taken over by the Department of Health, and your committee feels it should be returned at the earliest possible moment to the City of Toronto, to take some of the pressure off the Don Jail. The government is getting it for \$1.00 a year—we may think. Let us look at the facts. It is to

the credit of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions to endeavour to avoid further trouble and demonstrations in the Don Jail, and unless the overloading is relieved, there is always the danger of further trouble. Again to the credit of the department, it can be said that a great deal of the pressure has been taken off. How? By transporting prisoners who should be on the jail farm to provincial institutions, at a cost of nearly \$500,000 to the Province of Ontario. To be fair, it may be said of the City of Toronto that it has a great capital investment there, and perhaps \$500,000 may represent a fair return, but let us not delude ourselves into thinking we are getting Langstaff for \$1.00 a year.

Also, you must consider the harm that may come through overcrowding the Don Jail. We, as a committee, feel that this requires very early consideration.

The motion for the investigation endorsed by this House, and I think the report we bring in, if hon. members study it and consider it they will see the House was justified in accepting the motion and going on with the investigation; and on behalf of the committee it has been my privilege to be associated with, if at any time the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) would like to discuss any of the recommendations, I know every member of the committee will be very happy, ready and willing to give whatever service he can.

Again I would like to remind you, in regard to the recommendations we have presented in the hope of improving our service that when you study them, do not lose sight of the fact that no one surpasses the Ontario institutions for humane treatment, kindness, good food and opportunity, and I know the department and the committee will agree we are trying to build a social edifice worthy of the builders, and in Ontario, prisoners are still treated as persons.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon)

moved the motion which was later accepted by the government, and this committee was constituted, I am sure neither he nor the government had in mind they were going to "get" anybody, nor that they were out to severely criticize the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) in charge of the department. The whole purpose of the hon. member by the motion was there should be an exacting examination of the Department of Reform Institutions, and the policies emanating therefrom, and that this committee should report to the House in an unbiased way, and with recommendations which would tend to increase the efficiency of the department on the one hand, and point out the deficiencies in policy in respect to reform institutions on the other.

May I say, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that all the members of the committee agree with me, I am sure, when I say that no committee this House ever set up has had as its chairman a more energetic person than the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart). Ever since the committee commenced its sittings, the hon. member for Parkdale has been "on the go" and has constantly been trying to better conditions existing in this Province of Ontario.

It would be useless, and would serve no purpose, to go over the various aspects upon which the hon. member for Parkdale has touched, this afternoon. Therefore, I want simply to emphasize what, in my opinion, are the outstanding recommendations contained within the report, and may I say to the House, in concurring with what the hon. member has said, that so far as the institutions are concerned, and so far as the care of the prisoners and the meals served to the prisoners in the Province of Ontario are concerned, the committee has no criticism of any great consequence to offer. I believe we are caring for the people who have been sentenced to those institutions in a manner which would meet with the approval of the great majority of the people of this province, and the recommendations in this committee's report do not bear very heavily on this aspect of the situation, but rather have to do with the policies

in effect at the present time governing the Department of Reform Institutions.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Reform Institutions has a twin obligation to anyone who is sentenced to one of their institutions. In the first place, their obligation is to ensure that the person is detained in custody while he serves the sentence meted out to him by the court. In the second place, they have the responsibility of trying to reform the individual while he is in detention, so when he leaves the institution he will go back into free society with the idea in mind that he has erred, and that he is determined to correct those errors, and live a decent honest life.

Of those twin obligations the Department of Reform Institutions has, the one concerning the detaining of prisoners, I would say to the House, has been well looked after; so far as reforming the prisoner once he is in the institution, I think we have a right to expect a much better deal than we have had, and much better results than have emanated from the policies in vogue. Outside of Brampton, I would say to the House that our policy of the reformation of prisoners has fallen far short of what we have a right to expect. Brampton is a pilot scheme. It is an experimental place which looks to all of us as if it is going to be something really worthwhile. But so far as the other institutions are concerned, I am quite candid in saying to the House this afternoon that so far as the reformation of prisoners is concerned, we just have not gone very far. I think we have wasted a lot of money in the attempt, and I will tell you why.

Before you can have reformation of prisoners within institutions, two things must be apparent. In the first place, you must have proper segregation before you can have any hope of ultimate reformation. Segregation in our institutions today simply does not exist, I am frank and candid in saying to the House this afternoon. The segregation of prisoners is a myth, it is a thing we give lip service to, but in actuality and practice, it just does not exist and, therefore, without proper segregation

and classification of prisoners, we cannot expect to have a beneficial reformation of the prisoners themselves.

The hon. member (Mr. Stewart) mentioned—and it struck the committee very forcibly—that one cannot expect the money we are paying for rehabilitation, for psychiatrists, and all these people we send in to the prisoners to tell them how to live better, is going to be well used, unless it is directed primarily to the particular group which it is possible to reform. What is happening in our prisons and reformatories in this province is we send these men in, paying them decent salaries, and telling them to go in and sow the good seed, and reform those who have been bad; but they go into the institutions, they are dealing with 100 per cent. of the institutional population. There are, I suppose, only between 20 and 25 per cent. of that population whom it is possible to reform, yet our efforts are directed towards the 100 per cent.

I suggest to the House, to the hon. Prime Minister, and to the government this afternoon that we are not going to get the full benefit of our reformatory efforts, unless we direct our money and our talents and our man power to dealing with those whom it is possible to reform, that is, the 20 or 25 per cent. That is where segregation enters the picture again. It is just like pouring water over a dam, unless we segregate the prisoners to the degree that we know pretty well those who are capable of reformation, and those on whom we are throwing money away in trying to reform them. It seems to me we have a very long way to go in this province in that regard.

The only other point I want to touch upon is that of "probation." I believe once a chap goes to jail, the chances of reforming him have pretty well disappeared. You can do a lot more toward getting a young chap back on the straight and narrow path if you put him on probation, rather than sending him to jail. Once he has been contaminated with the environment that is prevalent in all our institutions, his chances of reformation are very slim indeed. So in that respect, at least, what

we can do in regard to probation should be examined very carefully. I think it is easier to reform a man on probation than after you put him in jail.

On the other hand, from a purely mercenary point of view, I agree with the hon. member, that unless we do something to tackle this problem of the jail population, we are going to be in a very difficult position in this province within a very few years. If present trends, as indicated by the figures, continue, one of two things has to happen, either we will have to spend money to build new jails and new accommodation throughout this province, or we have to devise a policy which will reform a number of those whom we have in our institutions and, in addition, step up our probation system, in order to keep out of jail those who should not properly be there.

This is not a new thing. Other countries in the world have gone a long way with respect to probation and keeping people out of jail. We on the committee were told that when the probation services really got going in England many years ago, they had to close a lot of the jails because there were no candidates for admission.

I do not say we should put everybody on probation but I do say to the House this afternoon that we could not spend more wisely than to give to the Department of Reform Institutions \$500,000, or \$1 million if they need it, to set up in this province a proper system of probation. I believe if we did that, not only would we keep out of jail many men who should not be there, but we would have a better chance of those young men getting on the straight and narrow path. From a purely mercenary point of view, we would be saving a great deal of money for the Province of Ontario, because you can keep a man on probation for one-tenth of the cost of keeping him in jail. These things, it seems to me, are very important, and stand out as highlights of this committee's report.

May I say, as I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, that I noticed in the paper this morning some criticism of a report of another committee of this House.

Certainly the same sort of criticism cannot be directed against this committee and its report, for I think we have been fearless in making our recommendations to the province, and to this Legislature. We have not "played politics." I think all hon. members of the House will agree that was not our purpose in asking for the committee. We felt there was a problem here. We thought there were solutions to be found, and each member of the committee worked assiduously to find those solutions, and we believe in this report the solutions to a great many of these problems are contained. If some of the report tends to criticize the Department of Reform Institutions, that is only incidental to a very large problem; it just happened that the policies in vogue at the present time do not meet with the views of the members of the committee. I do not think this government appointed the committee to "whitewash" the Department of Reform Institutions; I believe they appointed it to do a job and that is what the committee tried to do.

This is my last word to the House in this respect, Mr. Speaker. This committee's report, together with those of other committees, will be useful only insofar as it is implemented by the administration in power. I have great faith in committee work in this Legislature, I am very strong for Select Committees of the Legislature to deal with particular problems, but we are only going to maintain interest in such committees in the public mind if the government and the department concerned implements the recommendations of the committee. If the department ignores the committee's report, then the next committee which sits will not have public confidence behind them to the same degree, because the public will be apt to say: "Oh well, the last committee which sat made a very fine report, but nothing came out of it by way of legislation."

I think the hon. Prime Minister is seized with the importance, not only of saying that this is a good report, but of implementing it, insofar as it lies within the power of the government, and

within the judgment of hon. members of the House.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, in saying a few words in connection with this report, I wish first to congratulate our chairman on the very fine address he made this afternoon, in fact, Mr. Speaker, he has been so complete in his report, that I have been made to feel I am in a somewhat similar position to a person who on a platform says: "so and so has stolen my thunder." Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman this afternoon has "stolen the thunder" of every member of the committee. He has covered the report very, very fully.

I wish also to say that it was a pleasure to serve on this committee. The members of it were interested, each one paid a great deal of attention to the work of the committee, was present on every possible occasion, and assisted at our hearings.

I wish particularly to refer to the work of the chairman. I know if meetings were called for 10 o'clock, and I had occasion to be in the buildings at 8.30 or 9 on other work, I found the chairman "chasing around" getting ready for the meeting of that day. He devoted a great deal of attention to the committee's work and I am sure every member of the committee, as well as all hon. members of the House, owes a debt of gratitude to him for being one of the finest and most energetic chairmen we have ever had on a committee.

Mr. Speaker, I presume by now hon. members will realize that, roughly speaking, our reformatory institutions fall into 4 distinct classes. Firstly, we have the reformatories; secondly, the industrial farms; thirdly, the training schools; and fourthly, the district and county jails. The first 3 are reformatory in outlook, and in practice; the fourth is custodial only. The chairman has dealt very fully with the work of all 4, but I want to say a few words about our county and district jails.

The 8 district jails are very fine buildings. They were built by the province within the past 25 years, and they are doing a good job. They are up-to-date,

and well constructed for the purpose for which they are used. But as regards our county jails, I am afraid their day has come and gone, they are antiquated, obsolete, old "bastilles" in many cases. I had never had occasion to be in any of them prior to my work with the committee, but I was startled and surprised when I went into some of these old county jails, to see the type of construction. Some of them have long rows of cells, maybe two and a half feet wide or a little more, with walls between the cells of about an equal width. Every one had a separate lock, a turnkey who wanted to unlock one of the cells would go along with a long key, somewhat similar to the tool used by motorists in taking the wheels off their cars, and push it into a wall about a foot and a half wide and "fiddle around" for a while, until it clicked in the lock, and then he would turn it and in that manner could release the inmates.

I would like to tell hon. members of a rather funny incident which happened in one of the jails. We were examining the width of these cells and some of us were trying to see just how wide they were. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) when walking into a cell, had to turn sideways to get in where the bed was. The beds are the exact width of the cells. There is no space on either side of the beds, there is a little space of about a foot at the end. I believe the beds are pulled out and made up, then pushed back in, and when the men get in, the doors are locked behind them and they are left there until next morning.

It so happened that in one such jail, a very stout female was brought in one evening and ordered into a cell. After some persuasion they got her in. During the night the turnkey heard a lot of screaming and shouting. He notified the matron, who raced in to find what the matter was, and it turned out this stout female had tried to turn over in her bed, and was stuck.

In these antiquated old jails there is no ventilation whatsoever, and the lighting is very poor. There is no work provided. All the prisoners have to do

is to sweep the corridors and clean out their cells each day. I think the time has come when the province could very well take over the management of these county jails, and perhaps consolidate 8 or 10 counties into one jail district and build a decent jail in each district. These old buildings have served their day and should be demolished.

Another point which was very forcibly brought to the attention of the committee was the question of salaries. I do not believe there was one institution we visited but after a while, the guards and custodial officers got around to mentioning to us the question of salaries.

As you know, as has been explained by the chairman, the custodial officers and guards were brought in and permitted to talk to the committee freely. They discussed their problems with us, and, invariably, before leaving they stated there was one more matter they wanted to mention, and that was the matter of salaries. In every institution, the question of salaries was brought up. I think it is time we, in this province, paid a decent salary to those who are doing the job the officials of the department are doing.

We visited several institutions in the United States. We found in Wayne County, Michigan, I think it was, guards were paid a great deal more than some of our senior officials. Guards were getting higher salaries as guards in Wayne County Jail than our senior officials are in Ontario. That will illustrate one of the reasons why we have the tremendous turn-over in personnel.

In Guelph, the turn-over is practically 50 per cent. per year. That does not tend to give us good administration. What we desire, Mr. Speaker, is, when a guard is employed, he will accept his appointment, determined to make it his life's work, and that he is going to remain with that department, and not just make it a "stop-gap," while he looks for another job in industry.

Another thing we found was the temporary nature of the buildings at our industrial farms. I know, Mr. Speaker, the department has done a great deal of work in setting up industrial farms, but

I think the time has come when we should destroy all the temporary buildings, and construct permanent buildings at our industrial farms. The old army huts which have been used are not conducive to good reformatory measures. They are, as was mentioned by the chairman, of the dormitory type, and we, as a committee, are completely opposed to the dormitory-type of custodial care.

Mr. Speaker—and this has also been referred to by the chairman, and by the hon. Leader of the Opposition—we have in our reformatories too many men receiving reformatory measures, who are not reformatory. In other words, about 80 per cent. of the inmates of some of our institutions should never be in reformatories.

The committee believes the institution at Burwash should be made an Ontario Prison, and those who are not reformatory should be sent to that institution, so that officers attempting to reform men can concentrate their efforts on the 20 or 25 per cent. who are reformatory.

It is useless to attempt to reform men who have been in the penitentiary 3 or 4 times, or men who have been in our reform institutions 8 or 10 times. I know the committee, as a whole, was surprised quite often, when questioning some of the inmates, to find the number of times some of these young fellows had been in an institution. We asked for their opinion of the treatment in the institution, and so on, and later on we asked them for particulars regarding their committals, and, quite freely, they admitted they had been in institutions on different occasions, and sometimes even in a penitentiary. Upon checking their records in the office, we were startled to find that quite often some of these bright young fellows to whom we had been talking, had been inmates of our reformatories 8 or 10 times, and also inmates of a penitentiary 2 or 3 times.

Men who have served more than 3 sentences in a reformatory, or a penitentiary, should not go back to a reformatory. That was very strongly brought to our attention by an old prisoner at Burwash.

This man had requested permission to come in and speak to the committee. He was a man of 65 or 67 years of age, and when he got in, he sat down and said: "Gentlemen, I did not ask to come here to speak on my own behalf. I want to talk about the young chaps. There are some young fellows here in Burwash whom you can do something for. There are others for whom you cannot. Do something to segregate those prisoners. Take the young fellow who has not been in an institution before, and keep him away from the rest of the prisoners in the institution. Take, for instance, my own case. I am now serving my 37th sentence, and what the devil am I doing in a reformatory?"

That man was putting it plainly to us. What was a man doing in a reformatory who had served so many sentences? The committee, as a whole, believes a separate institution should be constructed, preferably at Burwash, to where men who are not reformatory can be sent, and there serve their terms of imprisonment. At the same time, those men should be given hard labour.

In our courts we quite often hear the convicting magistrate or judge sentence a prisoner to "hard labour." Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as "hard labour" in our institutions today. A man may be in our county jails and considered serving a term with "hard labour." All he has to do is sweep out the corridor and his own cell, perhaps. That is not "hard labour."

We think that in each institution some industrial plant should be set up, so these men can be given work which will keep them busy. If they are not reformatory, then "hard labour" and a greater degree of punishment will induce these men to decide they will not come back again in the near future. If we make our institutions too much of rest homes, then these men will come back as repeaters. They do not mind coming back. The man who is caught for a crime today does not fear a term of imprisonment in our institutions.

I would just like to stress one or two of the major suggestions made by our chairman, and also by the hon. Leader of

the Opposition, the first of which is in regard to a Commission on Correction.

Our committee is very, very strongly "sold" on the setting up of a Commission on Correction, which would administer probation, the rehabilitation of prisoners, or, as we call it in our report, "after-care," and also the reception centre, as recommended in our report. We believe the reception centre is one of the finest things which can be introduced into our penal system. We saw it in operation in Elmira, New York, and it was very impressive.

I know the members of the committee who went to Elmira and saw the work of this centre, were very much impressed. We were given seats in a room where about 12 or 14 specialists were sitting around a table. As explained by the chairman, these specialists had spent about 6 weeks considering the case of each applicant with whom they were to deal. The psychologist had spent a great deal of time with them; the educational director, the custodial officer, and so on had spent sometime with every prisoner, and each one had prepared a written report.

This written report was turned over to a secretary, who condensed the written reports and prepared a composite report, which he sent to each member of the committee.

On the day appointed for the hearing, the committee, consisting of about 12 or 14 men, discussed the case of the person appearing before it, as to what institution he would be sent to serve his sentence. The discussion, in some cases, did not amount to much. Some of the cases were clear-cut. The majority of the committee agreed, and the case was disposed of in 10 or 15 minutes.

However, those on which the committee disagreed on some of the points, took a considerable length of time. One case we heard took an hour and ten minutes, I think it was, for the committee to decide what was to be done with the inmate. The discussion was very, very interesting. We heard the viewpoints of the different men. They would argue with each other, and battle for their particular viewpoint. That lasted for

about an hour and ten minutes until eventually the chairman put the question to a vote as to where this inmate would go, whether to a certain type of institution, or to a more severe type. The vote was a tie, forcing the chairman to vote on this question.

That to me—and I believe to the other members of the committee—was very, very interesting, and something which we hope will be introduced in Ontario. That is a very, very necessary institution.

As for the Parole Board: our committee feels this board should be reconstituted. At the present time, it consists of 9 members who are part-time employees. The committee feels the Parole Board should be full-time, and should consist of 5 members; that it should not merely consider the case of an applicant for parole a few days or a few weeks before his release, but the very moment a man goes into an institution, the Parole Board should be made aware of his presence, and should start, at that time, to assemble data on his case. They should meet the man while serving the definite period of his sentence, and form an opinion as to his capabilities and the type of man he may be, and then when the time comes for the man to be released on parole, on the expiration of the definite period of his sentence, they will know all about the man with whom they are dealing.

At the present time the board has not the time nor the energy to give proper consideration to the question of parole.

Another point, which I believe the chairman of the committee did not touch on, was the Training Schools Advisory Board. We believe that this board, though it has rendered wonderful services, is not required and that its duties should be taken over by the Parole Board. This Advisory Board is, as hon. members know, not paid. It is a voluntary service. The 5 members have served for many years. Some of them have been on the board, I believe, for as many as 20 years. As a general rule they meet once a week, every Thursday, I believe, and they consider cases for placement of juveniles and

so on. But they do not see the applicant. They do not confer with the placement officers. They could not. These men are businessmen who are giving their time freely and voluntarily and they could not be expected to do what ordinarily would be required of them. So we believe that this work should be taken on by the Parole Board. To give you an idea of what are supposed to be the duties of the Advisory Board, I will read what the Act requires:

The board shall, by visiting, inspecting and otherwise investigating training schools, ascertain the condition thereof and of the boys and girls therein, particularly as to the matters of moral, scholastic, occupational and recreational natures and as to their wardship, care, health, treatment, conduct and discipline and shall make such reports to the Minister as he may require together with any recommendations which it deems advisable.

Mr. Speaker, no voluntary group of men could carry out all those duties, so it is recommended that these duties should be taken over by the Parole Board. I wish to express once more my appreciation of the privilege of having served on this committee under so able a chairman, and with so fine a body of men.

I do not know whether the House realizes the extent of the work the committee had to undertake. I believe that 153 meetings were held. I think I attended somewhere around 135. I wonder if it is realized that in attending those meetings during this past year, I travelled in the neighbourhood of 40,000 miles. This was distance travelled in carrying out the duties of this committee. I repeat that I appreciate the privilege of serving with a fine group of men who constituted the Select Committee.

MR. D. H. MORROW (Carleton): It was my pleasure to serve on this committee under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart) and I would like to join with former speakers in reciprocating his

kindly and complimentary references to the members. I congratulate him, as well as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) for their able presentations on this report. I found the work of this committee most interesting and, regardless of the critical nature of some of the passages of this report, it was a great source of pride to travel through the various reform institutions and see at first hand the wonderful work that is being done.

I think we have made remarkable progress through the years and I am sure that if some of the recommendations of this report are implemented, still greater progress will result.

Generally speaking, the academic educational training being carried out in our institutions appears to be adequate. The training schools have regular academic curricula up to grade IX, and provision is made in outside schools for those progressing beyond that grade. This academic training is given full credit by the Department of Education.

At Brampton—a specialized institution with specially selected personnel—there is an excellent academic school, extending up to and including grade XII. The inmates spend one-half of each working day in the school, and the other half-day in their vocational training. There is no academic training at all in some of the industrial farms, and the reformatory at Mimico, because of the type of inmate in these institutions. The Guelph Reformatory and Burwash Industrial Farm limit themselves to the teaching of illiterates.

Mr. Speaker, there are two schools of thought on academic training in our reformatories and industrial farms. One school of thought feels there should be full-time classes throughout the day for all those properly motivated to attend such classes. The other school of thought thinks that anyone in such institutions, who wishes to further himself academically, should do so in his own time at night.

I wish to subscribe to this latter point of view, and the committee endorses it.

There is no reason why those confined in custody should enjoy the special privileges of daytime education which cannot be enjoyed by those active in a free society, where thousands wishing to further their educational status do so by taking night-school courses in their own time. However, I think illiterates are a group deserving of special consideration. Wherever they are incarcerated, I think it is essential they should receive sufficient education to enable them to read and write, and means to this end should be provided at all our institutions.

Such teaching would play an important part in eliminating illiteracy in the general population of this province as well as helping to destroy one of the contributing factors towards crime. If a person can neither read nor write he is far more apt to react to force in order to reach his ends. Utilization of his leisure time, without the ability to do any reading or writing, poses a problem that sometimes leads to criminal acts.

In regard to vocational training, many of our institutions, particularly the training schools and the reformatory at Guelph are equipped with excellent vocational training shops and staffed by well-qualified vocational trade instructors. There is a good vocational programme in such trades as construction, machine shop, motor mechanics, welding, painting, radio, sheet metal, wood-working, and cooking.

On release, the inmate who has taken trade training is given a letter from the superintendent and the trade training instructor, showing the time spent in training. This is accepted by the Department of Labour and serves as a credit on apprenticeship training. Organized labour has displayed good co-operation in this regard.

At Galt the girls receive vocational training in home economics, hairdressing and some crafts. At the Mercer, training is given in beauty culture, needle craft, general domestic science, and household economics.

The chairman has asked me to say something about "hobbies and libraries."

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest

difficulties confronting young people today, is the inability to organize and properly utilize leisure hours. This has been a factor in the delinquency of a great many juveniles as well as a great many adults. In my opinion, one of the most effective ways of combating the leisure-time problem is to become interested in a hobby.

A few institutions, such as the Guelph Reformatory have excellent programmes in this respect. Others have few or no hobby projects.

It is not valid to suppose that inmates should only be taught that which will mean a better living after discharge, but it is also important that they be given instruction in things which will teach them to live better. It is in this category that hobbies should be considered.

Essentials could easily be provided in all institutions without too much expense, and a good programme established.

The female population in our institutions and jails, both doing creditable work in many places, could very well spend more of their leisure time on needlework, weaving, leathercraft and other such hobbies.

Libraries in the majority of institutions visited by the committee were inadequate, and only a few could be classed as being very good, notably Brampton.

Libraries in the reformatories and jails are a part of the educational programme, and should form a part of the rehabilitation process. A good library, properly established and housed, can do much to improve the education of the inmates, and provide a release from emotional strain, besides being of help in occupying idle hours and leisure time.

Many libraries require a drastic weeding out of old, damaged and useless books. All institutions should evolve a definite and practical system for providing good books, keeping them according to index, and making them available to inmates.

In the selection, emphasis should be placed upon books which will transfer the interest of the inmates from sensationalism, to that of a better grade of

book. Subversive literature and that depicting sex and crime should be considered contraband.

Along with a more refined segregation and the establishment of a reception and diagnostic centre, I believe the recommendation for a more widely extended probation, parole, rehabilitation and prison after-care system, forms one of the most important recommendations of this committee. Like the other members of the committee I am convinced that, if our probation system, in particular, were more fully put into operation, with competent and well-trained personnel, within a few years our prison population would be considerably reduced, and our recidivism problem would show great, and gradual improvement, in the generations to come. This report submits strong statistical evidence to substantiate this viewpoint.

As has been stated by our worthy chairman, the member for Parkdale, the figures on recidivism in Canada are disturbing, and I think it is time that a new approach to this problem is taken. As has been stated, it is sound economics to appoint a few dozen more probation officers to look after certain types of offenders, under strict supervision, particularly the juveniles, on the outside, rather than employ several hundred guards to look after them on the inside, and perhaps keep their families as well. This is the monetary aspect of the problem, without saying anything about the human values involved, which of course cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Mr. Speaker, there is another subject mentioned in this "pocket-sized" edition of the report, of which I would like to make special mention, and which our chairman touched on briefly, and that is juvenile delinquency.

This is a subject with which I am brought in close contact from time to time, in my duties as a school principal, and which, appears to be quite prevalent in our larger centres of population. From evidence submitted to the committee, it appears that Toronto is the only centre in the province where there

is a full-time clinic, investigating the problems of juvenile delinquency.

Dr. J. S. Atcheson, Director of the Juvenile Court Clinic, and his staff, deserve a great deal of credit for the contribution they have made, from their clinical services, not only to the Juvenile Court, but also to our training school at Galt and to the local court probation officers.

The fact that the Juvenile Court in this city utilizes the clinic's advice in at least 90 per cent. of its cases, speaks for itself. It is refreshing to know that every child sent to one of the province's training schools from the City of Toronto has been seen by this clinic, and a full investigation report has been given to the Juvenile Court officials, prior to any committal arrangement.

One could enumerate many of the causes of juvenile delinquency, such as broken homes, poor home relationships, both social and economic, poor personal relationships, defectiveness, emotional instability and so on, but it takes a great deal of clinical observation and work to diagnose the reasons for every act committed by a delinquent boy or girl. Such a study takes a great deal of time, Mr. Speaker, and one knows that a judge or other official cannot possibly explore all the facets of the child's behaviour within the time at their disposal and, therefore, the clinical report of such a body is of immeasurable value. Like the presentence report of the probation officer, a clinical-investigation report of a delinquent boy or girl, submitted to a Juvenile Court, enables the officials to assess the delinquent act in relation to the child, and prescribes proper treatment.

Although it is not recommended in this report, I am of the opinion that it would be a most progressive step if all the Juvenile Courts in this province, particularly those in the larger centres, established such a clinic. I am aware of the difficulties of securing qualified personnel for such work and of the economic factors involved, particularly in smaller centres, but what I am saying is that such facilities are the scientific way of effectively coping with this problem.

If the government in its wisdom sees fit to implement the recommendation covering the establishment of a reception and diagnostic centre—and this is definitely a step in the right direction for the scientific classification and segregation of all our incoming inmate population—then perhaps a wing of such a centre, with a separate organization, could very well be designated to carry on a parallel work with our youthful delinquent population. The court, after determining the guilt of any particular act, could refer the delinquent to such a centre, which would act as an observation centre, to undergo clinical study and diagnosis before any committal arrangement was made.

It is difficult to say, Mr. Speaker, if there is more juvenile delinquency today than, we will say, a decade or two ago. I think there is definitely more discussion and concern about it today, which of course is all to the good.

Although one may hear quite frequently that parents are not facing up to their responsibilities, and this is quite true in large measure, it has been my experience in the schools that the great majority of parents are genuinely interested in the progress and behaviour of their children, and are most anxious to co-operate with their teachers and other authorities in every possible way. However, I would say much more parental education on the subject would be in the public interest. We live in a very complicated society today, with many social problems, and things we perhaps did—and now boast about doing in our younger days—went by relatively unnoticed, and little was done about them, whereas, today such acts would perhaps warrant investigation for delinquent behaviour.

There is no doubt that, no matter how much money is spent in diagnosing and endeavouring to solve this problem, juvenile delinquency will never be fully grappled with until responsible citizens in the various communities take a hand in the problem themselves. Responsible citizens, the church, parent organizations, and other groups, could do much in this regard, and thus aid in taking the

pressure off our courts and institutions alike.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. members of the House for their attention, and once again express my pleasure at being appointed a member of this Select Committee.

The Acting Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should first like to say that it has been my pleasure to serve on this committee during the entire period of its sittings. I take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman, the hon. member from Parkdale (Mr. Stewart) for the fine report that he has presented here this afternoon. The hon. member was, I may say, intensely interested in this subject; I think I am safe in saying that during the entire period the committee held meetings he did the work of 3 men. Certainly, he was not afraid to work long hours, and I am quite sure he did not belong to a union; he had no thought of an 8-hour day or a 40-hour week.

For the members of the committee, this is our day of emancipation, for the chairman was known throughout our sittings as the slave driver. Today, the slaves are free. Nevertheless, I should like to say that through it all the chairman was kindly, generous and friendly, and that he got more information out of the witnesses than could any other man. Many a time he poured oil on the troubled waters, and as a result we have today a unanimous report.

I should like to pay tribute to the hon. Minister of the Department of Reform Institutions, for I believe with all my heart that he is trying to do a real job under the most difficult and trying conditions, with limited facilities and a lack of appreciation on the part of the public as to reform, and reformative methods.

The present hon. Minister is labouring under a legacy that has been created over the years; poor buildings, lack of segregation and all the other things that enter into the picture.

It seems to me that the Department of Reform Institutions has always been the

unwanted child, perhaps due to the fact that the department was not a revenue-producer. Yet this department should be of interest to every citizen in the Province of Ontario; and it should be of interest to every hon. member of this House, for it spends \$10 million a year, \$1½ million of which is returnable by way of products from the farms and industry. But it costs the Province of Ontario \$8½ million to administer this department each and every year.

The present hon. Minister and his officials have given excellent leadership, and I am sure they appreciate the spotlight that has been thrown on the difficulties they have had to contend with over the years. A year ago the hon. Minister laid plans before this House which would do much to improve the reform situation in Ontario. He told us what he proposed to do in the way of buildings and segregation. It is my opinion that the hon. Minister has not had a full opportunity to prove himself. I am quite sure that he will be prepared to carry out proper plans as soon as this report is inwardly digested.

I should like also to pay tribute to the Deputy Minister. I do not think I have ever met a man who had at his fingertips the information he has. Every time he came to the committee, I was reminded of that passage in *The Deserted Village* by Oliver Goldsmith, when speaking about the school teacher, he said:

Still they gaze,
And still the wonder grew,
That one small head
Could carry all he knew.

That can truthfully be said of the Deputy Minister, for we gazed and gazed, and still our wonder grew, that one small head could carry all he knew.

To a former hon. Minister, now the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), I must give credit for the creation of the institution at Brampton, and all that it has done. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I think it is the only institution in the province that has shown any results by way of reformation, apart from the Alex G.

Brown Clinic at Mimico, which operates in a very limited scope. Not only do I say that the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is responsible for Brampton, but he has given us the industrial farms at Burtch and Rideau, and he began the very important work that the report is now advocating. Whatever building was done over the past 20 years, was done during that period when the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was Minister of Reform Institutions.

The committee is recommending that more industrial farms be established in the various parts of Ontario to take the pressure off the jails, and to provide work for inmates. We believe that every inmate should work while he is incarcerated.

While we are paying tributes, I should like to mention the hon. Attorney-General, for it was under his department that the probation system was set up. To this government goes the credit of the probation system, and all that it means: I think it is the answer to many of the problems of reformation. Many changes have been made over the past years, and still more will be made in the years that lie ahead; but I make this definite assertion, that no administration anywhere is more humane or gives as kindly and generous treatment to the inmates of its institutions as does this administration.

I should like to speak for a few minutes on two or three other subjects.

First, as to rehabilitation; there should be plans, much more elaborate than we have ever had before, for the rehabilitation of ex-prisoners. These men must be brought back into the ranks of normal citizenship, and given every assistance towards this objective.

How are we going to do these things? First of all, transportation should be provided for every ex-inmate to his place of arrest. If necessary, clothing should be supplied. He should have means sufficient to provide for himself, until he is established in a job. And—this is very important, indeed it is a vital necessity—a job should be found for the prisoner before he is

released. Finally, society should be ready to receive him. Society at the moment is not always willing to accept the ex-prisoner.

All this can best be done by the Department of Reform Institutions and social workers paid by the government, with the co-operation of volunteer workers. The real test of any reformatory system is what happens to a man after his discharge, not what happens when he is in the reformatory. The purpose of training and treatment of prisoners should be to establish in them the will to lead a good life, so that upon their release, they will be ready to fit into the pattern of normal society.

I do not think we are going to reform prisoners unless we segregate the reformable from the non-reformable. Those who cannot be reformed—and there are many in the Province of Ontario—should be placed in preventative detention, not in a reformatory proper, but in a separate institution. By this means you protect society from them, and that is all you can do.

Secondly, I would like to speak about chaplain services in the institutions. In the Archambault Report, 1946, the Royal Commissioners had this to say on the subject of religion: "Religion touches the deepest springs of human conduct, for it can furnish to the weak and unstable the highest ideals and sternest inhibitions."

Formal religious services in our reformatory and jails are not enough. Nothing can take the place of personal work, individual counsel, constant guidance. I believe the chaplains should be permitted greater freedom in dealing with prisoners; and I believe they should be given the opportunity to render assistance in other than spiritual matters. At the present moment we have no chaplaincy service in any of our institutions. We have chaplains working on a part-time basis. But I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions upon the fact, of which he has informed us on one or two occasions, that he is setting up a permanent chaplaincy service. I believe, sir, that is a step in the right direction.

Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe, Home Secretary of Great Britain, has said that "one of the most important causes of the increase of crime and the decline in moral standards is the lack of religion in daily life."

The fundamental work of the chaplain is to recreate a sense of the spiritual; and I believe that only the chaplain can do that adequately.

Then I would like to speak for a few moments in regard to work. I think we should emphasize the dignity of work, and make adequate provision for it in all types of institutions. At the present moment we find the inmates of reformatory have considerable work to do; and when it comes down to the lowly jails, all the inmates have to do is housecleaning. As a result, they get out of the habit of working. If every adolescent had in the background the experience of hard work, there would be far fewer criminals in this province. When work is neglected, it soon is despised; laziness is exalted, vice and crime are encouraged. We need a good work programme in our institutions. Indeed, good work habits should be a cardinal principle governing all institutions in the Province of Ontario.

A word about recidivism. In all countries, including our own, recidivism has increased to an alarming extent. The only jurisdiction where it has not increased is Great Britain. There it has not only been checked, but reduced.

There are only a small percentage of the inmates of our reformatory who do not leave more criminally inclined than they came in. This is a severe indictment, but it is a just indictment. Although the reformatory purpose of reformatory was given statutory recognition a few years ago—

MR. SALSBERG: May I ask a question? I want to be sure if I heard the hon. member right. Does he, in this connection, refer to the work of the department, not only recently, but over the years?

MR. DOWNER: I am referring to the record over all the years, not just

recently. In fact I think it is a little better today than it has been.

Although the reformatory purpose of reformatories was given statutory recognition many years ago, practically nothing has been done to give that purpose effect during all the years reformatories have been in existence. We know that a man who goes into one of these places should come out a better citizen. That is, or should be, the aim of detention, the objective of any reformatory programme. We are interested not so much in punishment as in reformation. But most places of detention are just "colleges of crime." It will be far better for Ontario when we can point to a place of detention and say, "That is a hospital where the misfits of society are being cured, and where the incurables are being cared for."

A last word, about probation. We all know the story of probation in Great Britain. What has happened there in this respect can happen here. The probationary system was introduced in England in 1907. In that year 185,000 persons were committed to prison. In 1950, in spite of an increased population, only 34,825 were committed. In the same year, 34,000 adult offenders were placed on probation. This technique, practiced since 1907, has resulted in 75 per cent. rehabilitation; it has also caused a tremendous decrease in recidivism.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is far better economics to appoint 12 probation officers to look after people before they get to jail, than to hire 24 officers to look after them in prison. Britain has 1,100 probation officers. We have, at the most, 40. Our lack of a probation system has resulted in 70 per cent. of the inmates of our jails and reformatories becoming repeaters. In England, the practice of probation has resulted in a reduction of repeaters of 75 per cent. Viewing this only from the standpoint of economics, people must be convinced that the use of probation in the case of offenders who have not developed serious criminal records is a potent means of reducing the size of prisons

and the number of prisoners. Probation, as the chairman of the committee has said, will take the pressure off the front doors of our jails, and perhaps will avoid the heavy costs of maintaining people in them. We do not want more reformatories; we want fewer committals than we now have. We do not want to go on building reformatories in every county of Ontario. We want to keep people out of such places; and the only means of doing so are, first, probation; second, segregation; third, teaching the duties of citizenship. We must not continue to tolerate the conditions which exist today. We cannot afford the unnecessary wastage, in actual cash, in man-hours of production, or in the deterioration of human resources which are the consequences of placing too many offenders into overcrowded jails and reformatories.

Properly administered, probation will eliminate much of the work of rehabilitation, as well as the stigma which falls upon the prisoner and upon his family. It will eliminate the bad associations which are formed, even in the very best of jails, and which are responsible for a great deal of recidivism. It will eliminate the idleness one finds in jails, and the ill-effects of such idleness. It will eliminate a great deal of the costs of incarceration. The experts tell us that probation costs about 40 cents per day. In other words, it costs 40 cents per day to keep a man on probation, but it costs \$4.00 per day to keep him in jail.

In my opinion, once real probation is effected, we shall cut our prison population in the Province of Ontario by one-half, and I am quite sure that the incidence of repeaters will be vastly reduced.

You will never change a man from being a criminal to being a law-abiding citizen merely by sentencing him to jail, any more than you can make a man good by legislation. If we are to arrest and control the criminal habits of our fellow men, then we must plan and diagnose the positive reformatory plan for each individual.

In our report, we are bringing forth such a plan. I hope, along with all the

other members of the committee, that this report will be given the attention it deserves. We hope it will not be pigeon-holed, but implemented, so that we will not have to build new and larger institutions, but will be able to contain our ever-increasing number of prisoners, as a result of our continually growing population, within the walls of the present institutions.

I believe if we follow out the plan set out in this report, we will be able not only to contain them within the walls of our present institutions, but we will be able to do away with some of those presently existing.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken up a great deal of time, but I am especially interested in this subject. Before I sit down, I would like to congratulate the government for setting up this committee and for giving us its blessing.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston) : I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST : Mr. Speaker, I move that as some members may desire to speak to the report after they have had an opportunity of reading it, the discussion be adjourned to a later date and an Order be placed on the Order paper for its further consideration. That will fit into the motion made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle).

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST : Before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say we will continue with the debate on the amendment to the reply to the Speech from the Throne tomorrow. I would like to complete the debate on Wednesday, so we may introduce the budget on Thursday.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 of the clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, March 9, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 9, 1954.

Representation of the people in the Legislative Assembly, bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Frost, first reading	420
Provincial Parks Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Challies, first reading	421
Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Doucett, first reading ...	425
Highway Improvement Amendment Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Doucett, first reading	425
Trees Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gemmell, first reading	426
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Doucett, first reading ..	426
Schools Administration Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Dunlop, first reading	427
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading	427
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading	427
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading	427
Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gemmell, first reading	428
Crown Timber Act, 1952, bill to amend, Mr. Gemmell, first reading	428
Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, first reading	428
Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Nickle, Mr. Collings, Mr. Manley, Mr. Allan	429
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. T. D. Thomas, agreed to	448
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	448

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very glad today to welcome students from Norway Public School in the Beaches District, and also a group of 14 Kiwanians from the City of Stratford. I assure you, it is a very great pleasure, on behalf of the hon. members of the Legislature, to welcome these groups particularly the members of the Stratford Kiwanis Club.

I beg to announce that the Committee on Private Bills will continue its meeting at 7 o'clock this evening, in Committee Room No. 1, and as many members as possible are asked to attend.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister) moves that a Select Committee of 11 members be appointed to consider and to fill in the schedule in a bill to be introduced respecting the representation of the people in the Legislative Assembly, with all convenient speed, such committee to be composed as follows:

Mr. MacOdrum (Chairman), Messrs. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Collings, Downer, Grummett, Herbert, Nixon, Noden, Oliver, Porter and Whitney.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof, it stand adjourned until 2 of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule No. 2 of the assembly be suspended insofar as they might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: This is a precautionary measure. I am hopeful addresses on the amendment to the amendment to the Speech from the Throne may be concluded tomorrow, in order that the budget can be introduced on Thursday, and it seemed wise to call the House at 2 o'clock in case the extra hour be required for the addresses. If we require still further time, I may ask the indulgence of the House and yourself, Mr. Speaker, not to look at the clock, but let us continue past 6 o'clock, in order that the debate can be concluded without a night sitting tomorrow. That is the purpose of the motion.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): If the hon. Prime Minister is making plans to conclude the debate tonight, there will be no necessity of calling the House at 2 o'clock tomorrow.

HON. MR. FROST: I am not counting on the addresses being concluded tonight, but I am hoping they will be tomorrow afternoon. The budget will be introduced on Thursday.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like your guidance on a question of privilege, or procedure, whichever you may call it. I was taken

off guard, unfortunately, and did not quite understand the meaning of the previous motion which was before the House a few minutes ago. Is that the motion dealing with the Select Committee on Redistribution?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. SALSBERG: In view of the fact I was not prepared and did not expect it, could I say a word or two on the motion now, even though it has been formally carried?

HON. MR. FROST: I will be introducing the bill in a moment. Perhaps the hon. member might more properly speak at that time. A debate on first reading is out of order, and I think the hon. member might wait for second reading of this bill, when he can speak all he likes.

MR. SALSBERG: Except that the principle is set up by the adoption of the motion to set up a Select Committee, and I was going to suggest another procedure, so that now, or a few minutes ago, would have been the best time to raise it.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out this is the traditional method. It has been done this way ever since the beginning of time, and I think it is the right way.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid we cannot revert back to a motion which has already been carried. If we broke that rule our procedure would be completely thrown overboard. I feel I gave ample time and opportunity to the hon. members for discussion, before I announced it was carried, and I think I must abide by that very governing and guiding rule of the House.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston) moves that the Order for the House to resolve itself into committee to consider Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Conventions of Ontario and Quebec," be discharged, and that the bill be referred back to the

Standing Committee on Private Bills for further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of a bill intituled, "An Act respecting representation of the people in the Legislative Assembly."

He said: May I give this explanation. This bill is complementary to the motion a moment ago. The practice in the past, in connection with redistribution, has been to introduce a bill, the important part of which is the schedules and it has been the practice to leave the schedules blank so the committee may fill them in. That is the method, I believe, which has always been followed in this House. Indeed, I believe it is the method followed at Ottawa.

If hon. members will note the motion, they will see it refers to the appointment of a Select Committee to consider and fill in the schedule in a bill to be introduced respecting the representation of the people in the Legislative Assembly with all convenient speed. Nothing has been completed, nothing has been filled in. The schedules have all been left blank, and as a matter of fact, the membership of the House has been left blank as well, the entire matter being for the committee to consider.

It is the intention of the government that the Select Committee to which these matters will be referred, should consider the question during this session and report their findings, so the matter may be dealt with during the next 3 weeks.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Is it the intention of the government to have an over-all redistribution or simply to add 7 or 8 seats to the present membership?

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, to answer his question, that I do not want

to prophesy what the committee will do. After all, the committee is appointed with powers to deal with this matter. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants my personal opinion—and I suppose that that is in order—

MR. OLIVER: I imagine it would carry a good deal of weight.

HON. MR. FROST: —I have no hesitation in saying that redistribution which cuts people away from their moorings is a great mistake. That is my opinion. With regard to added representation in this House, I think that is a matter for the committee to determine, but I think the cutting up of historic ridings and disturbing historic associations is a mistake. I give that opinion to the committee for what it is worth.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): On the motion for first reading of this bill, I would like to say that I think the motion which preceded the bill is very undemocratic and an extremely partisan action with which we should not proceed.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know whether this is the place for the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to indulge in comments of that nature. They should be reserved for second reading.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to make this comment on both readings.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion has not yet been put.

Has the hon. member a question?

MR. SALSBERG: The "hon. member" will put it any way you insist. I will put it as a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Not an involved question.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to put a question to the government at this stage of the proposed legislation and ask whether, in view of the fact that the Conservative Party members in the Manitoba Legislature only a few days

ago, argued against the setting up of a Select Committee of that Legislature to study and deal with the question of redistribution because, they argued, such action was partisan, would not this government agree—since this is a Conservative Government—that the arguments advanced by their colleagues in Manitoba are sound, and that it should not resort to such a partisan method of redistributing the ridings—a method which invariably leads to the gerrymandering of ridings?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the question, may I say I have not seen or heard anything about the resolution in the Manitoba Legislature and even if I had, it would not have made any difference.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT, 1954

HON. MR. CHALLIES moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Provincial Parks Act, 1954."

He said: The importance of a new provincial parks policy as it will favourably affect every citizen of the province is such as to warrant a full explanation of its objectives.

The purpose of the new policy is outlined in section 2 of the new Act:

All provincial parks are dedicated to the people of the Province of Ontario and others who may use them for their healthful enjoyment and education and the provincial parks shall be maintained for the benefit of future generations in accordance with this Act and the regulations made under this Act.

The Provincial Government is aware that there is a need today for an enlarged provincial park policy and has given careful consideration to the problem. Increased economic productivity and prosperity have given the average Ontario family more leisure and greater spending power than ever before. The wide-spread adoption of a shorter work week, paid vacations, and retirement

pensions have contributed to this leisure and spending power. At the same time, the extension of paved highways and the great increase in the number of motor vehicles have given easy access to areas once considered remote. Our cities have grown larger and the proportion of urban dwellers in our population has greatly increased. The social and economic changes taking place in our province call for a reassessment of the present parks programme and for an enlarged policy dedicated to the people of Ontario.

Such a policy must look two ways—to the acquisition of new recreation areas and to the continued improvement of existing areas. Along the St. Lawrence River and throughout most of Southern Ontario, very little land has been retained by the Crown for public purposes. With few exceptions within 100 miles of our great urban centres, the week-end vacationer is unable to turn from the highway to relaxing and attractive recreation sites. Ontario, however, is in the enviable position of having many potential park sites, now privately-owned, but which could be acquired. The Ottawa River Valley, the Rideau Lakes, the banks of the St. Lawrence River, and the shores of the Great Lakes all offer natural advantages not easily found elsewhere.

Proposals for new parks and recreation areas must be made with the requirements of future years in mind and recommendations must be weighed in the light of anticipated conditions. The proposed development of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project will bring new demands as well as new opportunities. The industrial expansion that may well follow would produce new urban concentrations. New residents will seek recreation areas that are readily accessible and will increase the burden on existing areas. The growing tourist industry is already taxing parklands and recreation areas to the limit. Intelligent appraisal of future needs will permit simultaneous development of outdoor recreation facilities and the great economic and social expansion taking place in our province.

AIMS OF ENLARGED POLICY

The provision of recreation centres and parks must take into account the protection of natural advantages. Ontario has exceptional scenic beauty, great expanses of lake frontages, innumerable inland waters, and extensive forest lands. These must be preserved and protected for the people of Ontario and for future generations. Such a programme need not be inordinately expensive. Much of the potential parkland is not adequate for successful farming. Soil conditions are poor, the land is rough and rocky, or eroded and neglected. Such land, though unsuitable for agriculture or industrial use, has not lost its scenic beauty or the charm of its natural state. It has a wilderness atmosphere that can be enjoyed without the actual hardship of remote wilds. Some of these sites could become wild life sanctuaries or game preserves. Through conservation they could render a service to the community measurable not only in dollars and cents, but also in mental health and happiness.

Recreation centres require recreation facilities. These include beaches for adults and for children, fishing areas, wharfs, picnic and camping sites, scenic drives, hiking and riding trails, nature study areas, youth hostels, swimming holes, golf courses, and historic sites. The requirements of winter recreation should not be overlooked. Ski trails, toboggan slides, and ice fishing add to winter fun.

Ontario has a fascinating and varied history. Every locality has its own relics of early settlers, and records of remarkable men; the memories of our pioneer forefathers can be preserved in park museums, reminding us of their trials and hardships and encouraging us in our own advancement.

Control of parking facilities and careful supervision of camping grounds and concessionaries will protect the natural attractions and permit greater enjoyment. Unrestricted vehicle movement and camping can destroy vegetation and natural beauty. Indiscriminate granting of concessions can lead to exploitation of the travelling public by

"get-rich-quick" operators. Strict limiting of the amount of privately-controlled land in the park areas can preserve the parks' public character. Ontario parks can perform a dual function—protecting and conserving natural advantages and providing recreation for all our citizens.

PRINCIPLES AND EMBODIMENT

The principles it is proposed to embody in new legislation may be found within the Provincial Parks Act and the Presqu'ile Park Act. Recreational areas must be developed without discrimination and according to needs.

There must be long-term planning; consultation and co-operation with local authorities must be continued. There must, above all, be a benefit and service to the people of Ontario. While large parks such as Algonquin Park or Temagami Forest provide ample space without crowding, their facilities best serve the vacationer on an extended holiday. Today the development of smaller parklands close to urban centres where population pressures are greatest is most desirable.

Before these principles can be implemented, an overall classification covering the various types of parks in Ontario is required. Class I would include such large parklands as Algonquin, Lake Superior, Quetico, and Temagami. In Class II is the group of recreational areas such as Rondeau and Presqu'ile Parks within easy reach of urban centres. This class includes existing and proposed recreational sites conveniently located permitting the motorist to reach them quickly from his home or place of work. Facilities in such parks should be designed for week-end vacationers, families arriving to spend the day, or casual afternoon visitors. Here the outdoor barbecues, picnic sites, tables, benches, and bathing beaches are most important. Class III parks, like those in Class II, should be located within easy reach of urban centres but they will be smaller and less elaborately equipped. Such a park will provide a quiet and convenient place where a motorist may stop for a picnic lunch or a rest or where a family from the

nearby city may enjoy a quiet afternoon away from crowds and traffic. Class IV includes park areas sponsored by counties or municipalities. These are more local in character and while the Provincial Government takes an interest in them less directly, the facilities of government departments are available for advice and technical assistance.

The administration and control of parks within Class I would remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Forests. Parks within Classes II and III, gradually acquired and developed, would be placed under the authority of a designated Minister. He would determine the form of park administration suitable to each park. He would be given power to acquire private lands by direct purchase or through expropriation for park purposes. Such a scheme of administrative control would permit a co-ordinated and effective park programme of developing recreation centres where needs arise, bringing the beneficial advantages of recreation to new areas and greater numbers of our people.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

In the development of such a programme it is well to point out for consideration 3 important factors. Population pressures in Ontario are already great, particularly in the southern part of the province. Recreational areas of sufficient size to accommodate local requirements during most of the year are often overcrowded in the summer by large numbers of visitors. Congestion detracts from the natural advantages of any parkland. The Point Pelee National Park is an example of overcrowding and its destructive effect. Last summer, almost 500,000 people visited the Park, which is 6 square miles in size. It has lost much of its natural beauty and appeal. This is a blow not only to nearby urban dwellers who use the park on a daily or weekend basis, but also Ontario's tourist industry. Recreation areas should be of sufficient size to allow for seasonal fluctuation of population. Planned parklands must consider every aspect of population

requirements. The reservoir area to be created by the St. Lawrence development is a perfect example of this need. Along this new waterfront there will be new opportunities for the practical application of a sound parks programme. Recreation areas must serve visitors and tourists as well as citizens residing in the immediate vicinity.

Shifts and balances in population and their effect on recreation areas must be viewed in conjunction with the requirements of Ontario's tourist industry. Because this province has so many outdoor recreation attractions, the income derived from this industry is of very great importance in our economy. During 1951 American citizens paid 24,900,000 visits to Canada. A major proportion of these visitors came to Ontario. The tourist industry affects every section of the province from border towns to north-land areas where many people derive their total incomes from tourist expenditures. While the industry is thriving and growing, it is comparatively young. With foresight and planning, recreation areas for the people of Ontario can develop with the tourist industry. New recreation areas will add to the appreciation of our natural scenic advantages and attract greater numbers of visitors. Roadside parks and picnic grounds at convenient and attractive sites are popular features of the tourist industry. The parallel development and growth of the tourist industry and provincial recreation areas will add to the prosperity of our people as well as to their healthful enjoyment.

The acquisition and development by the province of publicly-owned parklands and recreational facilities is not to be construed in any way as an interference with private enterprise or rights. What is sought is a simultaneous growth of allied interests. Industry and recreation must expand together. The average citizen must not be prevented from enjoying the natural benefits of the province. Within recreation areas themselves, privately-held property must be kept at a minimum to protect both owners and visitors. Private holdings within parks in Classes I and II must not interfere

with the purpose of general community enjoyment. It must not be frustrated by indiscriminate leasing or sale. Summer cottage colonies must be controlled and made a part of overall recreational planning. Picturesque sites and easy access to beach areas are not the prerogatives of the few. If these factors are kept clearly in mind, the development of particular areas in a co-operative and community spirit will continue to keep Ontario in a leading position in the field of outdoor recreation attractions.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask my hon. friend whether these parks are to be set up under a department as yet undesignated, or are they to be under the Department of Planning and Development?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: As you will recall, under the old Parks Act, the larger parks were under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Forests; in the past, we have had to have a separate Act for each one, such as one for Presqu'ile and another for Long Point. As I have said, all the parks will be brought under the new Act.

Whether the parks will be under a commission or a superintendent, is a matter to be decided by the hon. Minister. The new Act provides for both types of administration. The administration will be under the Minister of one of the departments.

MR. OLIVER: Would you say by which Minister they will be administered?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: That has not yet been decided.

MR. OLIVER: Surely that point should be included in the bill. Can you not make up your mind about it?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I think it is a matter of government responsibility; the government will have to say under which department it is to come.

MR. OLIVER: The question has to be decided sometime.

MR. SALSBERG: Will it be administered by hydro?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: They would do a good job.

MR. SALSBERG: Since you introduced the bill, is it your intention to have hydro look after it?

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been answered.

MR. SALSBERG: But surely, Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister has given his answer to the question.

MR. SALSBERG: But, Mr. Speaker, my question was, since he introduced the bill—

MR. SPEAKER: In answer to a question by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), the hon. Minister has said that the matter is in the hands of the government. I do not think there should be any further questions on that point.

THE PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT, 1954

HON. G. H. DOUCETT moves first reading of a bill intituled, "The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is a revision of the present Act, and is designated to simplify the procedures with respect to application for aid to drainage works.

The Act will henceforth apply to all the channels of a drainage work. This will simplify procedures because, while at present only trunk channels are included, most branch drains are in themselves trunks and in the past separate applications have been required in respect of these. Now one application only will be required in respect of the whole drainage work.

The Act will not in future apply to either open or covered drains, or to

sections of a drainage work into which domestic sewage is discharged.

Where a drainage work on which a grant is paid includes a work toward which a grant is payable under another Act, the latter grant will be reduced accordingly. In this respect the bill is similar to the Act, but the new Act will clarify the matter somewhat.

The application procedure is simplified from the standpoint of the municipalities in that they will be enabled to apply after passing the by-law for undertaking the work. Under the present Act application is required before the passing of the by-law, and compliance was often difficult. In addition, a special provision is made for applications where emergency work is required to be performed and the work is commenced before the application is made.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENT ACT, 1954

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves first reading of a bill intituled "The Highway Improvement Amendment Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill would make four small changes in the present Act.

Firstly, it would permit county councils to consolidate their by-laws, subject of course to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Secondly, at the present time, councils or local municipalities have power, subject to the approval of the Municipal Board, to pass by-laws regulating the use of land abutting on any designated highway or part of a highway. The amendment would confer the same power on county councils with respect to land lying within 150 feet of any limit of a county road.

Thirdly, these amendments, which are designated to ensure that the free movement of traffic on controlled-access highways will not be impeded, will prohibit persons from erecting racetracks, drive-in theatres, etc. on land within one-half mile of a controlled-access

highway without a permit from the Minister. Any land now used for the purposes mentioned will not be affected. This bill would give to municipalities where the need exists, the same privilege respecting controlled-access highways.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask my hon. friend, did he not previously have control over the building of outdoor theatres and racetracks?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Only within a certain distance of the highways. We require this further amendment relating to controlled-access highways.

THE TREES ACT

HON. WELLAND S. GEMMELL moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Trees Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, apparently under the present Act certain municipalities have found themselves unable to pass by-laws controlling the cutting of trees within their boundaries. The purpose of this bill is to extend to all organized municipalities, townships, and towns throughout the Province of Ontario, power to pass such by-laws.

The bill would also give such municipalities power to enact regulations and to employ persons to enforce them, in respect of the cutting of trees. At the present time, certain municipalities in some sections of the province are faced with the problems of persons using fire, bulldozers and other means to destroy wood lots, as an excuse for clearing the land, and then use it for other purposes than that for which it was intended. This measure would give to such municipalities and townships the privilege of passing by-laws and enforcing them, to prevent the indiscriminate cutting of trees.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 1954

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in this bill we are suggesting an amendment be made to make it clear that a built-up area includes not only dwellings and buildings for business purposes, but also schools and churches.

At the present time, it is an offence under subsection 1 of section 4 of the Act to make a false statement in an application or other paper-writing made in order to procure a licence, permit or certificate of registration. This amendment makes it an offence to make a false statement in any application or paper-writing required under the Act.

The present Act requires two separate attaching devices when a motor vehicle is drawing a trailer, wagon, or other conveyance on the highway. Under the proposed amendment, such provisions would become applicable to farm tractors drawing trailers or other vehicles on a highway.

The amendments also provide that the council of a city, town or village and the trustees of a police village may prescribe a speed limit of 25 miles per hour within the municipality and that the council of a city, town or village, the council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the trustees of a police village may authorize a speed limit up to 50 miles per hour on any highway under its jurisdiction.

The proposed amendment under section 6 makes it clear that when two vehicles approach a crossroad or intersection, the person in charge of the vehicle to the left is under a duty to yield the right-of-way to the person on the right.

Under section 41 of the present Act, signals are required only for left turns. Under the amendments proposed herein, signals will be required for right turns and stopping.

It is at present provided that traffic, before entering a through highway, shall stop immediately before entering the nearest crosswalk. The proposed amendment provides for stopping before entering an intersection where there is no crosswalk.

At present, the depositing on highways of nails, glass, etc., which may be injurious to motor vehicle tires, is prohibited. We propose to add to that provision the words "and rubbish."

Provision is made for a greater penalty for a first offence of failing to remain at the scene of an accident.

At present, a penalty collected for an offence on the King's Highways is paid to the Department of Highways and a penalty collected for an offence committed on a county highway is paid to the treasurer of the county. The pertinent amendment provides that a penalty collected for an offence committed on a King's Highway within the limits of a city, town or village or on a county highway shall be paid to the local municipality in which the offence was committed.

The present Act provides that a person in charge of a motor vehicle involved in an accident must report the accident if the damage exceeds \$50. It is proposed to amend the Act to increase that amount to \$100. This amendment is necessary by reason of the fact that since 1930, or thereabouts, when the Act first came into force, the relative cost of repairs to damaged motor vehicles has greatly increased.

SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT, 1954

HON. W. J. DUNLOP moves first reading of a bill intituled, "The Schools Administration Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is the third and last instalment of the consolidation by which we are attempting to put 11 education acts into 3, and this particular one deals with school terms and compulsory attendance; with the duties, rights, and qualifications of teachers; with the boards of reference required sometimes by trustees and teachers; with the duties of school boards and trustees; with auxiliary classes; school sites; offences and penalties. This bill, after second reading, will be referred to the Committee on Education.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This bill takes out of The Public Schools Act as it at present exists those sections which have been put into The Schools Administration Act. The same arrangement applies to another of these bills.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for taking out of The Separate Schools Act as it is at present those sections which have been put into The Schools Administration Act, in order that all may be, so to speak, under the same roof. It is proposed that, after second reading, both bills shall be referred to the Committee on Education.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This bill will also go to the Committee on Education after it has been read the second time. I should like to explain at least two of the sections.

The first section provides that teachers who are employed by the Government of Canada and who hold Ontario certificates and are teaching members, or former members, of Her Majesty's Canadian Forces, whether they are employed by the Government of Canada or the Government of Ontario, may, if they wish, enjoy the privileges given by the present Superannuation Act. The second section provides that, in computing the pension of

a teacher who is about to retire, the term on which the computation is made should be reduced from 15 years, as at present, to 10 years, the last 10 years of his or her teaching. Other less important sections can be dealt with fully on second reading, and by the Committee on Education.

THE WOLF AND BEAR BOUNTY ACT

HON. WELLAND S. GEMMELL moves first reading of bill intituled "An Act to amend the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: The intention of this bill is, first of all, to encourage the destruction of wolves, and with special reference to Northern Ontario. It has come at the special request of those who have spent a considerable time at this work. Up to the present, the regulations have been to the effect that anybody destroying a wolf must, to claim a bounty on it, produce the whole carcass of the animal. The purpose of the bill is to relieve him of that responsibility and require him to produce only the head of the animal. He will thus be relieved of the obligation of dragging these animals down to civilization in order to claim the bounty.

THE CROWN TIMBER ACT, 1952

HON. WELLAND S. GEMMELL moves first reading of bill intituled "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act, 1952."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: As I explained in the House the other day, under the Crown Timber Act, 1952, the Department of Lands and Forests demands of all licenced operators in this province holding concessions of over 50 square miles that they supply the department with cutting plans for the next succeeding 10 years. The plans so submitted are known as "master plans"; and each year, of course, operators must submit to the department

their cutting plans for the year. Both plans must have the approval of the Division of Timber Management of Lands and Forests. The concessionaire will, under this bill, be required to submit to the department information as to how he is going to handle the regeneration and reforestation of the cut-over area covered by the concession. The bill will also give the Minister the power, if the submission does not accord with the wishes of the department, to insist on further work to ensure the regeneration of the timber on the lands help by the various concessionaires.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

HON. CHARLES DALEY moves first reading of bill intituled "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This deals with some internal affairs in the administration of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Some years ago an amount of \$100,000 per year was authorized to be set aside in respect of the rehabilitation of injured workmen. In view of the ever-increasing industrial activity in the province and consequently increased number of injuries, this amount is now deemed to be insufficient and the bill provides that it shall be increased to \$200,000.

By another section it is provided that were, for any reason, the secretary of the board is absent, some other officer may be appointed to certify copies of extracts from the board's books.

A further section provides that assessments in respect of a certain class of industry need not necessarily be the same. In other words, an employer who does not make what is regarded as reasonable provision for protecting from injury the workers for whom he has that obligation, may be penalized. That provision, of course, can work in reverse: where the record in an industry is extremely good, and injuries are avoided through the exercise of adequate maintenance, proper care, good housekeeping,

and the rest, the board, if in its judgment such action is deemed advisable, may reduce the assessment.

MR. SALSBERG: Will the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour?

HON. MR. DALEY: I do not think so.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask whether it is not customary to send a bill of this character to a Standing Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The answer has been given.

MR. SALSBERG: Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) afraid to refer the bill to the Committee on Labour?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) must accept the answer that the Minister has given. Any hon. member has a perfect right to ask questions, but when the answer is given, that is sufficient.

ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate very sincerely the mover and seconder of the resolution of thanks to the Lieutenant-Governor for the Speech from the Throne.

One of the first things I would like to say is that, when His Honour opened this session of the Legislature, I was very happy to notice that he wore on his coat a medal which has been bestowed by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II upon many important people through the length and breadth of what is known as the great British Empire. I thought it was a marvellous tribute to Her Majesty that her representative in this House should wear on the left breast of his tunic, on that eventful day, the medal to commemorate her Coronation.

I would like to say, if I might, Mr. Speaker, for the record, that I think the letter which was written by our leader, the hon. Prime Minister, and the little

booklet which was issued at the time of the Coronation, is something which should not be quickly forgotten, and I would like to read into my remarks a copy of the letter, in which the hon. Prime Minister said:

I wish to send my cordial greetings to the teachers, young men and women, and boys and girls in the secondary and elementary schools of Ontario. On Tuesday, June 2nd, 1953, when Queen Elizabeth is crowned according to ancient custom, she will solemnly pledge herself to serve the people of the British Commonwealth and Empire as her illustrious father did for many years; and that impressive ceremony is distinctly significant because it typifies and publicly emphasizes the foundation of the liberties which we cherish and which we propose to maintain. While you will enjoy a holiday on Coronation Day, I know you will learn in advance as much as you possibly can of the significance, the romance, and the true meaning of the Coronation of our Queen Elizabeth, the Queen of Canada.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the crash of thrones, many of them built on unrighteousness, others propped up by a brittle fabric of convention, the throne of Britain has remained firm. Her Majesty the Queen in her great broadcast at the time of her Coronation, said:

Parliamentary institutions with their free speech and the respect for the rights of minorities, and the consideration of a broad tolerance in thought and its expression—all this we believe to be a precious part of our way of life and outlook . . . These principles are as sacred to the Crown and Monarch as to its many parliaments and peoples—and I ask you to cherish them—and practice them too. Then we can go forward together to peace, seeking justice and freedom for all men.

Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty has asked us to pursue the great principles of

responsible government. I sometimes say that cheers, like tears, disappear, and if the cheers on Coronation Day were only an expression of a moment of emotion, then the Coronation was but a spectacle, soon to be a fading memory.

Opportunities will present themselves to us now, and in the future, when our integrity and loyalty to the Crown will demand of us that we stand up and be counted in the part we play, openly and bravely, or step aside as cowards, and evade the responsibilities which have fallen on our shoulders.

The people of this province, Mr. Speaker, were indescribably proud when we learned with satisfaction that the wife of our leader, the hon. Prime Minister had accompanied him to the Coronation in London. I am sure, every hon. member of this House was delighted to know this vivacious and dignified lady had accompanied her husband, representing the people of Ontario at the Coronation.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, knowing, as I do, the hon. Prime Minister, that he came back from that great historic event with a keener and deeper sense of the responsibilities of our parliamentary institution, than he had when he left the shores of this country for that great event.

While speaking of the Coronation, I am reminded of Westminster Abbey, and I would like to tell this House that the choir of St. George's Cathedral at Kingston, has accepted an invitation this summer to go to Westminster Abbey and sing in the great cathedral, and that the Bishop of Ontario, who lives in my riding, has been invited to preach a sermon in Westminster Abbey. I thought the House should know of those two great historic occasions.

I read, not long ago, an article in a newspaper with reference to a speech made by Dr. J. A. Corry, vice-principal of Queen's University, and head of the Department of Political Science.

In that article, Doctor Corry stated it was his opinion that the civil servants in Ontario were beginning to play a far too important part in relation to govern-

ment policy. He made the observation that a great number of these civil servants, in their own right, were experts, and he expressed the view that if the elected representatives of the people were going to have any knowledge of, and respect for government, then the hon. Prime Minister of the Legislature of this Province—and, indeed, the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of this great Dominion—would have to set up a number of standing parliamentary committees. The reason for these committees, in the opinion of this great author—who has written an outstanding book on political science—was this: The more committees of this House which are established, the more the elected representatives of the people become experts within the four corners of the knowledge they gain, having regard to the committees on which they serve.

I say, Mr. Speaker, without reservation, that the hon. Prime Minister of this Province must be congratulated on his vision in establishing the policy he has put into effect, at least since I have been in this House, of establishing a large number of committees, some of them Standing Committees of the House, others Select Committees. As a result, those of us who have had the opportunity of serving on committees have gained a vast and greater experience. It has taught us to assume our responsibilities in relation to government, rather than having it dictated to us by the civil servants, who are in the employ of this province.

Another thing I would like to say is this, and in this regard I direct my remarks to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar).

As every hon. member of this House knows when property is sold at a tax sale, it must be for the amount of taxes owing plus any penalties, and if the owner of the property wishes to redeem it, he must pay to the purchaser what he paid for the property plus 10 per cent. of the total amount as represented by the tax and the penalties.

It has been brought to my attention, and I use this expression advisedly, that

"financial vultures" have begun to adopt a practice of trying to buy in good farm lands, and good lands within the urban centres, at a high price, hoping that if the owner wishes to redeem, he can get his 10 per cent. of what this "vulture" paid in to the treasurer of the municipality in question.

I say with some competence to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that no man should be allowed, either in an urban or a rural corporation to receive more than 10 per cent. in relation to what he pays for it at a tax sale on the arrears of the taxes, plus the penalties.

I, therefore, suggest that at this session of the Legislature an amendment should be made to the Assessment Act to stop this practice, which, I am sorry to say, is beginning to take root in the part of the country from which I come.

Another thing I would like to say is this: Down in Kingston, we have what is called, "The Sunnyside Children's Centre." This is a sort of hospital, a home for the observation and treatment of young children with severe behaviour problems, children who are in an extreme need of specialized help, and who, if measures are not taken while there is still time, will become permanent social burdens on the province.

Before I came to the opening of this House, I met some outstanding women of the City of Kingston representing the Board of Management of this fine organization, Mrs. O. A. Carson, Mrs. J. H. C. Gowland, and Mrs. W. S. Arthey. These people told me that The Sunnyside Children's Centre is incorporated under the Charitable Institutions Act, and they get 5 cents per day per child resident in this institution. While this session is still young, I think the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) should bring in an amendment to the Charitable Institutions Act to make it possible to grant to such institutions as this, substantial amounts of money, so they may carry on their very magnificent work, and I say that with some competence.

I would like to say a word in connection with an address, made not long ago, by Colonel W. H. J. Peck, at Vancouver,

in which he was quoted as saying that the Canadian Army was almost non-existent as a defensive fighting force, and that the reserve army was not much better.

I want to say here, at this time, that in my riding I have three excellent reserve units, the Prince of Wales' Own Regiment, the First Field Ambulance, and No. 105 Manning Depot. Kingston is also the base for any orders for Eastern Ontario. We have in Barriefield Camp the Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers. We have the headquarters of the Signals Unit of Canada. We have the Royal Military College. If Colonel Peck wants to be sure that recruits are on the "up-and-up" and the units to which I refer are on full strength, I invite him to come to Kingston and see for himself what the situation is, and not make remarks which, having got into the press, are just ready to wreck everything for which democracy stands. He can see, if he comes to Kingston, that we have soldiers there who are just as good as we had in the two world wars, and who, if necessary, will be there when the call comes again. When Colonel Peck made that statement, he did not know what he was talking about, and I am denying that statement in this House, as an old soldier with some knowledge of military affairs.

While speaking of Kingston and its military achievements, it brings to my mind the 50th anniversary of the Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, which took place last November. At that time, a tremendous number of men who served in the Signals Corps came back to attend that great organization, and one does not like to hear remarks to the effect we have not an army that is fit and capable of fighting. It is fit and capable of carrying on a defensive, or an offensive campaign, as the need might arise. And, speaking for the army, it has gained much prestige, as the result of the part it played in two world wars.

However, I was apprehensive when I read in the newspapers some time ago of an RCAF twin-jet CF-100 fighter plane which crashed in Quebec. Some

press photographers went to take some pictures, and they were rather roughly handled by an RCAF guard, who thrust the muzzle of his gun into the back of the press photographer and gave orders that if the photographer tried to get away, he would be fired upon.

I want to say, as an old soldier and now a civilian, that the army must never be superior to the civil authority in this Province of Ontario. The members of the press give us the news, and the press must not be hampered. The press photographer must be allowed to take his pictures and, unless there is some good reason, such as danger of the press photographer giving information to a potential enemy, I say that the day of the army using the rifle against the press must come to an end and there should never be a re-occurrence of such an event.

Last September, we were honoured in Kingston by a visit from Sir Archibald Nye, the United Kingdom's High Commissioner to Canada, who came to visit old Fort Henry. I would like to say in relation to old Fort Henry, it was built after the War of 1812, when the people of this country thought the United States of America was a potential enemy. In 1948, we had 78,000 tourists visit old Fort Henry. In 1953, it had 152,000 visitors and the great majority of those tourists were citizens of the United States of America—the potential enemy of a century ago, and a firm and fast friend in these days when we need them so much.

One of the reasons old Fort Henry has done so well is by reason of the vision and foresight which made it an attractive place, having regard to the principle and policy put forward in connection with this fine institution by Mr. Ronald Way, the Commandant.

A moment ago, I made some observation about the Military College at Kingston, which is an important military centre, being in my riding. The Royal Military College in Kingston has an excellent course in both science and arts. I know just as well as I stand here the question of conferring the degree rests, primarily, with the Department of

Education for the Province of Ontario, but, after all, the Royal Military College was fashioned after West Point, and came into existence in 1876.

When a man graduates from West Point, he receives a degree. I have given some thought to the engineering and arts course, which is a 4-year course, in the Military College, and I say to the hon. Prime Minister of this province and the hon. Minister of Education that I hope the day is not far distant when they will meet with the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of this country, and the hon. Minister of National Defence, with the view of giving to the cadets who graduate from the Royal Military College the opportunity of receiving degrees, having regard to the fact it is a 4-year course.

While I am on this subject, let me say something else. I think if the Royal Military College could give degrees to the students, then it seems to me to follow, as day follows the night, that they will have the right to give an honorary degree. The 50th anniversary celebration of the Royal Canadian Signal Corps, last November, was attended by many men who are prominent in civil life today, and who were in active service in either the First or Second World Wars. If the Royal Military College had the right to grant degrees then, they would have had the privilege of conferring honorary degrees; and how fine it would have been on this occasion if an honorary degree from the Royal Military College could have been given to His Excellency, the Governor-General, and 2 or 3 outstanding ex-signalmen who were at the reunion. It seems to me the time has now come when this fine institution, its supervisors and lecturers, should be recognized in the academic world, and I believe there should be given to the students who have completed their courses, some sort of a degree, having regard to the course of study they followed while within the 4 walls of that College.

I would like to say a few words with respect to the 50th anniversary of the Royal Canadian Corps of Signals. The great success it was, was made possible

as a result of the efforts of Colonel Elroy Ford who, as a very young man, took an interest in signals, and established the firm foundations of this organization. I regret to say, Colonel Ford died shortly after the 50th anniversary of this great organization which he helped to bring into existence.

I read the other day about the resignation of a friend of mine, who served in the 22nd Infantry Battalion in the 5th Brigade. He is well-known by the hon. Prime Minister and equally well-known to me because we were each in the 4th Brigade, and that man was Major General George P. Vanier, who served his country faithfully and well in the First World War. After the loss of a leg while fighting for his country, he entered the diplomatic service and was appointed Canadian ambassador to France in 1939. He retired December 31st last year, and it is my view, Mr. Speaker, that this fine soldier, this great ambassador, has not yet finally served his day with relation to public duty to his country, and it is my guess he will be the next Governor-General of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some interest to remarks made in this House during this session by the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren). He does not seem to have anything good to say about the hon. members on this side of the House. As a matter of fact, he seems to be at loggerheads with his political parents—the Ontario Liberal Party, in that he made a speech in St. Catharines in which he stated that there is a hand-picked committee of the Liberal Party who are going to the country and through the urban centres looking for a Liberal leader to succeed Mr. Walter Thompson.

The hon. member says that with a good leader, 25 or 30 members should be elected behind the panel of Liberalism at the next provincial general election. I say to the hon. Prime Minister, we on this side of the House take courage from that observation, because it seems to me most of us will be back.

Another thing I want to say is that in my part of the country, the Ontario Liberals are taking a great interest in

who their leader should be, and although I do not want to discourage the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), I do say he would run a poor second because the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) would have him well out-distanced in the part of the country from which I come.

The other day, the question of campaign funds was brought up by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and he made some observations to the effect that hon. members of the Conservative Party had money donated to its campaign fund, by those who thought their principles and policies were sound.

He made the observation that campaign funds probably went into the exchequer of the Ontario Liberal Party from those who thought their principles and policies were sound. I see nothing wrong with that, but I do ask, Mr. Speaker, if the campaign funds for the member for St. Andrew come from the Kremlin in Communist Russia, and if that is so, I say everything that democracy stands for, as far as he is concerned, is now straight and fairly at the challenge, and I want to make my position clear on one thing, that is, in my opinion, Communists do not believe in parliamentary institutions with their free speech and their respect for the rights of minorities. If this Party ever took over the reins of office, that would be the end of democracy, and everything which is worth-while, and for which men in two wars have fought and died. As far as I am concerned, without reservation, I am absolutely against their policies. What is more, the Communist Party play in a rough league. Not long ago I read in the London *Times* the following report—this is Communist politics, and people might just as well know of the principles for which they stand. Listen to this article from the London *Times*:

What happens to Communists: 9 out of 11 Russian Cabinet Ministers holding office since 1936 have been shot; 5 out of 7 of the last Central Executive Committee met the same fate; 43 of the 53 secretaries of the Communist Party organization have

been shot; 15 of the 17 top Communists who drafted the 1936 constitution faced the firing squad; 70 of the 80 members of the Soviet war council have been executed.

Since 1937, 3 of every 5 marshals of the Soviet Army have been shot as spies or traitors. All members of Lenin's first post-revolution inner cabinet were finally shot except Stalin.

In a word, I would like to say to the Province of Ontario that the day the Communist Party takes control in this country, the shooting will begin—and I should not be surprised, if I am alive at the time, if I am the first to be shot for making this observation.

I had not intended to make any observations in connection with the case referred to by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay), who sits behind me, the Cachia case, but then I changed my mind and thought I would say a few words with relation to what he said the other day.

Ever since I graduated from Law School, and before I entered this House, I nearly always acted for the defence. I have never acted for the Crown in my life, either as a Crown prosecutor or in any other capacity. I have spent my life in the courts. My experience is limited, I admit, from Oshawa to the Quebec border, but in all my days at the bar never once did I ever defend a man who complained that a statement was obtained from him by force, torture, fear or threat.

I know the best men at the bar in this country who take nothing, generally speaking, but criminal cases, and I have never heard them complain that any statement was ever obtained from any accused person whom they defended, by fear, threat or torture. In all my time at the bar, I have never known the Crown prosecutor to go behind the back of defence counsel and try to get the ear of the trial judge, whether it be in an Assize Court, the County Court or the Magistrate's Court.

I want to make it as clear as I can that with my little experience, I am satisfied that generally speaking, in

relation to the criminal law of this province over which the hon. Attorney-General has power and control in relation to administration, I say without reservations, I have stacked my wits against the best Crown prosecutors he can secure, and they do their very best to conduct the trials on a high level, and, as people will know, "irrespective of your class, colour, or creed, as long as the British flag is at the top of the court house, you will get a fair trial." That has been my experience and that is the way it ought to be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the Department of Highways and the apparent irregularities which have taken place with relation to this department. I want the people of Kingston and the Islands to know that on the 7th day of October, a very serious statement was released in relation to the Highway irregularities. I want them also to know that the information was known to them on the 26th day of the month when the people of Niagara Falls went to the polls. Likewise, I would like the people of Kingston to know that on the 20th day of January, another serious statement was made by the government before the election in Simcoe East, before the people went to the polls.

And in each case, "Old Man Ontario" renewed his confidence in the leader of the majority of the hon. members in this House, the Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) says the Provincial Treasurer and the Prime Minister of this province has collected \$58 million more than he needed out of the pocket-books of the people of the province. I think it is well that the people in my part of the province should know that, of that amount of money, \$40 million was received as a result of some transactions between the Province of Ontario and the Federal Government, and quite properly that money was used to "pay off the mortgage on the farm belonging to Old Man Ontario."

I want to put myself on record in relation to the hon. Prime Minister of this province regarding the Department

of Highways. He went into Simcoe East and never applied the whitewash brush. He took a brave, courageous stand. He preferred honourable defeat, rather than a mean victory. That was his attitude, and he is to be congratulated on it, and commended for it.

Since that time there have been many and varying charges levelled against the government in relation to the Highways Department. Some hon. members of this House, who are lawyers, may take the point of view that because an individual is going to be prosecuted, the matter is sub judice. I do not "go along" with that theory at all. I take the position that Parliament is supreme. We are the people. Hon. members will see the viciousness which might follow, if any other point of view is taken. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chartrand) is a good lawyer and will follow me when I say supposing an imaginary person—call him Jones—is prosecuted. He goes before a learned magistrate, where he asks to be tried by a jury. There may be no jury court for months as in most small places, unlike cities the size of Toronto, there are only 4 jury courts a year. Supposing there are only 4, and he elects to be tried by a judge and jury. He has the option of being tried by a County Court judge, or a Sessions Court, or he may be tried in the Supreme Court by judge and jury. At his trial there may be a conviction. Then he will have the opportunity of launching an appeal, on the ground that the judge improperly charged the jury on a point of law, or in relation to a portion of the evidence. The case then goes to the Court of Appeal for Ontario. Then he may appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. In the meantime no information in connection with what has happened may be discussed in Parliament.

I say, without reservation, Parliament is supreme. We are the people. No "smoke screen" should interfere with our course of duty, with our doing our level best to see if any man has been found guilty of a crime, he is brought to the bar of justice and made to pay his penalty. That is my attitude. By that I stand or fall.

But I go a step further, and so does my hon. leader. He has said, with characteristic fearlessness that this matter is going to be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts. If that is so, then may I say the sooner the Committee on Public Accounts meets, the better for us, in order that we should know what is happening. There are lawyers in this House and my hon. leader was, in his day, a good lawyer, who will subscribe to this observation. If there is any evidence given at a preliminary inquiry before a magistrate, we have the right to get a transcript of that evidence, to learn what is happening. That may give some information which is worthwhile. It may not do so, but it is worth trying. I say if the information we desire cannot be made available between now and the time this House prorogues, there should be a committee appointed so it will be able to meet, and find out, by the calling of witnesses, and the adducing of evidence, what is going on. In that way, nobody can say that we are afraid.

The attitude of my hon. leader is this: be you rich or be you poor, be you influential or humble, let the chips fall where they may, the honour and integrity of the Frost Government will be maintained.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that in relation to the Department of Highways, the administration has not kept pace with the times. There may be some departmental procedures, shall I say, that require to be changed. My attitude on that score, and let there be no doubt about it, is this: if there is inefficiency, get rid of the inefficient people and replace them with efficient help. In my opinion, that is the way to approach this problem.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has suggested that a Royal Commission should be appointed to look into the problem. I do not question his sincerity in that observation any more than I expect him to question my sincerity this afternoon when I say that I do not go along with him on that score. As a matter of fact, I, as a rule listen with care and attention to the words that fall

from the lips of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, I recently read with interest his observation on Royal Commissions as recorded in the Debates of this House under date of February 16th, 1949. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is reported to have said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one more subject, and that is, to do with Royal Commissions. We almost had another one today. If we had said yes, we would have had it. I am saying this because to me, the Royal Commissions are a pain in the neck for all we get out of them.

I do not wish to cause the hon. Leader of the Opposition to suffer pain; therefore, I suggest to him that in his wisdom and foresight expressed in 1949, he was on sound ground, and I think he had better stay there.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that to judge a man you sometimes have to look into his record. It may interest the House and the province to know that during the First World War, in October, 1918, the British army broke, and the German armies came through. One of the men who had to stand up against the onslaught is now the hon. Prime Minister of this province. As a result of that action he was badly wounded, and he will take with him to his grave the scars of action and the disability that he suffers. Those scars have taught him that responsible government means a government of the people, for the people and by the people.

I want to say this about my leader: he and I have been friends for more than a quarter of a century, and I think I understand him. He is honest and sincere, and I know that the highway irregularities will, by his government, and on his directions, be completely and thoroughly investigated to the absolute satisfaction of the people of Ontario; the wrongdoer, whether he is influential or otherwise, shall be brought to the bar of justice and, if found guilty, shall pay the penalty imposed by the court for his dishonesty. It will be the attitude of the hon. Prime Minister, if I judge him aright, and I think I do, that he

will let the chips fall where they may. I know that in this highways matter, the hon. Prime Minister will have the strength of heart, the sincerity of purpose and the purity of aim to do the right thing. In a word, when the highway matter is finalized, the people of Ontario will say, "We always thought the Prime Minister was honest; now he has proven it, because he has had the courage to see to it that no stone was left unturned in clearing up completely the highway situation." And, indeed, Old Man Ontario will say that my leader took that course of action in fairness and frankness because he was honest enough to be bold, and bold enough to be honest.

The Acting Speaker in the Chair.

MR. WILLIAM H. COLLINGS (Beaches): Mr. Acting Speaker, I wish to join with the hon. members of this House in congratulating you on being chosen Acting Speaker for this session; and also may I offer my congratulations to the mover, the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) and the seconder, the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) of an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, both of whom gave excellent speeches to this House.

Speaking, Mr. Acting Speaker, of my own riding, that of Toronto Beaches, I may say that when I travel through my riding, I meet many people who remark on what a wonderful job "Les" Frost is doing for this province. In this observation they are quite right, for this administration is giving good government to the Province of Ontario.

The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh) told us the other day of the termites which had invaded his riding. Unfortunately, somehow or other, the queen of the termites slipped away the other night and came across the boundary of Beaches. So we now have in the western section of my riding the problem of termites, and I agree that they do a good deal of damage.

Speaking again for my riding, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have received complaints from the residents of Kingston Road, who have urged me to impress

upon the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) the need to amend the Highway Traffic Act to provide that trucks and tractor-trailers be examined for faulty equipment before being given licences. I am told that on that portion of highway, between the hour of seven in the evening and the early morning, the noise from defective mufflers is terrific. I voice that complaint, Mr. Acting Speaker, on behalf of the people of my riding.

I have had at least half-a-dozen of my constituents say to me, "Well, we see you got your indemnity raised to \$10,000. You ought to be able to get by on that." Of course, I hasten to remind them that I am a member of the Legislature, not of the House of Commons. However, I see the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) in his seat, and I suggest to him that when he is looking into the question of pensions for the members of this House, that he also make some enquiries about an increase in indemnities.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I believe the time has come when our government should negotiate with the Federal Government in a Dominion-Provincial conference. I realize the need for such a conference has not been apparent in the past year by reason of the fact that we have an agreement with Ottawa in reference to the rental taxation field. But I would point out that that agreement will come to an end and, as we all know, it takes time to work out a new agreement. I believe we should now be sitting in with the authorities at Ottawa to make arrangements for the time when the present agreement will expire. I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) gave a solid reason for convening such a conference when, in speaking on the Throne debate, he suggested that criticism is due the government for what he calls flagrant behaviour in respect of municipal finances. He asked the question, "What fields would you take over?", and he suggested that the municipal taxpayer should be relieved of certain fields. To my mind, that is a solid argument for getting together with the Federal

Government in order that we may designate what taxing fields we think should be allotted to the municipality, the province and the Dominion.

I have already said that it takes time before we can appreciate the results of a Dominion-Provincial conference. I understand that in the 1951 conference the Prime Minister and the Minister of Welfare proposed the legislation that is now on the Statute Books of this province, namely pensions to disabled persons. Now, after 2 years' time, we hear the Federal Government saying that it is good legislation and it will become federal law.

I have a further argument, Mr. Acting Speaker, in support of a Dominion-Provincial conference. I read the other evening that the Commissioner of Public Welfare in Toronto, reporting to the Committee of Public Welfare, stated that unemployment in this city was double that of a year ago. It is my belief that the hon. Minister of Public Works for the province should be in constant touch with the Federal Minister of Public Works, so that in the event of any recession which might take place, they would have on the drafting boards all of the projects which might be considered to alleviate a situation of unemployment which might develop. I believe that when the building trades are kept active, the whole economy is equally buoyant. In proof of that statement, I would remind hon. members of the raw materials which go into buildings, and of the allied trades and services which are stimulated by building projects.

In the last provincial election of 1951 the Conservative Party went to the people of this province with one promise, namely, to give them good government. I say we are doing just that. For example, let us look at the Department of Education: the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) has brought forward to the House in this session, three Acts which will consolidate 13 Acts governing the Department of Education. That is evidence of good government.

With respect to the Department of Lands and Forests, we have had the White Paper presented to the House,

which is the basis for action to preserve the forest wealth of this province.

The hon. Minister for the Department of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) has presented to the House a consolidation of the Welfare Acts that govern the welfare of children in the province. It contains new and far-reaching benefits to child welfare, the finest in the country. I was pleased to read in the press that experts in the field of child welfare are impressed with the benefits which will flow from this legislation.

Then, speaking in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he will introduce shortly a new finance bill, to provide for the appointment of a Deputy-Treasurer, a Comptroller of Finance, a Comptroller of Revenue and of Accounts, who with their assistants can go from department to department to make sure things are being properly done. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is sound and sensible business practice.

I believe the action of the hon. Prime Minister in taking advantage of the talents of private members, and appointing them to Select Committees, has given great satisfaction. Several reports by such committees have been presented to this House, and in no case has there been a minority report. I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister and also to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Dunbar) that they give consideration to the setting up of a Select Committee for the revision of the Municipal Act, the Assessment Act and the Local Improvement Act. The reference today by a previous speaker concerning the practice of selling lands which have been seized for taxes is, I suggest, one indication of the desirability of some revision of the Municipal Act. I believe that the revision of the Act by a Select Committee, which could meet during the recess and hold the public hearings which would be required in connection with a revision of such magnitude, would be in the best interests of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

To the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Warrender), let me say that we have heard and read that the

government is sponsoring a development near Malton for the building of homes with government aid. But, regarding a development so far afield, and considering that the people who will live in these subdivisions will work in the City of Toronto, I think the Minister of Planning and Development should spearhead a movement to bring the railroads, the Toronto Transit Commission, and the Metropolitan Council into a conference looking to the electrification of the railways within a radius of 25 miles of this city. We have had the opportunity of inspecting the subway here which will soon be opened; we have seen the type of cars and trains that will be operated. I can see no reason why, through the combined efforts of the Toronto Transit Commission and the railways, some service of that type could not be provided for commuters within the area I have mentioned. Already pool trains have proved their worth and benefit.

I hope that the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Doucett) will not relax his efforts to eliminate all dangerous level crossings in the province. There is room in this field for the provincial and federal authorities to work together.

The leader of Her Majesty's Opposition (Mr. Oliver) recently delivered in this Chamber one of the best speeches I have heard since I have had the pleasure of sitting here. There are reports that he is to speak in my riding of Beaches this evening. If I were not then engaged at meetings of the Private Bills Committee and of the Toronto and Lake Shore Labour Council, I would enjoy the opportunity of going down and introducing the Leader of the Opposition to this Liberal meeting in my riding.

We read in the press last Friday that the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is allowing his name to go before the convention which will meet in the early part of April. May I say to him that he has my best wishes for success at that convention. I do not think he has anything to fear from the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), for I believe that hon. gentleman killed his goose when, speaking in this House,

he advocated the open sale of beer in grocery stores in this province. So, I repeat, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) need not worry about opposition from that source.

MR. OLIVER: Thanks very much.

MR. COLLINGS: I want to reaffirm my belief in the value of the two-Party system of government in this province. I have never taken the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) seriously. He is in a fairly good position, in that he sits there as a one-man Party, the only one-man Party, I suppose, in the Dominion. I do not recall that there is any other.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or in North America.

MR. SALSBERG: You are quite wrong. But continue.

MR. COLLINGS: I know he is happy in that position. But, as I have said, I do not take him seriously. He was born a Conservative; his early education was as a Conservative; and probably, if there were an easy way out of his present position, he would slip over here and return to his early affiliations. I say, if he could. But, as I have said, I believe in the two-Party system. I notice, in reading the speech of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) he remarked that other Speeches from the Throne were, so to put it, "whistling in the dark." I am sorry he is not in his seat.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): I will tell him.

MR. COLLINGS: But all through his speech he had nothing but commendation for the government. So, as we are considering the Speech from the Throne, I would like to include the House leader of the CCF group (Mr. Grummett) and the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) in my appeal to get back to the two-Party system of government. And I would suggest to the hon. member for Ontario, "Come on, cross the floor and sit with us, so that you can give active support to good

government in this province. I am sure that if you come to sit here temporarily, his honour, the Speaker, will arrange for you to sit here permanently. As from tomorrow you can say 'Just as I am, I come'."

MR. THOMAS: I would rather sing it.

MR. COLLINGS: I have only one other remark to make. I hope that, probably not in the far distant future, we shall hear from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Frost) that the finances of this province are such that we can grant a monthly increase of \$5 to the old-age pension, for the benefit of the elderly people of this province. There is nothing I enjoy more, if I happen to be in the bank at the end of the month, than to see one of our older citizens stepping up to the window and passing through his old-age pension cheque. It serves to remind us that our older citizens are receiving from the resources of this province some recompense for the energies and the efforts which they have put forth in the building of this great province.

MR. P. MANLEY (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make my contribution to the Speech from the Throne Debate, I want to express my appreciation for the gracious and considerate manner in which you perform the duties of your high office, sir, and compliment you on the fairness and patience you exercise. As one who faces speaking assignments with some degree of trepidation, I can assure you, sir, it is a comforting thought to speak before one as indulgent and fair-minded as you have been on so many occasions in this House.

I also add my voice to those who extended greetings and congratulations to the two new hon. members for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) and Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby). I agree, the hon. member for Niagara Falls made an excellent address in moving the reply to the Speech from the Throne, as did the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) who seconded it.

I wish, also, sir, to express my

sympathy to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) because illness has prevented him from attending this session. I wish him a speedy recovery, and an early return to his duties as Minister. As a fellow farmer, I know how deeply interested he is in the agricultural pursuits of this province. There are not too many farmers here to occupy these benches and the absent Minister's contributions to the work of this government have been so conscientious and energetic that I, for one, feel a deep sense of loss at his inability to be present here, especially at a time when important matters pertaining to agriculture are coming up for discussion.

The Department of Agriculture is one of the most important branches of this government, in my opinion. For a great many years, agriculture has been the basic industry of this fine country. Despite the rapid expansion of other industries, farming is still the key industry in our national economy, and I feel confident it will continue to remain so. The great American statesman, Daniel Webster, said "farmers are the founders of civilization." And Emerson, the great essayist, said "the first farmer was the first man, and all historic nobility rests on possession and use of land."

These are truths I bring to the attention of this House, because I feel the farming community is so tightly woven into the fabric of Canada's greatness, that in it lies the strength to hold us together. Farming has weathered many a depression storm in the past because of its strong, basic qualities. I venture to say that nothing will destroy our national economy more quickly or more completely than the agriculture industry being allowed to languish through faulty legislation and failure to realize and recognize its great potentialities in Canada's contribution to world production.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to deal with a serious situation which developed in this province last spring and summer in which this government plainly demonstrated its inability to serve the best interests of the dairy industry. Instead,

it adopted a policy of "playing Party politics," at the expense of the cheese producers of this province. A situation developed which would have had embarrassing repercussions in this House at this session, had it not been for the timely aid afforded by the Liberal Government at Ottawa.

You may recall, sir, that when I spoke nearly a year ago in this House, I drew the government's attention to the crisis which was developing in cheese production. My constituency of Stormont, as you know, is one of the best cheese-producing sections of Ontario, and we are naturally sensitive to anything pertaining to the marketing of this product. And we are not alone in that respect, as practically all the farming sections of the province are interested in cheese production and marketing.

In 1952, Ontario carried a fairly heavy inventory of cheese, even with the diversion of milk from the cheese factories, which began early in the season. The main reason, of course, was that the export market in Britain had been cut off due to exchange difficulties and competition from other countries.

The price of cheese, which had been well above 30 cents per pound through 1951, dropped to as low as 24 cents per pound by May, 1952, which is the supporting price under the Federal Government's Agricultural Products Co-operative Marketing Act, designed to guarantee payment of initial prices up to a maximum of 80 per cent. of the average prices in the 3 previous years. But producing costs have mounted so substantially that cheese in this day and age could not be produced and sold profitably at that price. So sales were few.

Cheese prices improved slightly during the summer months of 1952, due to domestic requirements, and the offer of the Ontario Government of a 6c. a pound guarantee to the end of that year, to bring the guaranteed price to the producer up to 30c. The price rose again to slightly above the 30c. level, and remained there for the balance of the year, with a brief fluctuation upward late in the year, when Britain provided

some measure of relief by agreeing to take about 5½ million pounds. This cheese was sold for export at 28⅞ cents per pound, f.s.s. seaboard. It had to be shipped to the coast and the producers had to bear the high freight charges. But they had been guaranteed 30c., through the price-support agreements. This was the only sale, I believe, in which the Ontario Government had to make up the difference, representing a fairly small amount.

Despite all the efforts of the Marketing Boards, more than 15 million pounds of cheese had to be carried over into 1953, from the 1952 production. Consequently, by May of last year, the price again dropped to 24c., and might have gone still lower, had not the Ottawa Government assured producers it was prepared to continue the assistance under the Co-operative Marketing Act. But no such assurance was forthcoming from the Ontario Government. Although it was aware of the crisis developing, and the wide-spread effect it would have on farming generally, and the dairy industry in particular, it refused to renew the 6c. guarantee it had made the previous year. Obviously there was only one reason for this refusal. A federal election was pending and this government was evidently prepared to sacrifice the cheese industry in the province, in an effort to embarrass the Liberal administration at Ottawa.

The situation was grim, indeed, until the Ottawa government came to the rescue on May 26th, when the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) announced the government at Ottawa had agreed to buy 5 million pounds of cheese from Ontario producers at 30c. a pound, and take over the 1952 stocks held by the producers, and offer the cheese for sale at cost. I don't think we need ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, which government had the real interest of the people of this province at heart. I am sure that was reflected in the voting in the federal election last August. I often wonder what the hon. Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa (Mr. Drew) thought about the action of his Ontario Government friends, particularly on the morning after the election. I have also

wondered what the situation in the dairy industry would be today in this province, had it not been for the assistance given it by the Dominion Liberal Government.

Fortunately for the dairy industry, the situation last year was further helped by Britain's improved dollar situation, and the Old Country was able to "come through" again in the late fall with another contract, this time for 10 million pounds of cheese. This sale was not made without some sacrifice on the part of the individual producer, however, for in making the financial arrangements the Ontario Cheese Producers' Association found it necessary to raise its licence fee from 5c. to \$2 per 100 pounds. The additional \$1.95 came, of course, out of the dairy farmers' pockets.

In concluding this particular part of my address, I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that while 1953 was the most critical year in the history of the Producers' Association, the outlook for 1954 is a little more hopeful and we anticipate more prosperous days ahead. I note producer groups will be brought under one Act, by a bill now before the House. I think it is apparent that when one group of milk producers is in difficulty, it affects all other groups. Surplus is thus the responsibility of everyone, for all are affected by it.

At the risk of repeating some things I mentioned when last I addressed this House, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal briefly with a few matters which I think should again be brought to the attention of the government, because they merit consideration. If this government is interested in creating better labour relations in this province, I do not see why something is not done about the request of the fire fighters to shorten their work-week hours and bring them more in line with those in other and less hazardous occupations.

This matter was brought up last year not only by myself, but by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Child) who preceded me in the debate. We are in agreement, as I am sure are many other hon. members, that the 56-hour

week of the fire fighters is extreme in comparison with the 44-hour and 48-hour work weeks now regarded as standard in practically every line of industry. It is understandable that resentment is aroused and the fire fighters feel they are being discriminated against.

I also raise again, sir, the question of a more representative exhibit of this province's prize cattle at the annual Royal Winter Fair. I know we have many fine Holstein and Ayrshire herds in Stormont County which are not represented at the fair because their breeders cannot afford freight transportation and other costs involved in bringing them to Toronto. I believe this is true of a number of the smaller breeders in other parts of the province. Why cannot the Department of Agriculture extend the same inducement to them as is done to breeders outside the province, by defraying 50 per cent. of the costs of transportation? The additional amount involved would not be substantial and I am sure the expenditure would be justified, in making for keener competition and a better representation of provincial prize cattle at this Toronto showing.

I want to deal now with a subject, not only of tremendous interest and concern in my constituency, but to this whole province—and the nation as well—the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development project. We in Stormont, as well as people in other counties along the St. Lawrence River, where this development occurs, are going to be vitally affected in the progress of this project. For many of us it means the uprooting of our homes, the loss of our land and a severing of sentimental ties which go back to the days of the early settlers. Some 7,000 people will have to move to new homes, and be re-located on land strange to them, and often not of their own choosing. From Prescott to Cornwall, a distance of 49 miles, all riverside homes and all land under the 248-foot elevation will be condemned. Whole towns, Iroquois, Aultsville, Mille Roches, and the present business district of Morrisburg will be flooded. To many of these people, particularly the older

generation, this is a real tragedy. I can see plenty of trouble ahead and, undoubtedly, some costly complications will arise, if high-handed methods are adopted in clearing this area. This is a terribly serious matter and it has to be handled with tact and diplomacy and the utmost consideration for the people affected.

At the last session of this House, Mr. Speaker, I appealed to the government to give considerable thought and study to this matter, and formulate a comprehensive plan well in advance of any work undertaken. Such a plan must be publicized and freely discussed with the people concerned and made as flexible as possible so as to cause the least hardship and inconvenience. No matter how perfect a plan is devised, it is not going to please everyone, and probably the best we can hope for is that it will satisfy a majority of them. But the longer this plan is delayed, the greater the difficulty encountered in putting it into effect. If the government has such a plan, it should be brought to the attention of the House at this session. So far, I am not aware that anything definite has been done along this line, and I know the people who will be affected by it are still anxiously waiting word of definite proposals.

Over a year ago, the Hydro Commission announced the establishment of an Advisory Committee which included representatives of the various departments of government concerned with this work. This committee was to submit recommendations to Mr. H. D. Rothwell, a hydro engineer, who apparently has authority to accept or reject them as he saw fit. Now that the United States House of Representatives has given the "go-ahead" signal for the power development and seaway project, probably only a short time remains before a start will be made. If the Advisory Committee launched by the Hydro Commission has submitted its recommendations, then this House should be informed of that fact. If it has not, then the government should inform the hon. members when the report will be ready, and if it will be presented at this session. Delays are

costly, and I am afraid they will become increasingly so in this important matter which involves so many people, unless great care is taken to avert them.

In connection with seaway and power development on the St. Lawrence, there is another matter I want to bring to the government's attention at this time. When power is available from this source, I submit, Mr. Speaker, a block of it should be provided for the eastern Ontario counties at an attractive price, to induce industry to establish there. I know the Ontario Planning and Development Board has been studying the question of decentralizing industry, a necessary procedure in time of war, especially in atomic war, and no less desirable under existing conditions of industrial expansion. What more favourable area can industry be offered than that within the eastern counties adjacent to the seaway? It is one of the best farming districts in the province and one that is intersected by main lines of the railways and chief highways.

The United States is pursuing a policy of spreading its industry over a wide area to make it less vulnerable in case of attack. In Ontario, our industry is concentrated in a relatively small area, and industrial expansion is adding to this concentration, which is already too pronounced. In days of peace, it is obvious that a balanced economy must be built around a spreading-out of industry. From Eastern and Northern Ontario, there is constant movement of men and wealth toward the congested areas to feed the huge industrial machine. Establishing industries in these parts of Ontario would hold the population, provide markets locally, and build up a sustaining community less subject to recessions, than large centres of population would be. We should not, I submit, make the large centres larger, but distribute our strength for the good of all. In this way, too, we would be better able to meet the challenge of the housing situation, and relieve the heavy burden placed on some municipalities in the existing congested areas. I trust the government will see the wisdom of this suggestion, for now is the time to do something about it and not wait until

it has to be done under emergency conditions.

I was glad to hear the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. MacOdrum) bring up the matter the other day, and stress the point that a start should be made this year on building a new No. 2 Highway between Brockville and Cornwall. I certainly support everything he said about the condition of the present highway between these two points. I brought this question up a year ago, and said at that time this stretch of road never was intended to handle the amount of vehicular traffic required of it today. I also pointed out that it was in a deplorable condition and in need of repair and resurfacing, and the accident toll on this particular part of No. 2 Highway is very heavy.

I think traffic accident figures for Ontario last year bear out what I said then. One accident on this stretch of road took 20 lives and seriously injured a number of other people. There have been several accidents where the casualty toll has not been so great. The fact remains, however, that nothing has been done to relieve this situation, and we are facing another summer during which the traffic on this highway will be heavier than ever before.

I know that most of this particular stretch of road will be wiped out when the seaway project and power development is completed and it is not to be expected under the circumstances, to have it widened or rebuilt. But a new road has to be built through this area sooner or later, and why cannot it be started now? There is no more important or serious highway problem in the province than this. The newspapers in the eastern counties, as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. MacOdrum) said, have been pointing out the seriousness of the situation in editorials and through their reports of frequent accidents. It is time something was done, and I urge the Highways Department to delay it no longer.

There are other matters pertaining to conditions in the eastern counties in general, and my constituency in particular, which I desire to put before this

House, Mr. Speaker, but I realize that I have already spoken at length, and I do not want to tax your patience and trespass on the time of other hon. members unduly, so I will leave them, until another opportunity offers.

However, there is one important matter that I think is worthy of the attention of the hon. members at this time and which I feel I should "get off my chest." From my own observation and from what has been brought to my attention, I feel the morality standards of the Ontario film censors have been lowered in recent months.

I say this in all seriousness, because recently I visited what is regarded as one of the better theatres in Toronto, and witnessed a picture that I can only describe as "obscene," obviously catering to low moral standards. I probably should have been forewarned about it, as I noticed the sign in front of the theatre which said nobody under 18 years of age would be admitted. But being slightly over that age and fairly broadminded about these things, I did not let that stop me.

After seeing the picture, I can only say that the sign should have said that nobody under 80 years would be admitted. I will give the name of the film and the theatre that showed it—for 4 successive weeks, I believe—to any hon. member interested, but I do not want to mention it publicly in this House, because I fear it might prove too strong a temptation for other hon. members. This picture extolled immorality on the part of a mother and her young daughter as a means of obtaining expensive clothing and an easy way of life. The husband and father shot himself when the true state of affairs was suddenly and dramatically revealed to him. There was not one redeeming feature in the whole picture. It left little to the imagination and there was no attempt at a moral ending. I was the most sordid picture I have ever witnessed, and I cannot understand how it ever passed the Ontario Board of Film Censorship.

I doubt if such a picture would be offered in any theatre outside of Toronto. I know that any self-respecting

theatre manager in our smaller cities and towns would never dream of showing such a picture to his patrons. If he did, I am sure he would have to get out of town the next day. It would seem, sir, that the film censors have adopted a lower moral standard for theatres in the Metropolitan area—or is it that the motion picture industry is leaning toward this type of thing to meet competition from television, the beverage room, and other attractions?

I think if there have been any changes in film-censorship policy, this House should be informed of it. From what I have been told, other pictures of a similar nature have been booked into Toronto movie theatres. Such films can only have an evil influence and I shudder to think of what the moral tone of the people of this province will be in the years ahead if our theatres are allowed to show them. I think the circumstances under which these films are given approval should be fully investigated, and some statement on film-censorship policy should be forthcoming from the department responsible for the censors.

MR. J. N. ALLAN (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to be able to compliment you upon your continuing to occupy your present position and the delightful way in which you administer the duties of your office. We hope your health will be maintained and that you will be there for a long time.

I have been most encouraged, as one interested in highway safety, to note the keen and sincere interest in this problem by hon. members of this House. I would like to commend the hon. members who spoke upon this subject, because I am convinced that recognition of the problem is the first step in reducing highway accidents.

The Ontario Goods Roads Association, an organization of municipal officers and officials, representative of the entire province, has chosen the task of reducing highway accidents as their No. 1 project. This effort was undertaken about one year ago in co-operation with the Department of Highways of

this province and established safety promoting groups; they are progressing and it is hoped contributing to the overall effort to reduce highway accidents.

I consider that I was fortunate as a member of this safety committee to be privileged with Mr. T. J. Mahony, the secretary of the association to be delegated by the Ontario Good Roads Association to attend the President's Safety Conference at Washington, held February 17, 18th and 19th last, and I would like at this time to acquaint hon. members of this House with the thinking of that conference.

I should perhaps say at first that President Eisenhower called the conference for the purpose of developing public support at the community level for proven methods of improving street and highway traffic. Mention was made also that knowledge possessed by most drivers and the public could cut down accidents if they so willed.

The President asked the Governors of all states to participate and to designate outstanding citizens as delegates including representatives of agriculture, business, labour, women, public officials, media of public information and organizations (service, fraternal, religious, veterans, etc.) President Eisenhower pointed out the necessity of action by stating the number of persons killed, the number injured and the money loss in the United States—a stupendous figure—38,000 killed, 1,350,000 injured and property loss of nearly \$4 billion in 1952; no figures are available for suffering or for those maimed and made inactive for life.

It was agreed at this conference that safety organizations and officials have long since learned how to reduce accidents. The conference's purpose was to translate this knowledge into results by means of vigorous continuing public support.

This conference of 2,500 selected delegates representing every state in the union was unanimous in the conclusion that accidents occur at the local level and that they will be prevented at the local level and that the greatest

influence in such prevention will be the decision of the individual driver and the individual pedestrian to exercise care.

The highway accident problem in Ontario is similar to the highway accident problem in the United States. Our roads are similar as our people and also our highway accident experience. It would seem reasonable therefore that we in Ontario might profit from the experience of the large population of the United States and their 54 million drivers of motor vehicles. Certainly it would seem wise for us to consider their conclusions in an attempt to improve highway safety on the roads and streets of our province.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I came away from this conference convinced that the problem of safety on our highways will never be solved by legislation or enforcement alone or by engineering alone in the form of safer highways. These are helpful and important but as has been demonstrated with laws governing personal action and decision in years past, essence of the law must be supported by public opinion. The men who enforce the law must have public support—real backing. Lip service must give way to an earnest effort on the part of everyone, especially those persons with influence at the community level, to create a desire within the individual to drive or to walk safely.

Highway safety was the theme of this large convention of the Ontario Good Roads Association and addresses were delivered by many experts. I would like to quote briefly from the address of Mr. A. H. Rowan, of the Ontario Department of Highways, in charge of inventorying motor accidents for many years. It is his duty to record the accidents and the cause of same as reported by the police. I may add in this connection that the records compiled by this department are considered up-to-date and adequate by other jurisdictions in Canada and in the United States.

Mr. Rowan stated, and I quote:

There were 65,866 accidents reported to the Motor Vehicles Branch during 1953—in which 1,082 persons

were killed and 24,353 persons were injured, in addition to a property damage loss amounting to over \$24 million. It is estimated that loss of time, medical and hospital costs would increase this amount to more than \$90 million. A careful study was made of these fatal accidents and the study revealed that 96.7 per cent of these accidents were caused by human error, alone, or in combination with inattention, poor judgment or discourtesy. What were the drivers doing? Of the actions or violations of drivers contributing to the 920 fatal accidents, the greatest number involved driving at unsafe speeds; failure to give right of way; failure to keep to the right; improper passing; disregard of traffic controls; following too closely and improper turns.

And there is not an hon. member in this House who does not feel that these motorists knew how to drive.

Mr. Rowan summed up his remarks by saying: "We know that driving a motor car is a full-time job. It calls for a high degree of law observance. We need good attitudes and obedience to regulations designed for the protection of all citizens. These are points which must be driven home to all citizens." I repeat that sentence. "We need good attitudes and obedience to regulations designed for the protection of all citizens."

The convention referred to was impressed and many so stated from the convention floor—indeed they pledged themselves to exert their influence as best they can in their own community for highway safety. I would like to suggest that each and every hon. member of this House can be an ambassador for highway safety at the community level; that every support and assistance be given to the Minister of Highways, and especially to those of his department engaged in highway safety promotion, and likewise to those officers engaged in traffic regulation and control.

I would like to suggest a type of

driver education to the hon. Minister of Highways which I think is new and untried, and for this reason would suggest that it be used in a small area at first as an experiment.

My suggestion is the appointment of a number of men who would be courtesy officers on our highways. They could observe the traffic and if drivers were noticed doing anything not considered good driving practice, the courtesy officer could stop the driver and explain his misdemeanour, and at the same time administer tactfully a safety lesson. Much publicity for safety would result and the driver would be more likely to co-operate in future. It is doubtful if the giving of a ticket for a traffic violation increases the desire of the driver to be a good driver. It might have rather the effect of impressing upon the driver to watch more carefully for policemen, or "traffic officers," which seems a better word. If such courtesy officers were appointed, they could create a fine spirit of helpfulness and friendliness among the many tourists who visit our province each year.

It has been my hope to suggest a plan of highway safety promotion that can be proceeded with at once. I am not wanting to disagree with any recommendations or suggestions made by other hon. members who have spoken on highway safety. However, I am of the opinion that because there are so many suggestions for safety improvement and they vary so much that we might be in the position of the donkey between 2 bales of hay. It is supposed that he starved to death because he could not make up his mind which bale to eat.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I state again my conviction that safe driving will be brought about by the decision of the individual to drive safely. I watched Vice-President Nixon sign a pledge that he would drive safely and consider the rights of others on the road. That was the basis of what that conference endeavoured to impress on those who attended.

I wish to compliment the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) upon

his continual interest in and encouragement of highway safety. We see the sign on the road: "Accident Is a Word Until You Have One." I think that has been splendid publicity, and has no doubt prevented many accidents and here I should like to point out to hon. members of the House—each hon. member will find on his desk a small chart—certain facts with regard to our highway accident experience. It is true there have been more accidents per 100 million miles of driving as time has gone along, but I think perhaps the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), when he suggested this afternoon the limit above which accidents need to be reported should be raised from \$50 to \$100, explained why the number of accidents has increased.

But at the same time, since 1943, you will notice that fatalities for each 100 million miles of vehicle operation in the province are only half what they were in 1942.

I could not help being reminded, as I was preparing these few remarks, of the great work which has been done by the Department of Welfare in influencing workmen to be careful along the lines of "Safety First," and I am sure the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) would be a disciple for this sort of gospel which should be taken to the individual driver and pedestrian.

To point out how difficult it is to recommend a technique of which you can always be sure is the correct one—and I mention this because in the past our record in 1953 was 8.8 fatalities for each 100 million miles of driving, the same figure which the United States has—the State of Rhode Island, which leads the United States in its accident record, had only 2.4 accidents per 100 million miles, without having in force a definite speed limit.

They have a recommended speed limit, which is posted, but the individual driver is relied on to know how fast he feels it is safe to drive. The director of safety for that state told me that if a driver was driving at 70 miles an hour and was in good condition, and his car was in good condition, and if the

road was clear, he could not be convicted of speeding. But, if, on the other hand, the road was slippery and he was driving at 50 miles an hour, he could be convicted of speeding. And they have a wonderful record in the State of Rhode Island.

These figures are really not definite and, of course, there are many details which enter them. The State of New York has a better figure than we have, but that is largely accounted for by the fact that fewer persons drive to work. The drivers in that state own cars similar to those driven in Ontario, and have attained a splendid record over the same kind of roads. In that connection, I would again like to compliment the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) upon the condition of our provincial roads in the winter time. The Province of Ontario has a reputation in the United States and the other provinces of Canada for keeping its roads in a safer condition in winter than any other state or province, and that is achieved under the most difficult conditions.

But I do think we must improve our record, and we can by supporting the government agencies in their regulation and enforcement effort, and by the creating of a public opinion that will influence a larger and larger percentage of drivers of motor vehicles to decide to drive safely and to carry the gospel to other drivers.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say from my observations at Washington, that the Department of Highways has a safety organization comparable to the better state organizations in the United States, an admirable achievement when one considers that many states became safety conscious years before the hon. Minister of Highways founded a continuous safety campaign in 1947. We have the foundation for real progress in highway safety in this province. Our highways are good and are being continually improved. The drivers of our motor vehicles know how to drive. The pedestrians know how to walk—success depends upon public opinion influencing drivers to think and

drive safely and pedestrians to walk with care. If we do this well our accident experience will continue to improve as it has done since 1943—when the death rates were approximately double our present death rate when related to miles driven.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, may I seek the co-operation of every hon. member in this House in regard to our safety efforts, which we have heard pointed out by other hon. members, and they have done that wonderfully well. This House can wield a great deal of influence toward greater safety, and I am sure that if we all co-operate, we will achieve wonderful success.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Before moving the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker, may I say it is the intention to go on tomorrow with the addresses on the amendment to the motion to adopt the Speech from the Throne. Should there be any time available, we will consider certain bills.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Wednesday, March 10, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 10, 1954.

Ross Memorial Hospital , bill respecting, report of Commissioners of Estate Bills	451
City of Peterborough (No. 2) , bill respecting, report of Commissioners of Estate Bills	451
Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association , fourth report Standing Committee on Private Bills	452
Township of Scarborough , bill respecting, fourth report Standing Committee on Private Bills	452
City of Hamilton , bill respecting, fourth report Standing Committee on Private Bills	452
Financial Administration Act, 1954 , introduced by Mr. Frost, first reading	452
Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne , Mr. T. D. Thomas, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Connell, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Morningstar, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Porter	456
Motion to Adjourn , Mr. Frost, agreed to	486

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1954.

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Commissioners of Estate Bills their reports in the following matters:

Bill No. 17, An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital.

Bill No. 23, An Act respecting The City of Peterborough (No. 2).

PRIVATE BILL No. 17

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: The following letter has been received from the Commissioners of Estate Bills:

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JUDSON
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AYLESWORTH

Alex C. Lewis, Esq., Q.C.
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament Buildings
Toronto, Ontario

*Re: Private Bill No. 17, An Act respecting
The Ross Memorial Hospital*

DEAR SIR:

The undersigned as Commissioners of Estate Bills as provided by the Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1950, chapter 202, section 57, now report upon the above mentioned bill which has been referred to us.

We have considered representations made to us by counsel for the petitioners and by Messrs. S. A. Flavelle, a member of the Board of Governors of the Hospital, and Jasper Forman, Chairman of the Associates of the Hospital. In clause number 6 of subsection 1 of section 1 of the bill, and in subsection 2 of section 1, reference is made to "the Ross Memorial Trust." We are informed that there is no such legal entity and that reference to the pro-

visions of paragraph numbered 3 of the schedule to chapter 132 of the Statutes of Ontario, 1903, was intended thereby. We recommend that the bill be amended in the two subsections mentioned by substituting therein for the words "the Ross Memorial Trust" the words "the descendant of the donor James Ross, deceased, as described in paragraph 3 of the indenture forming the schedule to an Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital, being chapter 132 of the Statutes of Ontario, 1903."

Subject to the suggested amendment, we are of the opinion that it is reasonable that the bill do pass into a law and that the provisions thereof are proper for carrying its purposes into effect.

According, we have signed the bill and return it and the petition therefor herewith.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) JOHN B. AYLESWORTH

(signed) WILFRED JUDSON

Commissioners of Estate Bills.

PRIVATE BILL No. 23

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: The following letter has been received from the Commissioners of Estate Bills:

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JUDSON
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AYLESWORTH

March 9, 1954

Alex C. Lewis, Esq., Q.C.
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament Buildings
Toronto, Ontario

*Re: Private Bill No. 23, An Act respecting
The City of Peterborough (No. 2)*

DEAR SIR:

The undersigned as Commissioners of Estate Bills as provided by the Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1950, chapter 202, section 57, have had the above mentioned bill before us for consideration as such commissioners and now report thereon.

The applicants and their solicitors attended before us and after hearing their representations, we are of the opinion that to remove any

possible doubt concerning the position of the trustees of the R. A. Morrow Memorial Park in the event such trustees convey part of the trust property to the Corporation of the City of Peterborough as contemplated by the bill, the said bill should contain a provision to the effect that upon such conveyance the trustees are absolved from any claims alleging breach of trust by reason of such conveyance.

Subject to this comment we are of the opinion that it is reasonable that the bill do pass into a law and that the provisions thereof are proper for carrying its purposes into effect. Accordingly, we have signed the bill and the same, together with the petition, are returned herewith.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) JOHN B. AYLESWORTH

(signed) WILFRED JUDSON

Commissioners of Estate Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We are pleased today to welcome 250 students from the Toronto Teachers' College, whom we hope, before too long, are going to be entrusted with the training and education of our children. We appreciate very much their coming to our Assembly this afternoon, and hope that they will be enlightened and, we trust, become more enthused with the free system of government which we all enjoy.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. H. E. BECKETT (York East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Nickle, I beg leave to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Nickle from the Standing Committee on Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its fourth report:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 3, An Act respecting The Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association.

Bill No. 21, An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough.

Your committee begs leave to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 5, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 3, An Act respecting The Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT, 1954

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Financial Administration Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated at the opening of the debate on the Speech from the Throne the bill which I am now introducing sets out in particular, the financial administration and methods of procedure in the Treasury Department.

As will be apparent tomorrow, when I deliver the budget, the finances of this province have grown considerably in magnitude. Indeed, what is happening here is common to the rest of Canada. I have read some of the budgets from other provinces, and note that they too are very substantial. In particular, I noticed one province, having one-fifth of our population, with a budget double that of the amount contained in the one I delivered 10 years ago this month.

We have been quite aware of the financial growth of our province, and over a period of 5 years have developed a type of treasury control based upon studies elsewhere, in part upon the Ottawa system, but particularly upon our own experience. This Act translates that experience into fact. I have before me, a statement which I shall read to the House.

This bill is being introduced to accomplish the following objects:

1. To consolidate and bring up to date The Consolidated Revenue Fund

Act, The Public Revenue Act, The Provincial Loans Act, and certain sections of The Audit Act that provide for duties of the Treasury Department rather than the Provincial Auditor. This will make possible the integration of the essential financial processes of Ontario.

2. To reorganize the Treasury Department so that there will be a group of senior officials in the Treasury Department to delineate fiscal policies and generally to supervise departmental operations. This will have the effect of establishing modern fiscal procedure and controls throughout all departments of government and of producing financial facts and reports essential to the management of the government and necessary for the information of the Legislative Assembly and the public.

3. To designate the senior officials who will head up the organization of the various services that will be performed by the Treasury Department as follows:

(a) the Deputy Provincial Treasurer who will supervise and manage, under the direction of the Treasurer of Ontario, all matters relating to the responsibilities of the Treasury Department.

Sir, that gentleman is Mr. Hugh E. Brown, formerly the Chief Accountant, who last summer was appointed Deputy Treasurer.

(b) a Comptroller of Finances who will advise upon all matters relating to the public debt and sinking funds of Ontario.

That will be combined with paragraph (e), which I shall now read:

(e) a Provincial Economist who shall study and report upon economic and social trends and their effects on the policies of governments, on economic and social conditions, on the relations between federal, provincial and municipal governments and on any other matters that the Treasurer may assign to him.

That, of course, refers to the work now being done by Doctor Chester S. Walters, as Comptroller of Finances and Mr. George Gathercole, as Assistant Comptroller of Finances and Provincial Economist.

(c) A Comptroller of Revenue who will continually examine the methods of administration and control applied in any department of government in connection with collection and accounting of public money and on the basis of his approved recommendations, either supervise in all departments of government such methods of administration and control as he deems proper or he may provide in any such department accounting and other services in connection with the administration and control of the collection and accounting of public money. The Comptroller of Revenue will also make studies as to the sources and rates of any tax, fee, revenue or receipt being collected in any department so that consideration may be given either to the abandonment of any such source or the adjustment of the rates thereof or the introduction and use of new sources of revenue;

That refers to Mr. Philip T. Clark, who has been the very able Comptroller of Revenue for a number of years. This provision regarding the Comptroller of Revenue is not an exact pattern of the Department of National Revenue at Ottawa. You will recollect that some years ago the Department in Ottawa was divided into the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue. In other words, one was to some extent the policy-making department, and the other the collection department. This Act will introduce into our system a phase of that arrangement. I would say, that the duties of the Comptroller of Finances and the Provincial Economist are to keep in view the fiscal and economic trends of the country. We in Ontario have to be interested in trends taking place, for instance, in Newfoundland, as well as

in our own province, because they affect our economy. In the operations of the Comptroller of Revenue and the Comptroller of Finances, you have to some extent the pattern which at Ottawa stems from a Department of Finance and a Department of National Revenue. The duty of the Deputy Treasurer is to tie those two together. There will also be a Comptroller of Accounts, formerly called the Chief Accountant, and the person named to that position is Mr. Harold Walker. He assumed the office of Chief Accountant about a year ago, having come from the Department of Education. I give you this explanation of his duties:

(d) A Comptroller of Accounts who will examine continually the methods of administration and control applied in any department in connection with the accounting of the disbursement of public money and, on the basis of the approved recommendations he may make, he may require adjustments of such methods of administration and supervise their operation in any department or he may provide in any department accounting and other services in connection with the administration and control of the disbursement of public money;

My fourth and next point is in regard to a Budget Committee. This is a very useful instrument of activity which we have been using for many years, and which, indeed, goes back to the administration which preceded us.

This Act recognizes the status attained by the Budget Committee and confers upon it the sanction or approval of statute rather than leaving it in the position of an informal committee.

4. To set up a Budget Committee composed of the Senior Treasury Department officials referred to and any other officials that from time to time are deemed necessary to be placed on the Budget Committee.

The officials, at the present time are the gentlemen whom I have named and Mr. Harold Chater, the Provincial

Statistician and the secretary of the committee is Mr. Malcolm McIntyre who is the Secretary of the Cabinet Council. I think that is correct as of the present time, but we are not precluded from enlarging the committee if it should be deemed necessary.

This committee will supervise the budgeting service of the government relating to the affairs of every department. It will examine, advise upon and compile the annual and supplementary estimates of revenue, receipts, expenditure and payments; it will examine and advise upon the expenditures, the commitments, the prospective expenditures, the revenues and the prospective revenues of every department; it will make suggestions generally with a view to promoting efficiency and economy in every department.

Aside from these organizational changes and the wider powers given to Treasury Department officials over the administration of the accounting of the receipts of public money and the disbursements thereof, the bill contains no major change of policy. It brings up to date in one Act all the present provisions respecting budgeting, revenue, expenditure, accounting and control in all respects in every department.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House the following:

(1) The Annual Report of the Inspector of Legal Offices for the year ended December 31st, 1953.

(2) The Third Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario, for the year 1953.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, may I tell the House that next Wednesday, the 17th of March, is the day of the press dinner. I do not want the gentlemen of the press to become excited, but I intend to suggest the House adjourn at about

five o'clock, in order not to oppress the press with more troubles than they presently have.

On that afternoon, however, immediately following the adjournment of the House, I would like to unveil a plaque to Robert Baldwin, whose picture you may have noticed at the entrance to the Chamber.

There are a number of the Baldwin family in Ontario, and I am asking specific ones to be here at that time.

The plaque is in commemoration of Robert Baldwin, who was one of the champions of responsible government in this province. May I say to the hon. members that directly across the rotunda is a picture of a great contemporary of Mr. Baldwin, from Lower Canada, LaFontaine. The Baldwin-LaFontaine government was really the genesis of responsible government in the province. I would like to have the unveiling next Wednesday afternoon, immediately following the adjournment of the House. I think, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition will agree, we might have some references in the Chamber to this matter, before we adjourn to the corridor to unveil the plaque, which will not take very long.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to question number 17.

May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who yesterday referred to a motion for the tabling of the Trans-Canada agreements and correspondence, that we have no objection to that. Indeed, it would have been tabled before now, but it is customary when correspondence of that nature is tabled, to inform the other governments concerned, and that is in the process of being done at the present time. I will be very glad to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition the information as soon as possible.

MR. H. E. BECKETT (York East): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to mention the adverse criticism appearing in the press of the hockey team coming from my riding, which while overseas won all its games

but one. I think some mention should be made of that criticism, which I believe is totally unjustified.

MR. ALBERT WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hockey team, may I say a word?

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is not open for discussion. Is there a question the hon. member (Mr. Wren) would like to ask?

MR. WREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will put it in the form of a question. Would the hon. member who raised this question (Mr. Beckett) object to a request being forwarded to His Worship the Mayor of Toronto, to contribute the \$5,000 to the Kenora hockey team, the Western Canadian Champions, which is now on its way to Japan? If His Worship the Mayor of Toronto would like to redeem the honour of Canada, and of this province, I am sure the Kenora hockey team would like in the near future to slip over to Russia, and show them, some afternoon, just what they can do.

MR. ARTHUR CHILD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the adverse publicity mentioned by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett)?

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, but I think I must cut short the debate. It seems to me I have been very lenient this year, insofar as permitting members to speak before the Orders of the day, without a request having been made to my office.

I have already requested if any hon. member has a matter he considers of public interest, which he wishes to present to the House prior to the Orders of the day, he abide by the rules, and afford Mr. Speaker the opportunity of looking over the subject matter. This would curtail a great deal of discussion.

Matters before the Orders of the day are not open to discussion or debate. I think we shall have to proceed with the Orders.

ON AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION TO REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I am sure it was a very great shock to all hon. members of this Assembly, to hear of the sudden passing of the late hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey), and I would like to join other speakers who have preceded me in this debate, in extending my sincere sympathy to his family in the loss of a very dear father and beloved husband.

I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley), and the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden). Both spoke clearly and distinctly, and both were most fulsome in their praise of the government. I am sure that praise has been expressed by all the hon. members who have spoken, in fact, they have said all the good things about the government which can be said, and I am sorry I cannot find anything more to say, so I must be a little critical.

The Speech from the Throne, as presented by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, in the Legislature on February 11th, was, in my opinion, about the shortest on record, and I regret it did not contain one word of Canada's number one social problem, which is housing. Could it be that the government was ashamed of its own conduct in seceding from the field of rent control, and wished to soft-pedal the critical housing situation in Ontario?

We very often hear people say the 3 most important things in life are the "school," the "church," and the "home." With that I think we all agree. But what is the good of giving our youth of today spiritual guidance in the church, providing the finest educational facilities in the school, and then sending some of them back into sub-standard homes and slums, where a great deal of this splendid training can be wasted? If we take the normal day, the child is only in the school at most only 5½ hours per day. This does not seem to be of much concern to the government, for housing did not receive an honourable mention.

The housing shortage of today is closely connected with the increasing cost of our social services.

Last November, the Ontario County Canadian Club held a dinner meeting in Whitby. Mr. J. Alec Edmison, a director of the John Howard Society and past president of the Canadian Penal Association, now assistant Principal of Queen's University, was the guest speaker. This gentleman has given a great deal of time and thought to our social problems of today. During the course of his remarks he said:

It will be found that the average lawbreaker comes from a slum or depressed area, for this is the source of 9 out of 10 criminals. Many come from unsatisfactory homes, homes which are broken by separation or divorce, where there is no sense of inward security for the child.

and concluded with these words:

Magnificently unprepared for life.

What a damning indictment of our present housing situation.

I must compliment the Chairman of the Select Committee on Reform Institutions. I am sure that he, and the members of his committee, devoted a great deal of time to this volume which was presented to the hon. members the other day, but I wonder if they have given any consideration to the housing situation in Ontario? I think they should have, because the housing situation is closely connected with the increasing costs of our public and social services today.

Reading our daily papers, one can read of the hardships of some poor people. The *Daily Star* in the appeal for funds for Christmas Cheer last December, cites the case of a man and wife and 11 children, 7 of them under 12, living in one average size room on the second floor of a Jarvis Street rooming house, and believe it or not, they were paying \$150 per month for that one room. The father was able, out of his meagre earnings, to pay \$75 per month, and the remaining \$75 per month was paid by a special arrangement with the City Welfare Department. I discovered a case in my own riding where

a lady on Mothers' Allowance was asked to pay \$80 per month for a house one could have bought before the war for less than \$1,000 and yet the lady, with her 3 children, was only receiving from the department \$90 per month. I am sure many more cases of extreme hardship could be cited, and yet the Speech from the Throne did not even mention housing.

Although the government, in co-operation with the Federal Government, is servicing land for housing developments, the truth is we are not even scratching the surface of the housing problem. Only last week the Co-operative Union of Canada presented a brief to the House of Commons Banking Committee, and said it doubted if the housing legislation will be of much help to low income groups, a group which needs more protection than any. A Canadian wishing to build an \$11,000 home under the new legislation would require a down payment of \$2,400, and an annual income of \$3,860, or \$74.25 per week. Some 50 per cent. of our working population are earning less than \$2,500 per year, and modest homes must be built for those people in the low income groups. Ways and means must be found to provide decent homes for these people, and if we do, I sincerely believe the cost of our social services would decrease. The only answer, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a low rental housing project, one in which interest rates are low and the amortization period is extended.

It is estimated at the present time there are 500,000 housing units needed. Since the average family consists of about 3.5 persons, this means housing is needed in Canada for close to a million people. The Federal Government's new mortgage insurance plan will, no doubt, help by reducing the size of down payments and extending payments over a longer period, but this will not greatly assist those who lack even the smaller cash down payment. It is families in this category who are hardest hit by the housing shortage. Yet, Mr. Speaker, no large central housing schemes have been devised which will help them acquire

much-needed homes. Interest rates of up to 6 per cent. under the new regulations are far too high. The only way to reduce interest rates is for the government to assume a greater portion of the loan. Lower interest rates will help many people to buy new homes. Low cost housing will have to come—either that or thousands of Canadian families will go on indefinitely living in slum conditions.

A Conservative member of the Federal Parliament, Mr. George Hees, stated in the House of Commons:

The National Housing Act is nothing but a gigantic bluff designed to "kid" the people of Canada that something is being done.

I agree with that statement. Yet the Conservative Government at Queen's Park is supporting the federal housing regulations.

Now, I would like to say a word about unemployment. Various speakers have mentioned the increasing unemployment which exists throughout the country. Let me explain how some men and women at present unemployed could be put to work, not in building tanks and bombs and airplanes and things like that, but in building houses. It is estimated the building of 100,000 new homes would provide employment for 250,000 persons. This year, there will be an increase of 50,000 pupils in our schools. This will require additional accommodation to the extent of 1,500 class rooms to house the beginners at a cost of some \$30 million. Here we can give employment to people who are now out of a job. We need homes, we need schools, we need hospitals and yet we have approximately 500,000 men and women who are unemployed in the richest country in the world.

I was interested to read in the paper the other day, Mr. Speaker,—the paper was the *Toronto Star*—a headline which said: "Frost Is Serious About Jobless."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Prime Minister was very apprehensive when this was brought to his attention a few days ago by the hon. member for

St. Andrew. He was mentioned, as reported in *Hansard* on page 49, February the 16th, as having said:

It was only 4 years ago at this time that I stood in this House in connection with a similar problem. In 1950—at this time of the year—we had some recession and some levelling off. At that time there was a demand from the hon. members opposite that there should be the issuance of cash relief and for us to go into various things for which our province is neither constitutionally responsible, nor are the municipalities in this province fiscally capable of doing. At that time the same answer was given by this government and by the Ottawa government.

Mr. Speaker, I remember quite well on that occasion the answer given by the Prime Minister, and I think it was this: That unemployment would correct itself in the course of time. Well, Mr. Speaker, he was right. The Federal Government was right, too. But they would have guessed wrong had it not been for the war in Korea.

Next, I would refer to hospitalization. With the increase in the rates of Blue Cross and other private hospital organizations, it is interesting and encouraging to see the support the CCF is getting for a provincial or national hospital plan. I was interested in the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) who is prepared to support that idea. At the present time there are 1.7 million persons in the Province of Ontario covered by Blue Cross. The population of the province is roughly about 5 million. If we consider other private organizations, I think it would be safe to assume that about 2.5 million people in Ontario are covered by private insurance plans. Personally, I cannot see any reason why this government should not introduce a plan for hospitalization as the Province of Saskatchewan has done, and make it available to our people who need this service.

Some of the opponents of a government hospitalization plan always say that there is a deficit. That is quite true.

There is a deficit on government schemes, but there would be in the Blue Cross scheme, too, but for circumstances which I hope to make clear.

I was interested in a little publication called "Hospital Highlights" and particularly in an article on the editorial page written by Mr. A. J. Swanson who is, I think, the superintendent of one of the Toronto hospitals. He is talking about the 90-days' notice that the Blue Cross has to give to the hospitals. He then says:

Do you remember the early days of the plan? Only 21 days were provided initially and extra services were limited. To get the plan a number of our hospitals accepted their Blue Cross patients at per diem rate allowances which, for many hospitals, were less than cost.

So, Mr. Speaker, Blue Cross in the initial stages was subsidized by the hospitals of Ontario. Obviously, a government plan if put into operation by the Province of Ontario would have a deficit for some time. The plan introduced in Great Britain had a large deficit for the first two years, and when the Labour Party was questioned, the Minister of Health in the British Parliament of that day put it very aptly, I think, when he said that the deficit was really a reflection of the great need of such a service by the people of Britain.

It was introduced some 3 or 4 years ago, and even the great Conservative Party in the last election never mentioned during the campaign that they had any intention of interfering with that plan, because such a plan has come to stay.

The scheme operating in Saskatchewan has had a deficit every year since it began. But it should be remembered that the hospitalization scheme there provides for hospital treatment for the aged pensioner, to the cancer victim, to those stricken with polio, to the blind, to those on mothers' allowance, and to people unable to pay the premiums on a means test basis. In fact, last year, if I remember rightly, over 2,500 persons were apprehended by the government

for refusing to pay their premiums to the hospital plan and only 250, I think, were compelled to pay. The rest were excused because they could not afford to pay the premiums. The total cost for hospitalization for the people in that province is paid by the government. Yet in Ontario only persons destitute are given hospitalization, and then on an indigent-patient basis, where the government only pays \$2 or \$3 a day, and the remainder must be borne by the hospital or the local municipality. This is one of the reasons, I think, why hospital rates are so high in Ontario today, because hospital authorities have to adjust their rates so that the cost of indigent patients is borne by those who are able to pay—a charge, in my opinion, which should be assumed by the Provincial Government.

Some hon. members of the government have spoken from time to time in favour of a provincial hospitalization plan. Some were opposed to it and I do hope that during this debate the hon. Minister of Health, or some responsible Minister of the government will give us clearly and precisely the intention of the government in respect to this great social need.

I wish to say a word about supplementary pensions. We in the CCF have advocated from time to time that supplementary pensions be paid to aged pensioners in Ontario. At last the Provincial Government has come forward and is doing something along those lines. I am sure the aged pensioners appreciate this invoice, and not only the pensioners aged between 65 and 69, but those who are disabled and those who are in receipt of national security pensions. But, although this is a concession, 50 per cent. of the pension being borne by the provincial government, the other 50 per cent. must be paid by the local municipality. This, I suggest, is indirectly a cost-of-living bonus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the already overburdened municipalities should not be expected to carry this additional increase in expenditures. Surely, with the record surplus that the government has indicated during this last few weeks, we

could assume that burden ourselves or ask the Federal Government to pay some portion of it. The concession, I think, is given quite grudgingly and will leave the responsibility upon the local councils whose tax revenue sources are already overstrained.

While on the matter of pensions I would like to bring to the attention of the government—and I am sorry the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) is not in his place—a case which has come to my notice from my own riding.

Last spring, I was interested in the application of a lady who had applied for the pension on a means test basis. Her age was 68 years and 8 months. The lady had liquid assets of \$1,945. She was told she could not qualify because she had too much money.

Now, in the brochure issued by the Department of Welfare, it is clearly stated the applicant can have up to \$2,200 in liquid assets and still qualify for the pension. This seemed to be explicit and definite and I was quite confident the pension would be granted. I was surprised when the Chairman of the Pension Board advised that the claim had been disallowed.

It appears the sum of only \$1,000 is allowed in liquid assets, and any amount over that is apportioned over the remaining months before the applicant qualifies for national security pensions. The pension on a means test basis is paid in this manner. In bringing this to the attention of the government, I do hope this restrictive clause will be amended, or this section on the back page of the brochure deleted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention the Local Improvement District of Ajax. The hon. Prime Minister was there the other day and created quite an impression at the official opening of the hospital.

Up to 3 years ago, the affairs of the community were administered by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I might say the Administration did a very fine job, a good job of planning and designing for the future, for the industrial growth of that area

has been most marked. At the present time there are 29 industries located there with a population of 3,500. During the war, Central Mortgage built 600 war-time homes north of the new highway. Up to the present 593 of those 600 have been sold, either outright or on a time-payment basis, to the occupants.

Three years ago, the Improvement District was set up and three trustees, appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor, have been administering the affairs of the community since that time. They, too, have done a very fine job. In fact, the interests of the community and the industrial growth have been well taken care of.

However, I do think the people in this area should consider the question of an elected council. Some weeks ago the Pickering Co-operative, which is a producer co-operative shipping milk to Toronto, applied to the Ontario Milk Control Board for a licence to operate a producer dairy in Ajax. This application was refused. The reason given was this: That in the opinion of the board the area was adequately served.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts: there are 5 dairies operating in Ajax, 4 Toronto firms and 1 Oshawa firm. The delivery days are, of course, Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. Now, there is no milk dairy located in Ajax. The producers have promised they will erect a building where the people may obtain milk on any day of the week, and they will sell milk at the same price as the Oshawa firm.

This application received the support of the trustees and a large number of residents. Yet the Milk Control Board refused the application. Of course, the contention of the dairies operating there was that the area was adequately served, but, in this age of free enterprise, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why it should be, because the applicant company is a producer co-operative, and I am sure the hon. Prime Minister and the government have given their blessing to co-operatives for some time.

The application of the co-operative has received the approval of the trustees

of the Improvement District. Surely the local council is in a much better position to assess the needs of the community than the Milk Control Board sitting in Toronto.

I would like to ask the Acting hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Goodfellow) to give some consideration to this, and if he requires any further information respecting it, I will be happy to give it to him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, now before the House, be further amended by adding thereto the following:

(a) And this House further regrets that the Throne Speech makes no reference to the critical housing situation.

(b) That no effective measures are indicated to alleviate increasing unemployment, leaving this burden to the municipalities.

MR. HOLLIS E. BECKETT (York East): Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to take part in this debate. I want to congratulate the two new hon. members for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) and Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby). I contend that their victory holds proof that the administration of the affairs of this province is in good hands, and that this government is a government of the people and for all the people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to you for the able way in which you conduct the affairs of this assembly.

It is just about a year since Bill No. 80 was passed in this House, in Chapter 73 of the Statutes of Ontario, and there have been great strides made by the Metropolitan Council, the Metropolitan Planning Board, and the Transit Commission, to make that bill workable. So far as I know, it is the first federation which has been put into operation in Canada, and, I think, in the United States. Many of the large cities in this country and in the United States are interested and are watching how it works.

Since I first entered municipal politics in 1923, I have been constantly studying the formation of a metropolitan area. Last year was the first time anything concrete was put on the Statute Book. We know it will work, and I think it will set the pattern for other cities in this province, and it should do away with large annexation orders.

I am highly honoured to represent the riding of York East, which, today has a population of over 230,000 people. According to our records, it is growing at the rate of over 1,500 people a month. Mr. Speaker, people, in my mind, are the important factor in any riding. There is, of course, the material growth, the industries, and everything else, but, in the long run, it is the people who make a great country. The large growth in York East has necessitated providing all the essential services, including schools. The people in my riding have come from all parts of the country and are taking part in the greatest development this province has seen.

Our population of over 230,000 represents almost one-twentieth of the entire population of the Province of Ontario. One municipality in the riding has over 90,000 people, namely, the municipality of Scarborough, which is the largest municipality in the Toronto Metropolitan Area.

I want to compliment the councils of the various municipalities and their planning boards for the way they have handled the many hundreds of subdivisions for housing. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) spoke about housing, and I want to mention the fact that the Townships of Scarborough, East York, North York and Markham have done considerable to relieve the housing situation in this province. These municipalities started out 3 or 4 years ago on a planned programme that before a subdivision is approved by the Council and the Planning Board, the subdivider must agree to subdivide properly, according to certain regulations. One of the main regulations is, he must put in all the essential services at his own expense. At the same time, he signs an agreement that a by-law will be passed

restricting the use of the land, the volume and type of houses. That is approved by the Ontario Municipal Board and registered in their office.

The subdivider is called upon to pay up to \$3 per foot—that amounts to \$150 on a 50-foot lot—towards the cost of providing for water and sewage disposal plants. In cases where industry is coming into these municipalities, it contributes \$200 toward those costs.

It might be interesting to note how these municipalities have lived together. Last year, the Township of Scarborough supplied the Township of East York with 5 million gallons of water a day, and the Township of North York with 1 million gallons of water a day, which meant that these municipalities were able to develop the townships for housing and industry.

That brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the point that it is not necessary to have annexation if the municipalities will live together and provide each other with essential services. Since the war, there has been a tremendous expansion of industries throughout this province, and Scarborough Township is an example of a municipality able to obtain industries without annexation by the City of Toronto.

During the last 4 years there have been over 400 industries locate in the Township of Scarborough. Mr. Speaker, I say that shows what can be done by municipalities, outside of the big cities, to get industries.

Industry today is a little different than it was a few years ago when it depended upon municipal forms of transportation, street cars and buses, to get people to work. Today, the industry is no farther away than the automobile. The majority of people working in our industries in Scarborough come to work by automobile, and the industries have sufficient land for parking. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the decentralization of industry in this province is an important matter for the well-being of the entire province. I do not think any large centre has any right to say that it should have all the industry, and it should say to other

municipalities, "We want you to give up some land so that we can have industry." Let us keep the industry spread throughout the province.

In 1932, and 1933, when all the municipalities around Toronto suffered from the paying of debentures, with the exception of Swansea and Forest Hill, it was because we had no industrial assessment to fall back on. In the township of Scarborough, back in the thirties, there were 5,000 people on relief. These people worked in the City of Toronto and helped that city build up its big industries. But when they were thrown out of work they had to come back to the Township of Scarborough. The obligation of looking after the unemployed rested on the people of the township, and the increased taxes on the various municipalities caused them to default. Of course, Mr. Speaker, that condition cannot occur now in the Metropolitan area, and it will not recur where there are the resources of an industrial section to fall back upon. Today, in the Province of Ontario, there are many towns whose industrial assessment is as high as 40 per cent.; indeed, some are higher; and such towns as these, in my opinion, can never default. There is no more healthy condition to be found in any part of the country.

I suggest, the real reason why cities want to take over some areas to industrialize them is, they realize these municipalities of themselves are no longer profitable, but the people of those municipalities want to live there. I say it is not fair or equitable to require by legislation that John Brown shall be forced to agree to live in another municipality. The people of the townships and smaller municipalities of this province want to live in their own communities; they are satisfied with the services they have. If any section of their populations wish to be included in another municipality, let the people of the municipality as a whole vote on the question. This matter was considered in 1939 by the government then in power. I had the opportunity of sitting in on the drafting of the legislation which was passed at that time. The hon.

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) was a member of the government which took away from the people of a municipality the right to say whether they should live in the City of Toronto or in the Township of Scarborough. Prior to that date, all annexations to the City of Toronto were made as a result of negotiation. I could mention, for instance, East Toronto and Parkdale. The councils of the towns and villages concerned negotiated with Toronto regarding annexation, and most of us favoured legislation which prevented annexation without a vote of the people concerned. But, as I have said, that right was removed by the legislation of 1939. It was provided by the Municipal Act that any municipality could apply for an order to annex another municipality or part of it. Although provision was made for a vote of the applicant municipality, there was no such requirement in the case of the municipality that it was proposed to annex. I contend therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation should be amended to provide that where a municipality makes application to the Municipal Board for annexation, the board shall require an affirmative vote both by the electors of the municipality applying, and the electors of the municipality it is proposed to annex. Let us trust the people; let the people vote on an important matter of that kind. When you cease to trust people, the people will soon cease to trust you. We all know what that means. We have always felt that it is not fair for the large municipalities to take land from the smaller ones, any more than we approve of taking money from the little man to give to the big man. Let us all live together; let us all enjoy the benefits of the great industrial expansion of this province. I say that you will then have a much happier situation than can be expected if all your industries are centralized in your big cities.

Let us all work towards that end—the spreading of industries through all parts of the province. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Dunbar) is not in his seat, because I want to pay tribute to him.

We, who live in East York, are much indebted to him for the aid he provided under The Municipal Act, whereby municipalities are able to buy industrial lots and sell them to industry. I want also to compliment his Deputy, Mr. Orr, and the Chief Supervisor, Mr. Carter. These gentlemen, to my mind, are characteristic of the civil servants of this province. They are always ready and willing to help in matters pertaining to the municipalities.

In connection with housing developments in my riding, I want to mention that in 1953, North York issued building permits for 3,300 houses of the value of \$31 million, and Scarborough issued 3,725 permits for housing costing \$38 million. This is evidence, I submit, that these municipalities are doing their fair share of providing houses in the Toronto area. Today Scarborough Township has 9,700 serviced lots available for houses; another 3,000 lots have been laid out on a plan under which sewer and water facilities should be ready this fall. That makes a total of 12,700 lots in one municipality alone. North York, too, is keeping up the pace in supplying sewer and water.

It gives me great pleasure to have said these few words on behalf of the great riding I represent and in explanation of what we are doing for the people of the province.

MR. R. CONNELL (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker. I find in my notes the statement that it is going to be a pleasure to speak on this Throne Speech debate, but now that the moment has arrived I am not as sure as I was that I shall derive so much pleasure from it.

I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) and the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) on their speeches. Their congratulations have been several times repeated, and I have no doubt they voice the sincere feelings of all of us.

I would also like to compliment the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby), and the hon. member for

Niagara Falls (Mr. Jolley) upon their election to this House.

I might also mention the death during this past year of 2 of our fellow members. I do not know what is the effect of such happenings on other hon. members, but it tends to slow me up and suggests the wisdom of adjusting one's sights a bit on the pace one is living. I think this is a moral we all could take to heart.

It has not been my habit to belabour this House with my speeches, and I do not intend to take too long at this time. Modesty prevents me from speaking of my riding in quite the terms, which, possibly, some hon. members feel they are free to use. However, I feel that I come from a very good riding.

I have a few requests to make, and, possibly, a few compliments to pay the government.

First, I would like to speak on the matter of education. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) is doing, in my opinion, a good job. It was my fortune to come into the Chamber a few minutes early today, and to hear him speaking to a number of Teachers' College students, and he was certainly giving them a lot of encouragement. Along with some other members, I have had a great many representations from the Teachers' Federation requesting the reduction of the period of computation for pension from 15 to 10 years. I am pleased to see that the hon. Minister of Education has included a provision to this effect in the bill which he introduced yesterday. The hon. Minister has often remarked that this pension fund would not stand the extra expense which this concession would require. But we did have a suggestion the other day from the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) that a pension fund for members of the Legislature should be set up. Possibly in a few years, if the teachers' pension fund runs out, we could borrow from the members' pension fund; or perhaps the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), in his concern for the rural way of life, may have a farmers' pension fund set up from which we can borrow.

A little over a year ago, the Normal School in Hamilton was burned down. Last year we were promised a new Teachers' College. I have not seen too many signs of this college materializing. I have heard no complaints from the Zion Church people, who are looking after the accommodation of the pupils and their teachers, but I think, in fairness to the church itself and to the pupils, we should get on with the construction of this college.

To deal briefly with the subject of Workmen's Compensation, many of us were at the opening last summer of the new building to house this department and we were pleased at what we saw. It looks as though, with this equipment, they will be able to look after the interests of the workers for many years to come. I will not enlarge on their activities, for many of you are much better acquainted with the matter than I am.

Another interesting development in the last couple of years has to do with the compensation coverage for farmers. We all know that farming is becoming an increasingly dangerous occupation because of the advent of so much power machinery. Farmers have found it difficult to get adequate insurance to cover them for all the injuries they might incur. There have been cases in which the farmer has been almost ruined through a suit for damages brought by some hired man, as he is often spoken of, injured while in the farmer's employ.

Today, for 75c. per \$100 of wages paid, a farmer can secure coverage for his employees and himself. Under such a plan, the Board would treat him the same as anyone hurt in an industrial accident, and there is no chance of a farmer being sued by those whom we call "the hired man."

I turn next to the question of highways. The Department of Highways' programme in my area, in my estimation and that of many others, has been very successful. No. 5 Highway, as many hon. members know, is a heavily-travelled route carrying through traffic from Windsor to Toronto. A short span

of that road within my riding has not had much work done on it, but I understand contracts have been called for this summer, and we are looking for an early completion of the work on a 10-mile stretch.

The divisional engineer in our district has been using a grading mulch service on some of the secondary highways; this is very satisfactory and has received a great deal of commendation from people using the roads. As I say, these are secondary roads, and do not carry as much traffic as do some of the other highways.

Speaking for the county and township officials in and around the Hamilton area, they are very anxious to receive more by way of grants than they have in previous years. As you know, our area is heavily travelled, with a great deal of traffic going in and out of the City of Hamilton, which rapidly wears down the county and township roads. However, the county officials are very pleased with the way they have been treated from Toronto in the past.

I do, however, have one real problem, that having to do with Aldershot. I was pleased to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) introduce some amendments to the Act which may possibly be of some help, but I do not think they completely take care of our problem in Aldershot. This portion of No. 2 Highway carries the traffic from Queen Elizabeth Highway into Hamilton. This area, I would point out, over the past 3 or 4 years, has built up from a population of 1,000 to that of 6,000. They are not interested in Aldershot becoming a police village or being incorporated in any way; nevertheless, under the present Act, they are unable to enforce the 30-mile-an-hour speed limit. As you may know, this is a 4-lane highway, and in a short stretch of the road, there are 4 schools. Anyone who has raised a family on or near such a highway knows the hazards of motor traffic. In this section, there have already been several serious accidents.

Under the present Act, the 30-mile speed limit cannot be enforced unless the area is at least 50 per cent. built up.

In this particular section, most of the lots are at least 100 feet long, and it naturally takes a very large house to cover 50 per cent. of such a lot, and there is little chance that this area will ever become a 50 per cent. built-up area. I have a few suggestions which may be regarded as immature, but which would offer some help to these people.

First, may I suggest an early completion of the cut-off which was promised us here last year, by which we would be relieved of the Queen Elizabeth traffic from what we call "Campbell's Corners" to what is known as the "Neilson sign."

Another suggestion I have is to revise the Act to include built-up areas to a distance of 1,000 feet off the highways. In the Aldershot area, for every house on the highway, there are possibly 10 on the highway whose owners must come on to that road. This is not a controlled-access highway, where people can come in wherever they wish.

A further suggestion I have is that the Act should be revised to provide for the enforcement of the 30-mile an hour speed limit within 500 feet of a school, but only within what are known as "school hours." We hear a good deal of objection to such a proposal, but I think there is considerable merit in it, and the residents of this area have asked to see what could be done to bring about such a change.

"Safety" seems to be a word which has become quite popular in the House these days. I have a suggestion to offer to the House, which may have the effect of turning back the pages of time, but which I believe would contribute to general safety. I think we should adopt the method of other days when we had sheriffs—and we still see them in the moving pictures—who pinned badges on deputy sheriffs. Someone said, if we had a police cruiser following us, we would be better drivers. My suggestion is—and it is not unlike that which the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) put forward yesterday—that we delegate a limited number of people to perform this type of duty. I am thinking along the line of policemen who are off duty. I would not suggest

we delegate hon. members of Parliament to do the job. There are, however, many capable people who could assume the authority to check on persons who exceed the speed limit, or drive in a dangerous manner.

Under the method I propose, it might not be possible to prevent them from driving dangerously, but at least a letter could be sent to the authorities and possibly, if such person got into an accident later on, the earlier reports of careless driving could be used as evidence against him. Of course, I am not in favour of Gestapo methods, by which every person checks on somebody else, but I do believe that authority, properly delegated to a limited number of people, would have the effect of controlling traffic on our roads.

Again, I should like to say on behalf of my constituents, how grateful we are for the over-all job the Department of Highways has done and is doing.

I turn now to the Department of Planning and Development, and extend my congratulations to the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) upon the excellent job he is doing. We, in the Hamilton area, are very pleased to have one of our hon. members in the Cabinet. We are all well aware of the amount of work which can be put into the programme of this department. One point I should like to raise is the tendency on the part of some of the Planning Boards to infringe on the rights of the individual. These rights have always been held in high regard in this province, and I trust that they will always be.

My next subject is hydro. Since becoming a member of this House, I have been very surprised to hear the criticism by hon. members of the opposition of the costs of hydro. I maintain hydro is, without a doubt, the cheapest commodity we have in the Province of Ontario: we receive more value for a dollar spent on hydro than for anything else.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a personal reference. The hydro costs on my farm amount to approximately 75c. a day—possibly a little more in the winter, and

a little less in the summer. For that small expenditure, we get a few of the comforts we find around a home; and in addition to those, hydro pumps 1,200 gallons of water for me, moves 3,000 pounds of feed which I do not have to touch by hand, and also supplies light and a number of other odd services around the farm. And I get all this for 75c. a day.

It is my conservative estimate that if I hired help to do the work which hydro is doing, at \$1 an hour, it would cost me \$20 a day. According to my computation, that amounts to \$7,300 a year, as compared with the \$300 a year I now spend for hydro. I know this differential may not mean much to some of my lawyer friends in Toronto, but if I had to spend \$7,000 a year, it would put me out of business. Therefore, I say that hydro is the cheapest commodity we have on the farm.

As a further personal reference, may I say that my farm, with the help of hydro, produces one pound of poultry meat every 90 seconds. I calculate it would take 6 minutes to produce a pound of poultry meat, without the use of hydro.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything from which we get more value in this province than hydro, it is the value of the services of our own hon. Prime Minister.

Anyone who has served on the local councils realizes that the most important thing to the taxpayer is the figure on the lower corner of his tax bill. I was pleased to hear legislation introduced the other day providing that the clerks of our municipalities put on the tax bills, the amount of the government contribution by way of grants towards the taxpayers' costs. Many of our people do not realize how great the contribution is. Referring again to my own experience; my taxes last year, on an ordinary farm, were \$474. A calculation of what my taxes would have been without government grants such as 40 per cent. on education, and 55 per cent. on secondary education, our road subsidies and so on, would have increased my taxes to \$811.

True, modesty is a virtue, but I think this is one instance when the government should not hide what it is doing for the people of this province.

I turn now to the subject of the hon. Attorney-General's Department. In this connection, I should like to say that we have a new Provincial Police Inspector in the Dundas Division, and a new detachment in Waterdown. This addition helps to serve the busy area more adequately. In driving to Toronto, at times I may see only one police cruiser, on every 6 trips. That suggests to me that we are not making the best use of the men and the cruisers. Almost any morning as I go down to Dundas, I see perhaps 6 cruisers parked in front of the courthouse. I know these officers have to prosecute their cases, but I do not feel that they should be so occupied in that way. My suggestion to the hon. Attorney-General's Department is that possibly a certain day could be set aside for the hearing of traffic cases, and in that way, these officers would not have to sit in court all morning, listening to cases in which they were not interested.

The City of Hamilton and the County of Wentworth are badly in need of a new courthouse. We have far outgrown our old one. Representations were made to the hon. Attorney-General during the summer by county and civic officials, with a view to seeing if something could be done by way of assistance by the government. We are aware of the fact that assistance has been granted to cities and municipalities in the northern part of the province, and we feel some amendment should be made to the Act which could provide assistance for us. As has been pointed out, real estate is bearing the costs of the higher courts, and it apparently is not very satisfactory. The Registry Office supplies a great deal of revenue to the province, and we feel that the Act should be amended to the extent that the revenue from the Registry Office could go towards assisting us in the building of a new courthouse.

I turn now to a somewhat different subject. As you know, McMaster

University is in my riding, and Hamilton, like many cities, is quite a football centre. As recently as last Saturday, McMaster was turned out of a 5-team league, which was reduced to 4 teams.

There is a great deal of football tradition around the City of Hamilton, and even though I am not a college graduate myself, I do believe we have there a good case of discrimination. A bill was passed in this House legislating against discrimination, and, in my opinion, this is a form of discrimination in its worst form, the fact that McMaster has been thrown out of this league, and it must have a very degrading effect on the pupils attending that university.

I am sorry—I do not know whether I should be sorry—but I am surprised that the only team which supported McMaster was McGill University of Montreal, and I am not very flattered by the fact that our own teams in Ontario have “let them down.”

McMaster has been in a somewhat unusual situation, as far as finances are concerned. I heard that up until recently it has not been able to secure outside grants, but that the province has been doing very well toward it, this past year or two.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to use the words “Hog Town,” but apparently it has become very evident that Varsity in Toronto was the prime mover in getting them out. It has been said that McMaster was not up to par last year. I have gone through the records of its football team, and I find that it has lost 2 or 3 games by only 1 point, and with a few “breaks,” they could very easily have won some of those games.

The question of money arose, and was given as being the real reason. It has also been mentioned that a 5-team league will not operate successfully. I believe that greater difficulties than that have been overcome, and I am satisfied if an effort were made, they could succeed in operating with a 5-team league, without any difficulty.

I would like to point out I think the real reason behind the whole thing is

because there are a number of good Rugby players in Hamilton, and Queen's, Western, and Varsity, would like to have first call on their services, and as long as they are considered top-flight teams, I presume the players feel they would prefer playing with those teams.

A great deal has been said at different times in this House about Select Committees. I suggest that consideration be given to the appointment of a Select Committee to check the manufacturing of farm equipment which is produced, and to endeavour to find a means whereby better material may be used in the manufacture of this machinery. I do not think this is something which perhaps should be on a provincial level, and I suppose the chances of my ever being in the Federal House are slim—I do not know that I even want to be there—but I think that is where this protection should be afforded.

As you know, there is protection afforded labour, protection afforded to farmers, and protection afforded by the courts. We are also protected by the fact that if we buy a quart of milk, we are certain of getting a quart; if we buy a gallon of gasoline, we are certain of getting a gallon, and if we buy a pound of sugar, we are certain of getting a full pound, and, in my opinion, there is not enough attention given to the inspections to see that we get good farm machinery.

The farm machinery in this day and age consists of high-powered equipment, and according to the price we are forced to pay for it, it seems to me we are very sadly “shorted” when it comes to getting value for our money in regard to the purchase of farm machinery.

I might add to that list also electric bulbs. I purchase many of these in my business, and a great many of them do not last even overnight. Children's toys do not last until you get them home, and radios and cars are other things which I do not think are providing full value for what they are costing the purchaser.

One of the more recent things which has come to my attention, has to do with dairying. Under a new system of collecting milk, the farmers were forced to

install stainless steel tank coolers. It is just over a year ago that these vats had to be put in, and at that time, depending on the size, the cost was anywhere from \$1,600 to \$2,500.

Some of the milk men were here the other day, and from what they said, I understand that some of the farmers have already been forced to change these vats, because they have become worn out, and all that in just over a year. That is another thing in connection with which I think we are not getting full value. With the modern engineering facilities, and the high costs of everything, I feel there should be some enquiries made in regard to this important matter.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I appreciate being able to sit in this House, and taking part in this debate. I would like to stress the untiring efforts made by the Hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet on our behalf. It is said that for an individual to become great, he must be honest with his people and with himself, and that may be truly said of our Hon. Prime Minister. May he be spared to look after us for many years to come.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings) spoke the other day, he complimented the government upon bringing in a pension for disabled persons. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no pension for disabled persons, nor is there a pension for persons partially disabled. One has to be totally disabled in order to secure a pension—totally disabled. The Act is very narrow in its scope, and very few can qualify under it.

No doubt many of the hon. members have had cases brought to their attention, as have I. I will mention but one.

In Brantford, a young lady is totally disabled, and she qualifies for the pension, but because her father is getting \$10 a month as a veteran's pension, for which he fought, this young lady cannot receive the pension provided for persons who are disabled. I think it is a disgrace. Even if the amount received was only

\$5, which is by way of compensation, one could not qualify for the pension provided for a totally disabled person. I think that is something which should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can truthfully say, like my hon. leader said earlier in the debate, that I am a man of peace. But I must admit there are times when I get somewhat ruffled, when certain matters of injustice through legislation are brought to my attention.

I know it is practically impossible to enact laws and administer them to everyone's satisfaction. I am sure that the hon. members opposite, in all their wild and effervescent boasts of good government, will not go so far as to claim they have reached perfection in that respect. But I think that legislation, sir, should be administered wisely and with common sense. When injustices creep in, as they seem to do at times, I think some effort should be made to review the particular case and, for humanitarian reasons, if no other, seek to ameliorate the hardship inflicted.

I am referring to injustice, sir, in a particular case under the Workmen's Compensation Act occurring in my own riding of Brantford. There may be others, but this one I know of first hand. In 1947 a workman in the Cockshutt plant at Brantford was seriously injured when struck in the head by a piece of metal from a travelling crane. He survived, but his brain was so badly injured he had to be cared for in a mental institution. During the period he spent there and underwent several operations, his wife, through Workmen's Compensation, was drawing 66 2/3 per cent. of his salary.

This workman, after great suffering, died last September from complications following the accident. His death, of course, ended compensation arrangement of a percentage of his salary and made his widow eligible under the pension plan. She was advised by company officials that she would receive \$75 and I believe that amount is what she is really entitled to, but when her application for it was sent in, the Workmen's Compensation

Board replied that the pension would be only \$50 per month.

Now, sir, I am well aware, as are all other hon. members of this House, that the pension rate under Workmen's Compensation was amended at the 1953 session of this legislature and raised to \$75 a month. And let me add, sir, before any hon. member jumps up to interrupt me, that I am well aware of the wording of the amended act. I was in this Chamber at the previous session when the hon. Minister of Labour explained the amendment. I accept his explanation of why the increased pension rate applies only when the accident happens on or after the day the amendment act comes into force, which was April 2nd of last year.

At the same time, sir, I submit, that the pension in this particular case I am dealing with, should be \$75 a month under the meaning of the Act, if not under the wording. I know that some of the board feel this amendment should be changed and I declare an injustice is being done to this woman, who is elderly and unable to support herself, by refusing her the increased amount. The word "accident" in section 4 of the Workmen's Compensation Amendment Act, 1953, is ambiguous in its relation to the clauses in section 3 dealing with the pension rate. In these clauses the word "widow" is specifically used. I maintain, sir, that only death can make a wife a widow in the real meaning of the term. Widows are not necessarily made by accident.

It seems incredible to me that officials of the Workmen's Compensation Board would make such a doubtful interpretation of the Act to deprive a poor widow of \$25 a month, as has been done in this case. The wording is faulty, but the intent of the amended Act is clear. The amount of pension was made \$75 after a certain date and applied only to those becoming eligible for it after that date. That is quite plain. The woman in Brantford was widowed nearly 6 months after this Act went into force. In refusing her the full amount of the pension specified under the Act, the Workmen's Compensation Board, is, in effect, telling her that

she became a widow some years before, which is certainly not the case. I submit, sir, that under legislation of this government, no board has any right to make such a presumption and immediate steps should be taken to correct false interpretation such as this before more injustices are committed.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member (Mr. Gordon) permit me to say, that if I have heard him correctly, I am inclined to think he has a point, and if the hon. member will acquaint me with the name and the details of this case, I will be very happy to look into it.

MR. GORDON: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about another form of injustice for which this government is responsible. It is in remarkable contrast to the one I have just been dealing with, because it concerns lack of law enforcement whereas the other shows over-zealous enforcement.

In the last session of this House, sir, I raised my voice in protest against the increasing pollution of the waters of the Grand River. I have been requested by many citizens of Brantford to bring this to the attention of the government again. Pollution of this river is constantly getting worse. Despite the efforts of a highly competent chemist at the Brantford waterworks filtration plant, we are finding various flavours in the water. Incidentally, I heard a discussion by three ladies at a banquet recently. They were talking about the many tastes in the water. Two of them said they had given up drinking tea because of the objectionable flavour caused by the water, and had turned to coffee because it was less objectionable that way. Well, sir, I think we all appreciate what a hardship this is imposing on the people of Brantford at present coffee prices.

Just recently, a Brantford doctor informed me he detected a strong DDT flavour in the water, evidently a result of upstream industrial plants polluting the river. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, in presenting his White

Paper, said that the City of Los Angeles in California, because of water shortage, may have to turn to using the water from its sewers. Well, sir, that will be nothing new, because the people of Brantford have been doing that for some time. Our Grand River is, and has been referred to quite frequently as an open sewer, which, because of lack of enforcement of our pollution legislation, is what it really is.

On August 12th last, an inspection of the Grand River was made by some 120 representatives from the municipalities in the Grand River Valley. Starting at the Shand Dam, it was found the water was clear and unpolluted. But as we travelled down stream and were shown samples of water taken from the river at some 12 check points, the water got more and more cloudy and smelly. As the tour progressed, it became quite evident that the Grand River, once one of the finest streams in this province, had become, as I said before, nothing but an open sewer.

At a meeting held in Preston at the conclusion of this inspection tour, the hon. Minister of Health, who was present, said he realized the seriousness of the situation and that the province was willing to do its share in financing pollution control methods and the Provincial Government would match the Federal Government, dollar for dollar, in assisting the municipalities. Here we have another excellent example of this government's frequent attempts to pass along its responsibility to federal and municipal authorities.

Well, that isn't good enough for me, nor for the large number of people who live in the municipalities affected by the pollution of this river. The province has a definite responsibility and must recognize it. There are laws on our statute books concerning pollution; very definite laws, indeed. This government is evading its responsibility by failing to enforce them. This is the least it could do, and I am confident if that were done, there would be a general improvement all along the river. The very failure to enforce the existing legislation is aggravating a situation that should never have

been allowed to exist in the first place. If the existing legislation cannot be enforced, then it is time it was taken out of the Statute Books.

I'm sure the hon. Minister of Health will recall that at the meeting in Preston, a number of mayors and reeves of the municipalities concerned stated their views in no uncertain terms. The Reeve of Waterloo Township, he will recall, stated that townships are frequently compelled by medical health officers to prosecute individual owners of improperly working septic tanks, but towns and cities and industries can use the river for a sewer and nothing is done about it. It is a glaring infringement of people's rights and certainly the time has come when definite action must be taken to clean up the dirtiest river in Ontario. There is no more acute situation in this province today than that one.

Dr. A. E. Berry, Chairman of the Ontario Pollution Control Authority, has estimated the cost for pollution control at \$7 million. This covers the expenditure for a sufficient number of sewage treatment plants which the municipalities are required to build. But the question naturally arises, what of the other sources of pollution, from industry, etc.? Can they be controlled through the municipal sewage treatment plant? Some of them can, no doubt, but I don't think all of them can. Those that cannot must be regulated under the existing legislation concerning pollution. That legislation must be enforced, for it is the starting point in any effort made to deal with this problem in a satisfactory manner. And so long as it isn't enforced, the Grand River will remain a dirty, polluted stream, a likely source of epidemic and plague and a disgrace to the province.

In the second annual report of the Grand River Anti-Pollution Committee, covering the period from March, 1953, to February, 1954, there appears a copy of a letter received from the Hon. Ontario Minister of Health under date of December 1st, 1953. That letter reads as follows:

I have your letters in reference to the action taken by you and other

groups in an endeavour to clean up the pollution in the Grand River.

I have delayed in giving you anything specific on this matter since our investigations are continuing, and we are endeavouring to find a solution to this difficult problem. I can assure you that it is not easy to see a solution that will be satisfactory to all when the expenditures are so high. You may rest assured that we will do everything in our power to bring about a distinct improvement in the quality of the water in this stream.

I hope I can write you further at a later date, and give you something more specific.

Yours very truly,

(signed) M. PHILLIPS,
Minister of Health.

There is nothing about enforcing legislation in that letter or any hint that such a course is intended. There is only mention that investigation is continuing and a specific solution is being sought. Surely, the Hon. Minister of Health saw enough convincing evidence on the tour of inspection last August, and heard enough about the pollution that is constantly going on to satisfy him and his Health Department officials that the legislation is being ignored.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I shall have to await until I see that some of the offending polluters of this stream are brought into court under the provisions of the Act, before I am convinced the Department of Health is showing any real concern about the situation and treating it seriously.

On past occasions in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have had a little to say about fluoridation of drinking water which has met with such success in Brantford during the past eight years. It is not my intention at this time to deal with this subject at any length. I merely want to make reference briefly to a couple of figures issued by the Fluorine Committee in Brantford at its annual meeting on February 17th last. In the pre-fluoridation year of 1944, out of 2,741 Brantford school children, only 142 had perfect teeth. Today, in our ninth year

of fluoridating the domestic water supply in Brantford, out of 3,385 school children, 693 have perfect teeth. This is an increase of 20.47 per cent. in 8 years. There has been a continual improvement every year. There is an over-all increase in the dental health of our children of 44 per cent.

Incidentally, Brantford is the first city or community in the commonwealth to fluoridate its water supply. Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Newburgh, N.Y., preceded Brantford by a few months in this fluoridation experiment. Like Brantford, they have kept careful check by regular examinations and have found similar results. These results have been checked, analyzed, confirmed and approved by innumerable scientific bodies. It is now accepted in scientific circles that fluoridation will prevent more than half the dental caries, which invariably occur in communities where the public water supply lacks fluorine, and it will do this without any detectable injury to health.

I note that Dr. A. J. Coughlan, of St. John, N.B., president of the Canadian Dental Association, has announced that the association gives full backing to fluoridation. He terms the treatment of communal waters with fluorine as an effective preventative of tooth decay and declares it one of the most important health measures.

Mr. Speaker, just recently in a Toronto morning newspaper an article appeared, headed: "Fluorination—Boon or Blunder?" They thought they were so good that they put them in pamphlet form. Copies could be obtained by writing for them.

Just as the bell rang for the House to assemble, I received a long distance telephone message containing some very important information in connection with this pamphlet.

One of the doctors whom they quoted is described in the pamphlet as a "Scottish dentist." But this gentleman is a native of Jamaica. He was educated in the United States, and has never been heard of in the city in which, they claim, he made his investigations in England.

"Boon or Blunder"? I think that before this House adjourns, Mr. Speaker, I will have some statements to make.

In regard to the case I just mentioned, in my opinion, the statement is just so much "bunk."

Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I heartily support the suggestion made in this House recently by the hon. member for Riverdale, that all tenders the government asks for should be dealt with and opened in public and all information concerning them be available to the public. I believe that when a contractor or an industry submits a tender and goes to the expense of preparing costly samples and other specimens of work the job requires, all those tendering should be given a statement showing at least the figures of the tender accepted.

This is not being done by the departments of this government and I have often received complaints from manufacturers protesting that they have never heard another word after submitting the tender, nor are the samples ever returned to them. When I was on the Brantford City Council and the Public Utilities, it was the usual procedure to inform all contractors about the tenders, listing the winner and those who were unsuccessful together with the total amount of each tender. There was no attempt at secrecy. I think the province should act in a similar manner. It should have nothing to hide. As it is, no information is available on large numbers of bids, or if it is, it only appears in public accounts long after the contract has been completed and paid for.

I was somewhat amused, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Woodbine said in his speech on Friday that he found Canadian bacon to be foul smelling and not very appetizing. I find just the opposite. I think our bacon is equal to any from other countries and better than most. American tourists take large quantities of our bacon back home with them and many have told me Canadian bacon is far superior to any in the U.S. I am wondering if the termites in his riding,

which the hon. member from Woodbine referred to, are having some effect on the bacon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to you my felicitations on your position in this House and the able and understanding manner in which you perform your duties. I also thank you for the help and indulgence you have given me, not only today, but on numerous occasions in the past.

MR. E. P. MORNINGSTAR (Welland): Mr. Speaker, since the last session of this House I am sorry to say unemployment has become serious in many parts of Ontario, indeed in the country as a whole.

My own constituency of Welland is suffering. About 4,000 men and women in the City of Welland and the neighbouring Townships of Crowland and Thorold are out of work.

It is now time for the Federal Government Departments to abide by their promises.

A White Paper issued by the Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe, in 1952, stated the Federal Government's objective in the post-war period was, and I quote, "useful employment for all who are willing to work." The Prime Minister of Canada has himself stated on many occasions that a back-log of useful public works would be started at the first signs of a recession to prevent mass unemployment. The huge surpluses piled up by the Federal Government in previous years should be used now for needed public work—with provincial participation where applicable.

In this regard, two important considerations affecting Welland riding are:

1. The elimination of level crossings.
2. The construction of high level bridges across the Welland Canal.

In a time of national emergency the Niagara Peninsula is a most vital section of the country with a vast electrical power development and heavy industry. These two public works projects I have mentioned must come eventually—in fact could be considered in the light of national defence—and should be given

consideration. Surely the depression two decades ago taught us that needed public works cost less in every way than men on relief.

However it will soon be impossible for our local municipalities to tackle the problem when unemployment insurance benefits are exhausted.

I believe the Federal Government should bring unemployment insurance legislation up to present needs. The period should be increased. The Act is unfair in that it makes no distinction between a young married couple with perhaps the wife not working, and an older married man thrown out of work with wife and children at home.

With the backing, I am sure, of an organization of unemployed workers in my riding, and the municipal councils, I urge this government to approach the federal authorities and co-operate with them in every way possible to encourage public works, hospital additions, home construction, to stimulate trade with other countries, and to patronize home industries in order to stop the threat of a depression.

I can assure you that the unemployed in the Welland riding are not looking for handouts, but simply a chance to work and make a decent living with some government assistance to help the less fortunate during a very hard time.

I have the very great honour to represent a riding whose communities and citizens do things in a big way, whether the community be large or small.

Just look at the lovely village of Fonthill, where from a population of 2,000 has sprung our greatest name in golf. And the name is carried by a tiny young woman who has electrified all Canada by sweeping and repeating as Canadian champion in the 3 years in which she came into her sensational form.

That young woman, Marlene Stewart, I need not remind you became the first Canadian to ever win the British women's open championship, a feat she accomplished to world-wide acclaim in Wales last year.

Another great woman golfer from Fonthill, Anne Sharp, kept the fame of that village intact while Marlene was overseas by winning many provincial tournaments and capping a fine season's play by capturing the Ontario women's open. But then Anne Sharp has been in the forefront of Canadian women golfers for nearly a decade and has been one of the greatest all-round sports-women our district has produced.

Just a few miles from Fonthill, in neighbouring Pelham Township, is another young woman of whom we are justly proud. I refer to Mrs. Dorothy Rungeling, who last year was one of two persons in Canada selected for the aviation writing award presented by the air transport and air industry association.

Mrs. Rungeling is aviation columnist for the *Welland-Port Colborne Tribune*. Through her efforts, Welland was the terminal and starting point in the past two years in the All Women's Air Race between Canada and Florida.

One of our most experienced and enthusiastic airwomen, Mrs. Rungeling exhibited her flying prowess in these races by finishing fourth and second.

You'll forgive me if I return for a moment to Fonthill. That splendid village was the setting last year for an inspiring Scouts' Own Parade in which more than 2,000 boys and girls from all over the Niagara District took part.

I had the great honour of being asked to invite His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor, to take the salute on that occasion. Although he was busied with plans for his attendance at the Coronation, he readily assented; and the Scouts, Guides, Cubs and Brownies showed their appreciation by turning out in record numbers.

I am most grateful to His Excellency for responding to this appeal in what is undoubtedly one of our worthiest movements.

There have been at least 7 new fire halls constructed throughout the Welland riding last year. These halls were mostly built by the volunteer firemen themselves.

Being a volunteer fireman myself for some years, I do realize the very good work these firemen do, in saving lives and property, and also they are a great asset in our civil defence set-up.

At the present time, grants are paid by this government for fire prevention programmes only to province-wide associations.

I would strongly recommend grants for District Volunteer Firemen's Associations also. I believe there are today 7 in the province; they meet each year for 2 or 3 days to study newer methods in fire prevention and the prevention of loss of life from fires in our province.

This great province as part of the civil defence and national preparedness programme has instituted systems of county fire department mutual aid and has entered into an agreement with the Federal Government whereby all 2½ inch fire hose threads on couplings and allied fittings would be standardized to the Canadian Standards Association thread at an estimated cost of \$900,000, with the Federal Government paying 1/3 of the cost and the Province of Ontario paying the balance, with no cost to the municipalities.

Before the hose thread standardization programme in Ontario was started, there was a total of 81 different threads on 2½ inch fire hose used by 493 municipal fire departments throughout the province. These threads ran all the way from 4 threads per inch to 16 threads per inch and in the second most important measurement, the outside diameter of the male coupling, this ran all the way from 2¾ inches to 3 7/16 inches o.d. On the hydrants throughout the province there were 26 different shapes and sizes of the operating nuts for which a special wrench is needed before the firefighters can open the hydrants. This all meant that the well equipped fire pumper which wanted to be able to work in all parts of the province, had to carry 80 sets of adaptors for fire hose in addition to carry 26 different hydrant wrenches. All hydrant operating nuts are being standardized on the one size of 1¼ inches a square throughout all municipalities and industry.

The Provincial Government now has converted throughout the province a total of some 22 counties whose populations number more than two-thirds of the population of the entire province. Broadly speaking the area converted extends from Port Hope on the East, westerly along Lake Ontario and Lake Erie to Windsor and Sarnia excluding the County of Wentworth which conversion crews are presently working in. Within a matter of weeks this conversion will extend northward to the line of Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe.

The people of the Welland riding are very grateful to hon. Minister of Highways and the Federal Government for making it possible for a road to be constructed on the west side of the Welland Ship Canal from Port Colborne to the City of Welland, a distance of approximately 5 miles. When this road is built, it will certainly go a long way in relieving the congestion of traffic at the Town of Port Colborne and the City of Welland.

I also would like to commend Mayor Armour McCrae and his City Council of Welland and Warden Charles Daly and his County Council of Welland County for negotiating this deal with the two governments.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate on behalf of those who sit on this side of the House, I want to assure the hon. members that I am not going to take a great deal of time inasmuch as I have already spoken in the debate.

It is not my intention to speak on any new subjects, because when the Estimates come down—and they will not be very much longer delayed—there will be the opportunity, as each hon. Minister presents his Estimates to the House, for us to make all the remarks we care to, in connection with that particular department.

I do want to make a remark with reference to the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) in respect to unemployment. I think it is pertinent I should say something about that matter, inas-

much as it is referred to in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas).

The figures for unemployment in this province are substantial, as the hon. members of the House well know, and I am not going to argue this afternoon that the province has the initial responsibility for unemployment. I think I could make a much better argument for the other side of the picture.

I have said in this House many times in the days that are gone that I believe—with other hon. members—that the primary responsibility for unemployment does lie with the federal administration in this country, inasmuch as the Federal Government is the national government and unemployment is a national problem. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, one should go on and say that even if you accept that premise, we in this province cannot fail but be aware of the unemployment situation, and the implications it might have on the economy of our province and on the lives of our people. I agree very heartily with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) when he made the suggestion that the government of this province should sit in with the federal administration and try to work out a plan which would be a common attack on the problem of unemployment.

Although the Federal Government has the basic responsibility for unemployment, I am not sure—and I do not think this government would argue—that we should not accept financial responsibility to a certain extent. I think the problem resolves itself into this: that if the Government of this Province and the Federal Government could sit down together and work out what would be a unified solution to the problem of unemployment, then we would get somewhere, because to me, Mr. Speaker, it is incredible—and I think it is to every hon. member of this House—that when these periods of recession appear, in which there is an increase in unemployment, there is always a wrangling, there is always a dispute or a difference of opinion as to whose responsibility unemployment really is.

After all, the responsibility for unemployment belongs to the people of Canada, and Ontario is part of this great country, and consequently must enter into the picture. I am not saying for a moment, that I feel this government is not prepared to sit down and work out a long-range programme to combat this problem, but I am saying it should be done, and that plans should be laid and programmes put forward which will meet this problem head-on.

I want to say just one other word with respect to the problem of unemployment. I, for one—and I think this is concurred in by a majority of the hon. members of this House—would not again countenance the cash relief system for able-bodied men, because, in this province and in this country, there are things to be done; there are great projects which can be moved forward which will be beneficial, not only to the workers but the body politic of the country itself.

I make those remarks, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that I think in Ontario we must recognize there is a problem, and that our duty, it seems to me, is to sit down with the federal authorities and try to work out a long-range programme, which will adequately meet the problem, and find a solution to it, in the days which lie ahead.

I do not want to refer to many of the speeches which were made in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, but I will say, in a general way, I think the speeches were up to par, if not above it.

We have listened to some very well-considered speeches, which were very well delivered, indeed. All of them were thought-provoking and all brought something new to the attention of the hon. members of this Legislature. If I do not refer to the various speeches, I do not want the speakers to assume that I have had any lack of interest in their contribution to the debate. It is, rather, because it would be not only impossible, but, I think, unwise on this occasion to deal specifically with the various speeches that were made. I want to say, however, in reference to the speech last night of the hon. member for Kingston

(Mr. Nickle)—and I regret that he is not in his seat at the moment—the thing that impressed me about his speech was that it seemed to me he was much less a crusader than he was a year ago. He has mellowed much in the 12 months that have passed, and in that mellowing process, I imagine, he has rendered himself more liable to a position in the Cabinet than if he had maintained the attitude he displayed in this House a year ago.

And may I say further in reference to that particular point, that I think the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) would make a valuable addition to the present Cabinet. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would welcome any addition to the present Cabinet that he has in the House. Any addition is bound to be for the good, it could not, I think, be otherwise. I just leave that thought with the hon. Prime Minister and say to the hon. member for Kingston that he can expect a call now that he has mellowed to the point that he does not criticize the government much any more. In spite of that, however, his speech was interesting and I am glad to see that he has now taken his seat, because, as I proceed, with my remarks, it may be I shall have further reference to something that he said.

Following the remarks of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) in moving the amendment to the amendment, I say now, as I said in a former speech in this House, that I feel the Ontario Government should do something more than it is doing for housing in the Province of Ontario. I cannot get it out of my mind that we have a responsibility to provide good houses for our people in this province. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) reminded me last night that I should know there was some \$40 million in this big budget surplus that came from the Federal Government. I do know that I have taken that into consideration. But it just serves to point up the fact that we have in the Federal Government a great benefactor. May I point out to the hon. member (Mr. Nickle) and to the House that in this windfall

that you receive from the Federal Government, there are ample funds to provide this province with a housing programme supplementary to the National Housing Act and a housing programme worthy of the name. I cannot help but reiterate that there is a place in this province for the government of the province to step into the housing field and do something of a worthwhile character.

Mr. Speaker, I want to devote the rest of my time to the question of highways and I want to deal with this subject as dispassionately as I can, and I think I can do it in that spirit.

An announcement was made the other day by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) that 6 contractors in this province were under the careful eye of his officers and that the books and records of those companies would be seized under a warrant executed by the officers of the provincial police. Now that was a statement of fact, Mr. Speaker, and I am not unduly concerned at the moment as to why the hon. Attorney-General made the announcement, rather than the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). One might draw conclusions as to why the statement was made by the hon. Attorney-General, but that matters very little. The statement was made that the government of this province had taken it into its own hands to raid the offices and collect the books and documents belonging to 6 contractors who had contracts in Northern Ontario and on, I presume, the Trans-Canada Highway.

That simply points up, Mr. Speaker, the growing dimensions of the gathering immensity of this highways problem. It served to point out to the people of Ontario that this is no ordinary set of irregularities; it is a set of irregularities that transcends anything we have had in this province for many years past in respect to dealing with corrupt practices and irregularities.

It points up that when one is mindful of the fact that this deals with only one division of the Highways Department in this province, one is reminded that it is hardly likely that skullduggery is so

rampant in one particular division of the Highways Department of this province and that in the other 16 divisions there would be no skullduggery. I think it is rather obvious to those who have listened to this matter being discussed, that where you find these irregularities to such an extent in one particular division, you are apt to find that they are prevalent in other divisions of the Highways Department. So I say this chapter-by-chapter that we get from day-to-day of the growing irregularities in the Highways Department serves to emphasize to the people of Ontario the immensity of this problem and the great source of worry and concern that it is to the province.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, because of the immensity of the set of circumstances—and I say to the hon. Prime Minister—that it calls for the most exhaustive examination of the policies and practices of the Department of Highways, not in one division alone, but in all 17 divisions of that department in this province.

The people of Ontario, who pay the taxes in the form of gasoline taxes, licence fees and driving permits, have a fundamental right to expect a most thorough investigation, and those of us in this House who represent the people back home and who speak for those people, regardless of our political affiliation, will be, I suggest, derelict in our duty if we do not implement the rights of the people in regard to finding out what is done with their money and assuring them that it is spent properly and that no irregularities will continue to exist.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) in his remarks made, I believe, last night, expressed confidence that the Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) would see to it that there was a thorough examination of this whole problem. May I say to him and to this House, Mr. Speaker, that it is not enough that the government should ask for its own interest and from its own viewpoint in regard to this whole problem. It is essential, I say, that the Legislature, which is in essence outside the government and which, as a whole, acts for all hon. members of the House irrespective

of party and speaks for the province as a whole, should cast aside anything that stands in the way of a complete investigation. Assuming therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we are agreed there should be a complete and exhaustive investigation, how are we going to go about it? What avenue are we going to use and what set of rules are we going to adopt?

We have proposed in the Amendment to the Speech from the Throne that there should have been a judicial commission of some kind set up to examine this entire situation. The government of course is adverse to that proposal and it is not going to accept it, I understand. Indeed, I would be greatly surprised if at this late date it does accept that suggestion.

If we do not accept the suggestion of a judicial commission, how then are we going to probe into these matters and do so in a way which will be exhaustive and complete enough to satisfy the people of Ontario that from this time on there will be a clean sheet in the Department of Highways?

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) suggested that the Public Accounts Committee could be called and that this matter could be examined by that committee. May I say to him and to you, Mr. Speaker, that the function of the Public Accounts Committee, as I understand it, is to deal with specific items that appear in the public accounts from year to year, one item or a number of items. But never in my experience have I known the Public Accounts Committee to be called upon to deal with an examination so wide as this one needs to be and dealing with the ramifications of the administration of a whole department of government. I repeat, because I think it is important, that the function of the Public Accounts Committee, and the way that it has been used down through the years, has been to examine a particular item in public accounts, but never to my knowledge has it been used to examine the complete administrative practices and the whole setup of a particular department of government.

Instances have occurred time after time, Mr. Speaker, where this problem

has arisen. I remember, and so does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) a few years ago when the hon. Mr. Drew, who was then leading the Opposition, made some charges in respect to the Department of Lands and Forests and suggested that they be dealt with by a Select Committee of the House. That suggestion was acquiesced in by the government of the day, because it felt, as I think the government should feel today, that to go into the ramifications of an entire department of government is not the function of a Public Accounts Committee. So a Select Committee was set up in that instance and carried on in the interval between sessions, and, in due course, rendered its report to this House.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, just how we can take this before the Public Accounts Committee and do the kind of job which the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) suggested should and would be done by this administration. Quite frankly, I do not see how we can do that, because as hon. members of the House are well aware, the Public Accounts Committee dies with the House. When the House is over, the Public Accounts Committee is likewise over. It does not continue after the session of the House prorogues. There are, I suppose, only 3 weeks or so left in this session of the Legislature, and even if there were no other committees to interfere, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to give this matter the attention it deserves and the scrutiny it must have, if we sat for the whole 3 weeks between now and the date that this session prorogues. But as well as that, Mr. Speaker, there are 17 committees of the House sitting, 2 or 3 of them every day from now until the end of the session. The Committee on Redistribution set up yesterday by motion of the hon. Prime Minister, is a very important committee. We will have to consider the legislation that comes before it and the other 17 committees between now and the time at which the session prorogues. I make the suggestion to the House and to the hon. Prime Minister that it is just fooling with nothing to say that we can meet and give this matter the examination it deserves before the Public

Accounts Committee and during the life of the legislative session we are now engaged in. Because, Mr. Speaker, and I want to emphasize this point for a moment or so, this examination, if it is to be the kind of examination that I think we should have and that the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) suggested last night, is going to take a long time. It is going to take many weeks of examination.

For instance, we will want to know, and properly so, I suggest, how it was possible for these irregularities to persist under the very noses of auditors and inspectors of the Department of Highways. How did they get away with the things that are supposed to have gone on, when we had auditors and inspectors who were supposed to be working for us? This matter will have to be thoroughly examined by the committee. We will have to draw our conclusions after evidence from many witnesses will have been adduced by the committee. Another thing that will have to come before the committee, and upon which a decision will have to be reached, is this, Mr. Speaker: we want to find out, through the channels of a committee or some investigating body, if the divisional engineers were instructed to "bail out" contractors who had bid too low. That, of course, is the root of this problem, and the House is well aware of it.

It is suggested on some sides that, from the divisional engineer down, there is some trouble. I cannot conceive, Mr. Speaker, how all the trouble would lie from the divisional engineer level downward. I cannot conceive how there was not collusion of some kind between those at the divisional engineer level and below on the one hand and those above the divisional engineer level on the other. We have got to find those things out. Those things are important, indeed, and it strikes me, Mr. Speaker, after listening the other day to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) calling for the books of these contractors—and this expresses my own personal opinion and I think perhaps it coincides with the views of many other hon. members in this House—I doubt very much if the engineers and those from that level down

were wholly to blame for the mess that we are in. I believe there must have been direction in some way and some form by those above the engineering level and that it was left to the engineers to carry out those instructions.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is the crux of the whole matter. I cannot believe that all is bad from the divisional engineer level down and that everything is in order in the higher levels of administration. I would suggest to the government and to the Department of Highways that the "high brass" in the Department of Highways should stop shouting "thief" and stop pointing an accusing finger at those from the engineer level down, and turn the spotlight on their own front door and determine if some of the instructions issued to the divisional engineers could be carried out without inviting corruption and irregularity. I suggest that is the crux of the whole matter. I think it will be found as we move forward in this examination that some of the things we have been saying—for instance the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) suggested the other day that we on this side of the House were trying to go after the little fellow—

MR. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that this is quite incorrect. The investigations conducted by Messrs. J. B. Woods and Gordon Limited and the auditors involve the whole department.

MR. OLIVER: I am glad to have the assurance of the hon. Prime Minister on that point; I would expect that that would be the sort of investigation that is carried out. When we go before the House Committee we want to know, as I said a few minutes ago, if conditions similar to those prevailing in Fort William are prevalent in other divisions. I think it is fundamental that that knowledge should be before the committee. And we will want to know, in addition, Mr. Speaker, if the department was aware that, prior to the end of the fiscal year, it was the practice

of departmental officials under its divisional engineers to step up expenditure in the various districts in order to exhaust the appropriation within that particular district, the idea in mind, of course, being that in that way they would keep their expenditures high. I do not think there is a doubt, Mr. Speaker, certainly not in my mind, that that practice has been in vogue for some time and that there is a practice on the part of those within the divisional engineer's office, as the end of the year draws near, to sort of urge upon the foreman to take on more men. If he tells them he does not need any more men and cannot usefully employ them, that does not make any difference. He is to take them on anyway. The idea behind that is that if he goes past the end of a year with a surplus, his appropriation will be cut the following year.

I think those practices, if they exist in the Department of Highways, should be stopped forthwith.

HON. MR. FROST: I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that he will find tomorrow that the Department of Highways has operated within its estimates. Furthermore, I assure him if in any department, there is the tendency to spend money, in order to live up to an appropriation, that will not be tolerated. Such is not the case. I expect all departments to operate within their appropriations; and the compliment that they receive from me is that they remain well below them.

MR. OLIVER: I am afraid the hon. Prime Minister's expectations sometimes fall on the hard rocks of unreality. What he has in mind is not achieved.

HON. MR. FROST: Look at what we have achieved in the past few years.

MR. OLIVER: I have some little knowledge of what has gone on; and my friend, I think, has too. It is time these practices were stopped, not only in the interests of economy, but in the interest of the welfare of the people generally.

There are other matters which would naturally come before this committee, whatever form it takes. I ask the hon. Prime Minister, as well as the House, seriously to consider the question as to whether we will go before the Public Accounts Committee or if he will recommend the appointment of a Select Committee of the Legislature. So far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, the hon. Prime Minister said the other day the provincial auditor would be prepared to make a statement to that committee. I would say that is proper procedure. If the auditor has information arising out of the examinations to date with respect to these irregularities, it is quite proper he should present it to the Public Accounts Committee. But when it goes beyond that, I ask the hon. the Prime Minister to consider the advisability of not making the Public Accounts Committee the medium of examining this whole problem. I suggest to him that, if he is sincere—and I think he is—in wanting to get this thing cleaned up, he cannot conformably, and with sincerity, take this matter before the Public Accounts Committee; it has to go before a committee, or a body of some kind, where ample time will be available, and where the most minute examination can be carried on.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that there will be the most minute and complete examination. He will be satisfied—I think, in fact, everybody will be—with what is done.

Within a day or two I am hopeful the Provincial Auditor, and perhaps others, will produce to the Public Accounts Committee a statement of what has been done, and what procedures have been followed. I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that no effort will be spared, to see that there is the most complete and minute examination. I assure him of that.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister said "no effort will be spared." Did he mean to add to that, that nothing would be withheld?

HON. MR. FROST: Absolutely.

MR. OLIVER: That is quite a good understanding to have and to which we can look forward.

I want to say it is my position, Mr. Speaker, that the interests of the province, as a whole, will be best served by the appointment of a Select Committee. If the hon. Prime Minister feels otherwise, we shall have to meet him as best we can. But if he has in mind a full examination of the whole problem, I would suggest to him that it cannot be done before the Public Accounts Committee. So if he wants to pursue that course, we shall just have to see what developes before that committee.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very great interest to the many excellent speeches which have been given during the course of this debate. As I listened to my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Oliver) again—twice in this debate—very much to my surprise I found that he has pretty well repeated himself. In its main aspects, his second speech covers pretty much the subject-matter which was contained in his first speech. It may be that the hon. Leader of the Opposition thinks he must repeat in order to emphasize. He is limiting his criticism of this government to the same points which he introduced in his original speech. I have read again the amendment put forward to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is confined entirely to one point:

That this House regrets that the Speech from the Throne contains no assurance from the government that the serious and widespread irregularities in the Department of Highways will be thoroughly investigated by a Judicial Commission.

That amendment, Mr. Speaker, does not look to me like any attempt to secure a vote of want of confidence in the government. It is an amendment confined to one specific subject, and deals only with a question of procedure. He prefers an investigation by a Judicial Commission. Now he says he is advocating one by a Select Committee. First by a

Judicial Commission, or as an alternative by a Select Committee.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition in his amendment this year, has not suggested the government has not carried on in all its branches, in general, in the best interests of the people of this province. He has not suggested that at all. I have just been reading the first speech he made, to see what he did say—and this is the first time I have read *Hansard* this session—and I think my recollection of his speech is very clear. In that speech I find very much the same type of criticism of this government by which he has attacked it on many occasions before.

This amendment with which we are now faced is in no sense a suggestion that there is any want of confidence in this government; it is merely a suggestion that we are not carrying out—in investigating the situation which is now under inquiry, just the sort of procedure which would suit the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his followers. I need add nothing to what the hon. Prime Minister has said, not only this afternoon, but on other occasions, as to the sort of inquiry which is being undertaken, and the steps which are being carried out to investigate to the very fullest degree any possible defects and irregularities which may have occurred in the department concerned.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to suggest there is something peculiar about the announcement as to search warrants being executed against certain contractors. Surely he knows that the conduct of the prosecutions are being proceeded with, and everything that has to do with the criminal aspects of any of the matters involved, is entirely in the hands of the Department of the Attorney-General. The Special Prosecutor who has been retained for this purpose is a prosecutor for the Attorney-General. In the course of his investigation he made a recommendation that search warrants be issued; and as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, a search warrant can be obtained only if there are reasonable grounds for believing there is some

information in the books to be seized, which may have some connection with the commission of a crime. It is not a power which can be exercised merely at the whim of any official or of any Minister of government, or by the government itself. The power to execute a search warrant can result only from certain evidence which has to be placed before the judicial officials, to satisfy them there are reasonable grounds to believe that a search might bring forth something which would be relevant to the matter in hand.

On the recommendation I have mentioned those search warrants were issued, and were executed, as I stated in the House the other day. That was a perfectly reasonable proceeding, I think, and surely the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not criticize the fact the announcement was made in this House. As a matter of fact, this is the proper place. I think the House should be informed when an action of that kind is taken, in view of all the circumstances. The search warrants were executed at 10.30 in the morning and the announcement was made at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Surely there is no complaint about the promptitude of the government in informing the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his followers of what we were doing in order to further the investigations which are being carried on.

Now as to the part played in this whole debate by the hon. Leader of the Opposition: he has touched upon the question of unemployment, and when the assertion was made that there were a number of unemployed the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) beamed; he was happy; he gloated; he was delighted. The only trouble with the hon. member was that he did not find there was as much unemployment as he would have liked to see.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I must say I beamed at seeing that the followers of the hon. Attorney-General, the government party, are also seeing the light. I raised the matter first, and I am glad to see others now see it too.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was unduly delighted.

MR. SALSBERG: No. I am very unhappy over it.

HON. MR. PORTER: He did not look unhappy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SALSBERG: I must have looked at you for a moment, and happiness came over me.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has suggested the province should confer with the Federal Government on this whole matter. I may remind the hon. members of this House that some years ago—and from time to time in the interim—the hon. Prime Minister of this province has strongly urged upon the federal authorities the setting up of a Joint Economic Committee, on a high civil service level, with experts at its disposal, to keep in touch with the changing economic trends in this country, to advise the various governments as to changes in those conditions, and make recommendations which might involve joint action by the governments concerned. That was not a suggestion which was made on only one occasion. It was made by the hon. Prime Minister some years ago, at a Dominion-Provincial conference, and was raised at every subsequent Dominion-Provincial conference; when the hon. Prime Minister repeated that request from time to time. I do not know whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition could use his influence with the Ottawa government, so that they might come to the very sensible conclusion that the recommendation should be accepted. I am in entire agreement with the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he suggests there should be conferences of this kind, and should be continuous, and that they should be on a basis which would enable the very best expert brains to be assembled to consider this problem and keep the government alive to the

situation and make recommendations as to what joint action could be taken. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself says, until that is done, how can we take joint action?

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I must say, is a very fair man. As a matter of fact, he recognizes the difficulty, as he admitted in his speech, when he referred to the government alone, single-handedly, dealing with the problem which, once entered into, might be beyond the capacity of a provincial government, with its resources, to follow through.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, however, says that we had a "windfall from the federal government of \$40 millions."

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) said that.

HON. MR. PORTER: I know, but the hon. Leader of the Opposition confirmed it. He said that was a "windfall from the federal government." He well knows that it is no "windfall." He went on to talk about the Ottawa government being a great benefactor by handing over to this province—the same place from where they received it—the sum of \$40 million. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that we in this province transferred, leased, handed over—whatever one wants to call it—our rights to collect corporation tax and income tax during the term of the Dominion-Provincial agreement with us, and that it is from that money this so-called "windfall" was obtained; that it was from tax fields which we could have used ourselves, if it had been left with us to raise that money, that the Federal Government has collected the money to hand back to us. I am not criticizing the benefits derived from the agreement. I think that, under all the circumstances of the time, the agreement was a sound one; it has simplified the whole problem of raising this money and it has provided many advantages to this province. But to suggest the Federal Government

as a result of that agreement, is raising, from its own ordinary sources of revenue, \$40 millions which we could not have had otherwise and which we did not have before is an entire misstatement of the situation. It is far, far from the truth.

MR. SALSBERG: Are you sorry for the years we might have had that money, if you had not been so long in coming to terms?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question.

MR. SALSBERG: It is very real. You robbed us of this money.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that, up to the time of the offer of 1950, which became effective on April 1st, 1952, we made more money by staying with the old arrangement than we have with the new.

MR. SALSBERG: Things changed when you became Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no, no.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has put his case in a way which—to express it mildly—is not in proper perspective. I think his perspective has been a little bit out, in his discussion of that so-called “windfall” from the Federal Government.

Then, of course, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has once again hammered away at the government's policy with respect to municipalities. I do not like to repeat things too often, but since the hon. Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to make two speeches on the same subject, perhaps a little repetition on my part will not do him any harm.

I do not know whether he realizes that in the year 1953-54, the subsidies by the Provincial Government to municipalities covering local grants of all kinds—education, health, and all the

other grants which were made at that time—amounted to \$138,999,000.

MR. OLIVER: That was the “windfall”!

HON. MR. PORTER: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to call the \$40 million a “windfall” to us, I would say that \$138,999,000—which is nearly \$140 million—might be fairly called a “windfall” too. But the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not admit that.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition speaks in the most despairing terms of the municipalities being ground down by the lack of enlightenment by this government. But does he, when he makes his speeches, speak about what we have done? Again, it is a matter of perspective.

Let me refer to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, according to a news item in the *Evening Tribune*. The name *Tribune* sounds rather familiar, but I would point out this is the good *Tribune*, from Welland. The article carries the heading “Farquhar Oliver Seeks Clear Liberal Policy.” When I read that heading, I was anxious to read of any clarification which might come out of the fog on the opposite side of the House, and so I read the article. It contains these words:

He had been round the province quite considerably in the past few months, and it was quite clear that the Liberal Party was determined to improve their political position. They were being helped in their campaign by the tactics of the Tory Party at Queen's Park because of the bad government they were giving the people, he said.

MR. OLIVER: The article is alright so far.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is extraordinary to note the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not say that in his speech to this House. He did not refer to the government in his amendment. He

merely said our procedural technique was not quite correct.

MR. OLIVER: That was generally understood.

HON. MR. PORTER: Then why did the hon. Leader of the Opposition make that statement to a public gathering, and not make it in this House, if he thought it was generally understood? Why would he have to remind the people of something as ingrained in their minds as that, if it was so generally understood? Nevertheless, he said there was bad government. The news item continues:

The Liberals, he declared, felt that the present government had dealt most unfairly with the municipalities.

Yet, here are the figures: almost \$140 million for the year 1953-54, and it will be higher next year by reason of the unconditional grants. I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition what would he do for the municipalities? I hate to remind him of events of the past, for he is reminded so often, but the government contribution to the municipalities in the years 1943-44 was only \$19,697,486. That is what his government did.

MR. SALSBERG: But the winds did not blow; there was no windfall.

HON. MR. PORTER: There was a great deal of wind, though.

MR. SALSBERG: But there are 80 of you here now.

HON. MR. PORTER: I hesitate to "rub it in" so often, but when the hon. Leader of the Opposition tried to attack us for what he calls "miserable treatment of the municipalities," he did not tell the people at this Liberal gathering in Welland the whole story. Why should he, just because he is speaking to a Liberal group, tell them only part of the story? But when he comes before a Conservative gathering like this, he does not tell us that he thinks we are a bad government. Why would he not tell his

Liberal friends about such a significant thing as government contributions totalling \$140 million? Perhaps it would be of interest to point out to the House that this sum of \$140 million represents between one-third and one-half of the whole provincial budget. In other words, almost one-half of all the money this government collects, in the province, is turned back in grants of different kinds to the municipalities. How can anyone say this government has dealt unfairly with municipalities, with almost half our revenue going to them? And, as hon. members will hear tomorrow, that sum will be increased.

Further, I would point out that the sum which the municipalities receive by way of provincial grants, represents about 50 per cent. of the total municipal expenditure. Yet, the hon. Leader of the Opposition complains that municipal taxes have tripled since 1943. I scarcely know what he means by that. It may be that some municipalities have had a rather sudden growth of population, and compared with the taxes they formerly paid when their land was vacant, higher taxes are now levied on the same land with buildings on it. It is, of course, obvious that in those circumstances the amount of taxes would be increased considerably.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition goes on to suggest that the municipalities should be given some further grants. In other words, the cry of the opposition over the past few years has been, "You have been doing a wonderful job, because you have given the municipalities perhaps eight or nine times what we gave them in 1943, and the people like it so much, they want more." That is about all they can say.

While the hon. Leader of the Opposition complains that municipal taxes have increased in some places, I would point out that the value of the dollar has decreased, and the amount of taxes collected has increased, as the population increased.

When he spoke in Welland, he did not analyze the whole situation. When

I look at this amendment before us, I question whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition feels in his heart that the amendment is intended to suggest any lack of confidence in the government as a whole. In my opinion, he does not sincerely intend it to so indicate. He has had too long and varied an experience in government to have framed an amendment in that way, if he intended it to carry a general vote of want of confidence. So I take the most charitable view of it I can, because I think he really admires, in a general way, what this government has accomplished, and the programme we have laid before the House.

MR. OLIVER: It must be in a very general way.

HON. MR. PORTER: It may be general admiration, but it is never very generous. I wonder why the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not a little more generous and fair about this matter?

MR. OLIVER: Don't you get that habit now.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago, we have heard in this House many fine speeches from hon. members on all sides. I wish to make some brief comment on the work done by the Select Committees which sat during the recess of the House. It has been my privilege to be associated with the work of some of these committees over the past few years, and I believe they have served a very useful purpose. With a government which has a somewhat large majority, it is very gratifying to have our own followers take an active part in the administration of the affairs of this province, by sitting on these Select Committees and investigating the various problems laid before them. In this way, they find out what is being done in certain departments; they learn not only the good things, but very often the weaknesses and where they lie. No government can claim that everything it

does is perfect. We are ordinary people: we can be helped, and sustained, and we can learn a great deal about our own deficiencies, when we have members who devote themselves to work of this kind, and lay before us, in an official way, after the fullest investigation, some of their views as to what changes should be made. The committee work which is being carried on throughout the province at the present time inspires a great deal of confidence in the government.

Mr. Speaker, again referring to this skilfully worded, cautious and narrow amendment, I must say that I cannot see in it anything which would indicate a lack of confidence in the government. I had hoped the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and those who support him, would perhaps do something a little different this year, and vote according to their conscience, and with the government instead of against it.

The amendment to the amendment was negatived on division.

YEAS: Mr. Oliver, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Chartrand, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Manley, Mr. Wren, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Thomas (Ontario), Mr. Salsberg.

NAYS: Hon. Mr. Frost, Mr. Lyons, hon. Mr. Warrender, hon. Mr. Kelly, hon. Mr. Phillips, hon. Mr. Foote, hon. Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Collings, Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Brandon, Mr. Connell, Mr. Cowling, Mr. Letherby, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Parry, hon. Mr. Scott, hon. Mr. Gemmell, hon. Mr. Welsh, hon. Mr. Griesinger, hon. Mr. Cecile, Mr. Murdoch, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Morrow, Mr. Elliott, Mr. Beech, Mr. Downer, Mr. Nickle, Mr. Hanna, hon. Mr. Dunbar, hon. Mr. Challies, hon. Mr. Porter, hon. Mr. Doucett, hon. Mr. Daley, Mr. Patrick, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Pryde, Mr. MacOdum, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Mr. Hall, Mr. Robson, Mr. Janes, Mr. Villeneuve, Mr. Cathcart, Mr. Allen, Mr. Dent, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Pringle, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Dempsey, Mr. Fullerton, Mr. Myers, Mr. Noden, Mr. Weaver, Mr. Mapledoram, Mr.

Fishleigh, Mr. Sandercock, Mr. Jolley, Mr. Johnstone (Bruce), Mr. Kerr, Mr. Whitney, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Morningstar, Mr. Root, Mr. Frost (Bracondale), Mr. Child, Mr. Ward.

The amendment to the motion was negatived on division.

YEAS: 9

NAYS: 69

Motion agreed to, on division.

YEAS: 69

NAYS: 9

HON. MR. FROST moves that this House will tomorrow resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that this House will tomorrow resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.37 of the clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, March 11, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 11, 1954.

Standing Committee on Municipal Law, first report	489
Budget Address, Mr. Frost	490
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	506

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Today, we are honoured by the presence of Division "B" of the Toronto Teachers' College. If I remember correctly, yesterday we had about 250 students from this college, and today we are very, very happy to welcome the second group from this splendid institution located in the City of Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. H. E. BECKETT (York East): I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Beckett from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law presents the committee's first report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act.

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act.

Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I have here two messages from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor signed by his own hand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year to end 31st March, 1955, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Supplementary Estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending 31st March, 1954, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to call your attention to this morning's issue of the *Globe and Mail*. There was a statement on the proceedings in the Assembly yesterday afternoon. The statement was that "Mr. Thomas criticized municipal legislative powers in our communities," pointing out that the Local Improvement District of Ajax, a well-planned community which grew from a wartime housing

project, had been refused municipal status by the Municipal Board.

May I correct that statement, Mr. Speaker. What I did say was this: That the Pickering Co-operative, a producers' organization, had applied for a licence to sell milk in the Improvement District of Ajax, and the licence had been supported by the 3 trustees appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor. I do hope that the *Globe and Mail* will give this the same prominence they gave the mis-statement. I am very happy to say that the *Hansard* report was quite accurate.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

BUDGET ADDRESS

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, it was a Thursday, March 16th, 1944—10 years ago—that I brought down my first budget. It was a wartime budget, but I am sure that what I now say bears out the prophecy of that time, when I said:

We are building not only for these times, we are planning for a greater population, for industrial expansion, for prosperous farms and for a happy and healthy people. We are laying the sure foundations for a greater and stronger Ontario.

The years which have elapsed since that occasion have brought a fulfilment of those aims, and on this tenth anniversary, actually involving 11 annual budgets, it is my intention to give to the House a more comprehensive review of our activities than I have heretofore.

The years which have passed since that date 10 years ago have been remarkable by any standard. They have brought difficulties and imposed arduous tasks, but they have also been years of more concentrated growth and progress than this province has seen in any other corresponding period of its history.

The past year has been no exception. Although there have been some soft

spots, all the chief economic indicators, such as capital investment, industrial production, mining and forestry output, housing, and employment, reached higher levels and in most cases the highest level ever attained in our history in Ontario. Capital investment in 1953 was about 7 per cent. higher than in the previous year—reaching for the first time an annual rate of over \$2 billion.

I have spoken of soft spots. Rippling the broad surface of Ontario's economic prosperity have been the downward trend in farm incomes and the slackness which has arisen in the farm implement and textile industries and several other branches of industry, particularly in the electrical appliance sector. As a result, unemployment has been somewhat in excess of that which can be attributed to a normal seasonal trend. The plight of the gold mining industry, which has been the subject of study and attention by both the Ontario and Federal Governments, has also been a matter of concern. Serious as these dislocations have been, general employment in this province has been more favourable than in the rest of Canada, and with the coming of spring, the normal seasonal pick-up in activity is expected to provide relief.

Every year presents its problems and it is important to keep them in proper focus. Not long ago, we were in the throes of a great inflationary rise in prices which was causing hardship to people on relatively fixed incomes. For 2 years now, we have enjoyed a stable consumer price level. As average wages and salaries have continued to advance during this period there has been a rise in real living standards.

There are many strong and vigorous elements in our economy which justify an attitude of confidence. For one thing, our domestic market is expanding rapidly. Ontario's population is currently growing at a rate of about 150,000 a year, 110,000 more than when I introduced my first budget. I might say, Mr. Speaker, I do not take the credit for that entirely. Since then our population has grown by over 1 million and, as I forecast a year ago, we now have passed

the 5 million mark. It is not only that more than 50 per cent. of the immigrants who come to Canada settle in Ontario, attracted by its fine living conditions and its opportunities for advancement, but that the number of persons born in Ontario has climbed steadily, reaching 130,000 last year—61 per cent. more than in 1943.

Several effects follow from this growth, which in percentage terms, has been greater than that in the rest of Canada. Each year, we require an increase of at least 2½ per cent. in the supply of a great variety of structures, commodities and wearing apparel just to keep our living standard from falling. Moreover, with our larger market, there will be a better balance between agriculture and manufacturing, and through doing more of our processing at home, we shall also secure, in greater measure, the economies of large scale production, with corresponding reductions in unit cost, which is most important.

Aside from population growth, there are other factors that engender confidence. It is anticipated that the value of capital investment which forms 22 per cent. of all private and public spending in the province, will be at least 4 per cent. higher in 1954 than in 1953. Personal incomes and consumer spending continue to advance. The excesses which have foreshadowed economic slumps in the past have, in the main, been avoided. Farm indebtedness in relation to value of output has been reduced. Many corporations have large reserves, while the savings of the people, despite the inroads made by instalment and credit buying, are still at a high level.

We are hopeful that a start will be made this year upon the construction of the St. Lawrence River power project and the natural gas pipeline from Alberta to Central Canada, which, with its ancillary and interceptor pipelines, will create many new employment opportunities. The province and the municipalities are proceeding with a large volume of construction which will extend into the next fiscal period. The tempo of housing construction will be sustained and probably accelerated,

giving rise to demands over many years for electrical appliances, household furnishings and other products. All these demands come at a time when the ratio of our labour force to our total population will be at the lowest level that it has been for many years, which I think should indicate a high rate of employment.

To meet the adjustments which will occur in various sectors of our economy, we need constantly to aim for flexibility and adaptability to changing conditions. We should recognize that in a dynamic economy, adjustment in industry and employment is the natural process by which production is adapted to demand. If normal influences fail, there is a variety of measures that will be brought into play to help cushion the downward swing.

The Federal Government is committed to the policy of a high general level of employment and income, and the province on its part will keep the situation under review and do everything possible within its more limited financial power to maintain stability. Furthermore, when these measures are brought into effect, we shall have reasonable assurance that similar steps will be taken on a fairly broad international basis. It is important, however, that we should keep in mind that the decisions governing the spending of 75 per cent. of the gross national product in Canada are made by private individuals. An attitude of confidence will therefore do more to maintain high levels of income and employment than any other single factor.

Mr. Speaker, having given that very brief survey of conditions generally in this province, may I at this time table the budget. It is a voluminous document consisting of some 80 pages, including the budget survey, the various schedules, and appended thereto is a list of some 40 reports on various phases of our economy. They are of very great interest. They include reports on almost every phase of our economic life in Ontario.

First of all, may I say this document is the result of the work of many people. I have previously in this House referred

to Mr. Hugh Brown, the Deputy Treasurer, Mr. Harry Cotnam, the Provincial Auditor, Doctor Chester S. Walters, Mr. Philip Clark, Mr. George Gathercole, Mr. Harold Walker, to whom I referred yesterday, to Mr. H. J. Chater, and many others who have assisted in the preparation of this budget.

Mr. Speaker, there is the budgetary statement and review, the reports, and the schedules involving a host of subjects. I will not inflict the reading of this document upon the House, but I propose, as last year, to table the budget, and to refer to the various items as I go along, in rather an informal manner.

I well remember the criticism last year by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), and I assure him that this year I will confine my statement to the economics, and—as I think he put it last year—to a “coldly factual statement of the position of the province.” Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can do it “coldly,” but I will try to keep it “factual,” and as much in line with what the hon. member for Brant said last year, as possible.

I will table the budget, and will refer to matters contained in it, without boring the House by reading this voluminous document.

In preparing this annual budget, I have again made certain changes in its form, which I hope will be conducive to a clear understanding of the financial and economic position of the government and its programme.

Our fiscal programme, ordinary and capital, now exceeds \$450 million annually. The task of preparing a budget of such formidable dimensions not only requires months of very careful screening of departmental Estimates and reconciliation of competing demands for our revenues, but also imposes a need for modernizing the form of its presentation.

Traditionally, the province's expenditures have been classified as “ordinary” and “capital.” This system follows sound accounting procedures, which are widely used in both government and industry, and it has merit.

This is for the benefit of those who

referred to a “\$58 million surplus,” which I said was applied to “pay off the mortgage on the farm.”

A surplus on ordinary account should, however, always be considered in the light of expenditure for new capital construction. If we run into any substantial volume of unemployment, we would be expected to play an active part in financing an expanded public works programme without increasing taxation. In such a period, we would resort more extensively to financing our capital programme by using our credit. But if we are to adhere to that policy in periods of general unemployment, then we should apply as much of our current income as possible to capital account. Only in this way can we conserve our credit to meet the problems which lie ahead. Thus, there is no mystery to our plan of budgeting. It is this: to meet as large a proportion as is reasonably possible of our overall expenditures out of current revenue, while at the same time keeping our burden of provincial taxation well within moderate limits. On this latter point, I am glad to say there is incontrovertible evidence that the people of Ontario enjoy about the lowest provincial taxation in Canada.

This year, for the first time—and when I say this, I give credit to my very able assistants, who have made a very great study of this problem—I am presenting in an appendix to this budget detailed statements showing a 4-year comparison of the province's ordinary and capital revenues and expenditures, surplus and the effect of capital financing on the net debt. These statements afford the fullest information on the operations of the government.

For the current fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954, the net ordinary expenditure of the government is estimated at \$361,167,000. This includes a number of special grants and payments, which I shall mention later, as well as a provision for sinking funds of \$16,945,000. The net ordinary revenue is estimated at \$362,176,000, which leaves an interim surplus on ordinary account of \$1,009,000. That is the eleventh successive surplus which we have achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned special payments. We shall be introducing supplementary estimates which will provide for certain special payments to be made before the 31st of March. These include the following grants to the hospitals of Ontario to assist them in meeting their debt and rehabilitation problems, at the rate of \$300 per bed, for every bed which was in service as of December 31st last. There is a schedule attached to the budget showing the estimated payments to all the hospitals of Ontario, but I might read some examples so hon. members may have an idea of what these grants mean. They will total something over \$7 million.

Peterborough, Civic Hospital.....	\$ 67,800
Peterborough, St. Joseph's Hospital.....	54,000
North Bay, Civic Hospital.....	30,300
North Bay, St. Joseph's Hospital.....	34,800
Toronto, East General Hospital.....	110,400
Toronto, St. Michael's Hospital.....	225,600
Galt, South Waterloo Memorial Hospital.....	50,700
Fort Frances, La Verendrye Hospital.....	30,000
Sioux Lookout, General Hospital.....	11,700

The list, Mr. Speaker, is attached to the budget so hon. members will find it available. These grants will provide assistance to hospitals of this province, for rehabilitation, and will permit payments, if they want to make them, on debts they have incurred.

A special capital payment of \$1.0 million will also be made to the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation for the new institute building. The total cost of the whole cancer project, including equipment, will be about \$9.5 million, of which the province's share will be \$8.5 million and the Federal Government will contribute the remaining \$1.0 million. Mr. Speaker, I hope to persuade the Federal Government to increase their contribution, to bring about lower ratio than 8.5 to 1, and to make the sharing in the costs a little more equal.

With this grant, the province will have paid out \$6.3 million towards the cost of this project, which includes the site, the erection of the Nurses' Residence and the provision of other facilities. As against an estimated cost of \$4.5 million for the new institute building, the foundation will now hold over \$3.0 million, including the \$2.0 million paid in 1952-53 and the above special grant

of \$1.0 million, with which to proceed with the construction of the building.

We are making this year a special grant which has never been made before in this province, and that is a grant of \$1.0 million to the University of Toronto, for the expansion of the Ontario College of Dentistry. This Mr. Speaker, is the situation: in the 10 provinces of Canada there are only 5 dental colleges, the largest of which is the Ontario Dental College. My recollection is that less than 80 dentists are graduated per year, and those of course, have to provide for Ontario's needs, as well as helping to provide dental treatment for many people in other parts of Canada. Mr. Speaker, federal authorities tell us that no health plan can be successful unless this dental situation is corrected, so we are meeting that situation to the extent of granting \$1.0 million to the University of Toronto to enable it to expand its facilities. I am hopeful the Government of Canada will follow Ontario's lead, and make a substantial contribution towards the cost of this project—and I know hon. members will agree with me when I say—we shall match anything they may do. As time goes on, there should be dental facilities established in some of the other universities. The reason I mention the University of Toronto is because it has the only dental college in Ontario.

Dealing with the universities, we are making capital grants in addition to the \$1.0 million to the University of Toronto. \$525,000 to Queen's University and to the University of Western Ontario; \$250,000 to McMaster University for instruction in the sciences, and the same sum to Ottawa University for the Faculty of Medicine; \$150,000 to Carleton College, and to the Ontario College of Art, \$200,000. I may say the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) used his great powers of persuasion in that connection. A grant of \$100,000 is also made to the Royal Botanical Gardens which is attached to McMaster University.

These grants total \$3 million.

We are asking the House to provide for payments of \$1 million each to the

Teachers' Superannuation Fund and to the Public Service Superannuation Fund, in order to strengthen them. We have been doing that for some time past so that the teachers' fund in particular might be placed in a stronger position. And we are recommending payment of \$350,000 to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind as a contribution to enable the institution to establish facilities for rehabilitation and occupational services.

Supplementary estimates will be introduced providing for the payment of these sums before the close of the present fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, in the budget we have included certain services and matters in broad groups. The first is "human betterment," "education," "health and welfare."

May I refer to some of these things. Education continues to be, again, our most pressing problem. School accommodation must be found for more than 60,000 new students each year, and in another 5 years this annual increase will exceed 70,000. To cope with last year's increase, \$48 million was spent to provide 1,610 classrooms in new schools or additions to existing schools, and it is apparent that an even larger building programme is foreordained.

Mr. Speaker, we have, of course, to realize that to meet this requirement we have to tighten our belts—either that or increase taxation. That has to be faced, if we are to meet the requirements of our programme.

I commend this section to hon. members indeed, as I do all of these sections, but I will pick out certain items. In the universities, for instance, enrolment has receded from the postwar high level, and it probably will continue to decline somewhat for several years; but later, as the tide of school population moves upward through the elementary and secondary school grades, it will flow into existing university facilities. That is the reason for making the grants to universities. We are trying to meet beforehand the problem which the universities will have to face probably 6 or 7 years hence.

As I said before, if we are to meet our problems in a practical and reasonable way, we must confine our assistance to the basic essentials, and strive for the strictest economy.

In Ontario, salary scales have been revised and there have been successive improvements in the superannuation plan, for 32,000 teachers. More than 2,000 teachers must be recruited each year to staff the additional classrooms, and provide replacements for retirements. That is why progress in building two new teachers' colleges is a matter of the greatest importance.

The Ontario Government's expenditure on education in the current fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954, including school grants of \$57.8 million and the special capital grants to universities and the College of Art, will total \$81.9 million. Next year, school grants, payable on the same formula, will rise \$3.6 million to \$61.4 million. Maintenance grants to the universities are also being increased, and for the fiscal year 1954-55 they will be as follows:

MAINTENANCE GRANTS		FISCAL YEAR 1954-55
University of Toronto	\$4,700,000
Ontario College of Education	470,000
Queen's University	675,000
University of Western Ontario	675,000
McMaster University (Hamilton College)	
for instruction in the sciences	225,000
University of Ottawa—for Medical Faculty	225,000
Carleton College	145,000
		<u>\$7,115,000</u>

In developing this educational programme, we have not overlooked the need for assisting deserving students who have financial or physical handicaps. Under a programme inaugurated in 1943, over 1,500 students now receive bursaries every year to assist them to carry on their studies. A greatly increased number of scholarships are also provided by the Ontario Research Council, and just last year we inaugurated a plan for providing assistance of \$250 per year per pupil for the education of retarded children. Of more general benefit, are our grants of up to \$3 per pupil per year for "free" text books in Grades I to X.

The health programme is being carried forward on a broad front. The

ordinary expenditure this year, including the \$7 million in special grants to hospitals, is estimated at \$53.3 million, an increase of \$2.6 million over last year. With this special payment of \$7 million, \$20 million will be paid out to the public general hospitals during 1953-54 to help meet their cost of operations, to retire debt and facilitate expansion. Since the inauguration in 1947 of the present hospital construction grants, the province has committed itself to an expenditure of \$32.6 million, of which \$26.1 million had been paid out by December 31st, 1953. These grants provide for the construction of over 18,000 hospital beds and 2,600 nursery bassinets.

I will not refer, except in passing, to the Ontario mental hospitals, because full particulars are contained in the budget and its schedules, but our programme in this respect is coming along very well. We are making very definite progress. I am glad to be able to say that before long, those who are mentally ill in Northern Ontario will not have to come to Toronto for attention, but will be treated in their own section of the province.

Another very important matter is the provision we have made for psychiatric treatment in the public general hospitals, which was started under a pilot plan in Ontario some 3 years ago. Then hospitals have established psychiatric divisions, providing 311 beds, for which the province has approved capital grants amounting to \$2.6 million. That provision is more important than it may appear to be. The fact of the matter is that it gives the general practitioner—who is one of the great assets of this province—an opportunity to become a specialist in psychiatry. The lack of doctors with this specialized knowledge creates one of the difficulties with which we are faced in dealing with the problem of mental health.

I have already referred to the Ontario Cancer Foundation, and will only add, in this connection, that Cobalt-bomb therapy units have been installed, or are being installed, in 3 hospitals.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) will tell you about the fight against poliomyelitis. I think there are grounds for believing that we are on the verge of conquering that disease. I do not want to be too optimistic, but I believe the progress which has been made justifies optimism. I would not say that we are on the way to conquering hay fever, but the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) will be pleased to know that we have grounds for hope in this matter.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I am very happy to hear it.

HON. MR. FROST: There will be legislation introduced in this respect.

I am sorry that the hon. minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) is not in his place, but he is out looking after the needs of the 30,000 to 35,000 Indians, comprising some of the finest citizens of this province. He is at present in British Columbia, and I hope when he returns in a few days, he will have a satisfactory report to make as to the efforts being made to improve the welfare of these good citizens. I know our hopes are shared by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), because in common with us all, he is wholeheartedly in favour of all the aid we can render to the Indians.

For charitable institutions which are taking care of those in the indigent class, grants for construction will be increased from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per bed, and the per diem rate of assistance will be increased.

I think we in this Province can take credit for having pioneered the giving of assistance to those who are totally and permanently disabled. The federal government is now coming into this field, and proposes to make such assistance available throughout Canada.

The expansion of these 3 humanitarian services has been a notable feature of the government's programme of social development. The year before I became Treasurer, the expenditures of the government for education, health and welfare amounted to only \$34.6 million. This year, our expenditure on

these 3 services will total \$159.6 million, a five-fold increase.

As predicted a year ago, more housing units were completed in Ontario in 1953 than in any previous period in Ontario's history. The total completions of new housing units and conversions amounted to 36,504—8,000 or 28 per cent. more than in 1952, and 12 per cent. more than in the previous record-breaking year, 1951. In the 9 years since 1944, more than 250,000 houses have been built in Ontario, providing accommodation for a million people. On December 31, 1953, there were 24,130 dwellings under construction in Ontario, 18 per cent. more than at the end of 1952. Thus, there is every likelihood that a new record in housing construction will be attained in 1954.

Housing activity increased rapidly in the Toronto region following the introduction of the Metropolitan plan. By the end of 1953, there were 31 per cent. more units under construction than on the corresponding date a year earlier, portending a much higher rate of completions this year than last.

To assist housing, we have developed a variety of partnership arrangements with the Federal Government. In many municipalities experiencing rapid population growth, urgent demands have arisen for serviced lots which can be made available at reasonable prices to private persons or builders who are desirous of constructing medium-priced houses. To facilitate this programme, large tracts of land have been acquired in many municipalities. Under agreements already signed, 7,000 serviced lots have been, or are being, made available. Land has been acquired and negotiations are proceeding which should ultimately raise this total to 18,000 serviced lots. Rental housing projects are also being undertaken in an increasing number of municipalities. Here, sir, I think I should give credit to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Beech) who represents a riding which now, and always has been one of the leading townships in the Province of Ontario. What has been done in that community is a great inspiration to us all, and I

recommend to hon. members that before returning to their homes they visit that district and see what has been done there.

We are hoping to make marked progress in the Metropolitan Toronto area, where a considerable amount of land has been acquired to provide additional living accommodation under these various plans.

In addition to the serviced lot and rental projects, a subsidized rental housing plan has been projected as part of the Toronto Regent Park Development. This will consist of 20 blocks of 48 units each, making a total of 960 units. It will be the first time that multiple units have been constructed under the joint federal-provincial partnership, giving effect to the 1953 amendments to the National Housing Act.

I am again able to report progress in the repayment under the government's second mortgage plan. By February 28th, 1954, 3,480 loans out of a total of 14,695 had been fully repaid. That is a great record.

Under the heading of "Natural Resources" are included agriculture, forestry and mining. As time is passing, I shall refer to them rather briefly.

Despite the fact that farm income has declined from its peak level, last year's was still one of the best in the industry's history. Moreover, during the last decade, the long-term trend in Ontario farming has been very favourable. Farm indebtedness has been reduced, farmers have been retaining a much larger proportion of the income from the sale of their produce, and despite a 25 per cent. smaller labour force, they have raised their physical output by over 10 per cent.

The rural areas of Ontario will continue to benefit from provincial assistance for the extension of electric power lines. Since December 1943, some 235,691 rural power customers have been added to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission lines, an increase of 173 per cent. Of these, 28,318 were connected in the past year. The Provincial Government's contribution in grants to this programme of rural electrification has totalled \$64.1 million

in the last 11 years. So rapidly have lines been extended and customers provided with power in recent years that we are gradually narrowing the number of rural dwellers to whom it is economically feasible to provide electric power.

The latest survey shows that about 85 per cent. of rural dwellers are now supplied with electric power, and this percentage is even higher in the case of farmers.

It is not necessary for me to elaborate on Ontario's great record in this regard—a record, I believe, unsurpassed anywhere. Imagine the advances which have been made in providing for our rural people the benefits of refrigeration, electricity for cooking, bathroom equipment, and hot and cold running water. All these amenities add not only to the enjoyment of living but to the betterment of life and to the health of our people. I should say that this service is one of the great achievements of Ontario.

The mining industry of Ontario enjoyed another prosperous year. The value of its mineral output rose in 1953 to the unprecedented level of \$460.5 million, a rise of 3.6 per cent. above that of a year ago. This increase was achieved despite a downward trend in the price of some metals and the depressed state of the gold mining industry. A committee to consider and report upon the economics of the gold mining industry of Ontario will shortly be appointed.

After all, this was one of our great foundation industries. It helped to pull Ontario and Canada through the depression of the 1930's. There are many of us here, particularly the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and myself, who have been engaged very deeply with problems arising from that industry. We are seized with the fact that anything we can do, provincially and in co-operation with the federal and other governments, to improve the state of that industry, should be done. Ten years ago I also held the portfolio of Minister of Mines. I cannot say, in that capacity, I was especially distinguished for knowing a great deal about the industry. I confess that at the end of 6 years, when

I left the department, I must have been distinguished by the fact that there was so much about it I had yet to learn. But the picture in those years was a different one. I well remember—and this may interest the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. Herbert)—that at the time I was advised by many people to close out Cobalt and move the people away. Hon. members, and particularly the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) know how false that advice was. As a matter of fact, Cobalt is one of the most important areas in Ontario, and it will become more important as time goes on.

When I look at the list of new metals, I find it difficult to pronounce the names of some of them, let alone describe them. Ten years ago uranium, as I recall, was almost unknown; certainly I, the Minister of Mines at the time, was unfamiliar with it. Now there are uranium rushes and stakings all over this province, including the districts represented by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Scott) and myself; and today I see that there is a uranium rush near Orillia. Just imagine! I may say I have had nothing to do with that.

I can assure you it is a strange thing to read headlines in the newspapers, "Uranium Rush Near Orillia," and "Report A Find At Sparrow Lake." Just imagine what changes science is making in this province. It is only a day or two ago I heard one of the hydro engineers in this province—a very prominent engineer—say that there was more power in uranium buried in the ground of Ontario—many, many times more—than all the water power we can hope to develop in this province. It may be that some who were here 25 years ago now have a different picture of the autonomy of Ontario, brought about by bringing into the orbit of things, resources about which they knew so little.

In hurrying along, I may say that in forestry, we have also made advances.

In forestry, where the value of production again resumed its upward trend after a moderate decline in 1952, a new stage is being introduced in the manage-

ment of these renewable resources. The White Paper on Forestry has been presented to the Legislature for study and consideration. Inevitably, it involves long-range planning to ensure that the best methods will be adopted. To assist in the carrying out of this programme in its initial phases, the appropriation of the Department of Lands and Forests is being increased by \$150,000 for the use of the Timber Management Division. Additional funds will be allocated as this new programme takes more definite shape.

The combined net ordinary expenditure of these 3 departments—agriculture, mining and forestry—has been increased by 136 per cent. since 1942-43. For 1954-55, it is proposed to increase the appropriation by \$486,000—approximately \$500,000 higher.

In connection with conservation, Mr. Speaker, many departments of the government are concerned with the conservation of natural resources. It was back in 1944 that the Conservation Branch was first established to give special attention to this phase of our activities. Since that time, 15 Conservation Authorities have been established throughout the province, with a total membership of 256 municipalities embracing an area of 10,505 square miles. Moreover, municipalities in 4 additional watersheds are now considering plans for establishing such authorities. Up to the present, 26 surveys have been made covering watersheds, either in whole or in part, and as a result of the recommendations in these reports, major conservation projects have been undertaken as follows:

Conservation projects completed up to the present time:

Long Branch Flood Control.....	\$ 80,000
Ingersoll Channel Improvement.....	1,000,000
Port Franks Flood Control.....	120,000
Total.....	<u>\$ 1,200,000</u>

Work completed and in progress during the year 1953-54:

Fanshaw Dam and Reservoir.....	\$ 4,890,000
Conestogo Dam and Reservoir.....	5,400,000
Luther Marsh Dam.....	247,123
Deloro Dam.....	52,000
Brampton Flood Control.....	920,750
Total.....	<u>\$11,509,873</u>

In addition to these projects, a shelf of plans for further conservation and flood control has been prepared which, when carried out, will entail a capital investment of \$52 million. Additional sums will again be provided in the Estimates of the Department of Public Works to finance the province's share of the cost of next year's capital programme. For instance, the land for the reservoir required in connection with the Conestogo Dam has been acquired and tenders will be called immediately to enable an early start on construction to be made.

Reforestation by organized Conservation Authorities is also being stressed. There are now agreements between 7 of the authorities and the Department of Lands and Forests for this work, and so far, \$440,000 has been spent for land purchases, planning and management.

The Conservation Authorities serve as an effective educational force in promoting, with the co-operation of various government departments, farm planning through little valley studies, the building of farm ponds and reforestation. More than 450 farm ponds have been built with the assistance of grants from the authorities since this programme was introduced. Public relations and educational activities in connection with schools, forestry clubs and other groups in the watershed are also important phases of their work. Grants for this purpose to the end of 1953 amounted to \$140,000.

During the coming fiscal year, 1954-55, expenditures on conservation by various departments will total \$16.5 million.

In regard to highways: during 1953—and these figures are very enlightening indeed, giving some indication of the great pressure there is for building of new roads, by-passes, and things of that sort—the number of motor vehicles in service in Ontario increased by 112,000, or 8.7 per cent. continuing the unbroken upward trend which has now lasted for 8 years. That is a striking fact. It is a striking fact that while our population has increased by 25 per cent. since 1945, the number of

Ontario motor vehicles on our highways and roads has risen by 112 per cent. Nor does this extraordinary increase fully measure the demands upon our provincial highway and road system. There are several reasons for this. Tourist travel by automobile has climbed even more. The number of traveller's vehicle permits issued last year was 177 per cent. higher than in 1945. There has also been a pronounced tendency for Ontario motorists to drive more miles per year than heretofore. Another factor is the relatively greater increase in the number of motor transports, particularly of the heavier types, that are now using our highways system. For instance, the number of motor transports with a gross loaded weight of 5 tons or more rose between 1945 and 1953 by 126 per cent. and those of 10 tons or more by 883 per cent. There is little doubt that the amount of freight carried on Ontario's highways system has increased tremendously in that period of time.

It is anticipated that expenditures by the Department of Highways in the fiscal year 1953-54 will amount to \$127.2 million, made up to \$55.4 million on ordinary account (\$95.9 million gross, less \$40.5 million transferred to Highway Reserve Account) and \$71.8 million on capital account, of which \$37.0 million will have been expended from the Highway Reserve Account. The department lived well within its appropriation on both Ordinary and Capital Accounts. Nevertheless, for the third consecutive year we shall have spent on highways more than we have obtained in revenue from gasoline tax and motor vehicle licences.

May I refer the hon. members of the House to pages 19 and 20, which contain a great deal of detail with reference to highway construction, which I shall not read at this time.

The 5-year plan of highway expansion announced in 1949 is ahead of schedule in the mileage of roads completed and in the number of bridges constructed and placed in service. The use of heavier and more efficient equipment and machines and the employ-

ment of mass-production techniques have helped make this possible. Besides carrying out these greatly expanded activities of construction and maintenance, the department has been able to place in service additional snow-plowing and sanding equipment and to extend the coverage of its teletype reports on driving conditions. With the steady climb in motor vehicle registrations and the mounting use of our highways, we must proceed with our expanded highway programme. Accordingly, \$124.3 million, including \$1.0 million for mining roads, is being provided in the fiscal year 1954-55 for this purpose. This provision will still leave an unexpended balance of \$21.5 million in the Highway Reserve Account which will be used as required, as soon as the preliminary engineering work is completed.

That is a matter of fact. If my figures are correct—and I believe they are—of this \$145 million for highway construction, nearly \$125 million is allocated to various projects at the present time.

In connection with Public Works, Mr. Speaker, may I say that to keep pace with the growth of our population and the expansion in our industry, we have undertaken a large scale programme involving the acquisition of land and the construction of buildings for Ontario hospitals and the Ontario Agricultural College, conservation projects, the food terminal building at Etobicoke, warehouses, stations and other buildings to be used by the Department of Lands and Forests and Reform Institutions, and the provincial police, teachers' colleges and the new provincial administration buildings.

In my last budget, I listed a number of major construction projects that were either under way or planned, having a total value of \$65 million. During the present year, we will spend on capital account on these various projects the amount of \$18.0 million. In some cases, of course, these projects will require several years before they are brought to completion. An additional amount of \$20 million is therefore being included as capital expenditure in the Estimates for 1954-55 to continue these projects.

While the work under way represents a large programme of construction in itself, it is considered advisable to include an additional sum of \$7.5 million to enable a start on new work to be made. This will make the total amount to be voted for the construction of new public buildings \$27.5 million. Particulars are shown in the appendix.

Now a word about hydro. Great progress has been made in regard to hydro. I will not give the hon. members of the House the very lengthy figures which could be given, because there has been a committee of the House sitting, which will inform the hon. members as to the progress which has been made.

Work is proceeding favourably at Niagara Falls, and it is estimated that in the next 3 years, the hydro's dependable peak capacity will have increased by another 1.6 million h.p., giving a total available supply by the end of 1956 of 5.5 million h.p. The next largest source after Niagara is the 1,100,000 h.p. representing Ontario's share of the St. Lawrence River Power Project. Accordingly, we are making every effort to expedite the development of this site at the earliest possible date. Ontario Hydro has spent \$1.0 billion on the construction of new generating plants, lines and equipment since November 1st, 1945, but despite this expenditure, there is still a tremendous demand for energy.

In reference to rural hydro; this year a further sum is being placed in an account to assist in financing rural power extensions, which we believe will result in 28,000 new rural customers being added to the lines.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to assistance to municipalities, but because of the very able speech by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) the other day, I do not think it will be necessary for me to refer to it again, but I think it is a matter of great interest because basically our government starts in the municipalities.

The coming fiscal year marks a signal event in the development of our programme of assistance to municipalities, with the payment of \$12 million under

the new unconditional grants plan. It is estimated that in this current year we will pay out to municipalities, local school boards and associated agencies a total of \$125.1 million, equal to 35 per cent. of the province's net ordinary expenditure and 45 per cent. of last year's total municipal tax levy. This coming year, instead of giving the municipalities \$125 million, we will give them \$134 million.

With the introduction of the new unconditional grants, we are terminating the payment for fire and police services, except for the province's contribution to Superannuation and Workmen's Compensation funds, but the net result from this change is an increase of \$7.0 million in grants to the municipalities. I think it may fairly be said that we have been doing our best to assist the municipalities. Of course, there is a limit to what any province can do. During the last 11 years, when demands for direct provincial services have also been heavy, we have stepped up our provincial assistance seven-fold.

As I am sure hon. members will appreciate, it is difficult to continue that tempo, and maintain our position of having the lowest taxes in Canada.

I think we are doing a splendid job this year, when we consider that almost 40 per cent. of the total monies voted, will go to the municipalities.

I would like to hurry along now to "Federal-Provincial Relations."

Nearly 2 years ago, Ontario entered into a Tax Rental Agreement with the Federal Government for a 5-year period on a basis which we felt was to the advantage of both governments. Although we have never regarded this arrangement as the last word, we have considered it, for the time being, to be a reasonable approach to a difficult problem. I am now convinced that there is a more urgent need than ever for a fuller understanding of the problems of all governments—federal, provincial and municipal.

I have increasingly felt the need for a closer integration of federal, provincial and municipal policies to ensure the

continuation of a high level of employment. In recent years, we have accelerated our capital spending for new highways and other public projects, and, if necessary, we are prepared to extend that programme, which will be supplemented by Ontario Hydro's large capital expansion.

On several occasions I have urged that an Economic Committee be established on the federal-provincial level, such as the 1945 committee.

This committee—a fact-finding body, composed of technical advisors of the various governments—would not confine its inquiry solely to questions pertaining to the allocation of responsibilities and tax sources. It would also undertake the study of problems dealing with economic stability, income and employment, timing of capital investment and public works, and public borrowings. The committee would submit plans on these problems to a conference of provincial representatives or to their respective governments. Recently, rather painful adjustments have occurred in several industries and undoubtedly there will be others. Where these adjustments are acute and result in substantial unemployment—and this was a point the hon. Leader of the Opposition brought up yesterday—there should be some action when we meet, and methods and plans formulated whereby federal, provincial and municipal governments can act together to meet the problem.

Unfortunately, the division of responsibility between the federal and provincial governments on unemployment matters is not clearly defined, nor have we made progress in implementing the public investment proposals discussed at the Dominion-Provincial Conference of 1945-46.

During this conference in 1945-46, discussions were held concerning capital investment and planning and timing grants. The time has certainly come, indeed, if it has not passed, when we should be resuming our discussions on these questions.

There is nothing I would like better for our government than to sit down in

an atmosphere of understanding, not only on government level, but on a technical level, with the representatives of other governments, and discuss this great problem. As a matter of fact, our country is getting smaller because of the influences of the days in which we live, and it is more important than ever, that we should act together. I never look upon Ontario as being a single entity. We are part of Canada, and conditions in other parts of Canada affect us, just as our conditions affect them.

It may be necessary in the future to undertake, as stabilizing measures, a larger capital programme than that upon which we are now engaged. We have to recognize that. We have to lay the foundation for it and strengthen our organization to build up those things.

In Canada, most of the projects which lend themselves to timing lie within the field of provincial and municipal jurisdiction. Accordingly, a working partnership between the Federal and Provincial Governments is necessary. The task of maintaining high levels of income and employment will be difficult enough, even if we use every opportunity for co-operation, without adding to our problems the disabilities which result from pursuing diverse courses in dealing with this problem. An Economic Committee would help to keep under review our everchanging problems, which are not going to be any less in the days ahead. Even with the very much larger employment and expansion, our problems in Canada and Ontario are going to be great, and are going to be trying, in prosperous conditions, and they will be more difficult and trying in conditions of recession.

I now come to "Provincial Net Debt and Investment in Resources."

Mr. Speaker, I always like to talk about our credit, because that is the means by which we do things. About a week ago, on March 2nd last, the province sold in New York \$50 million of debentures having an average maturity of 18.8 years at an average interest cost of 3.11 per cent. in order to raise money for hydro's capital expenditure. This

was one of the best issues any province has sold for several years, and it demonstrates that despite the formidable demands we have made on the money market, our credit ranks with the highest among the Canadian provinces.

Those figures are somewhat staggering and I want to clarify them.

In the 11 years that I have been Treasurer, the province has issued its own bonds, or guaranteed Ontario Hydro bonds, totalling \$1.651 million—that is a great development. Remember those bonds are in the portfolios of investors, big and little, across Canada and elsewhere. Of this immense total, only \$285 million was raised outside Canada, while the remainder—amounting to 83 per cent.—was obtained in the home market. Hydro's capital requirements absorbed \$1.0 billion of these total borrowings. I know the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) will recognize it is to keep the wheels of industry turning and to provide lights, refrigerators and farm machinery for our rural people. We had to have the power. We had to step out and get it, and there has been invested in the safest investment in Canada \$1.0 billion, borrowed from our people at home and abroad.

In preparing every post World War II budget, we have been confronted with inevitable commitments arising out of the deferment of construction and repairs during the war years, upon which have been superimposed the post-war expansion of our population and industry. Over this period of 11 years, we have brought into service physical assets—and these figures, Mr. Speaker, are striking—in new highways, buildings, conservation projects and rural power extensions to a value of \$466.9 million; and it is a source of great satisfaction to us that we have capitalized only 35 per cent. of this investment. We have paid out in cash, right out of the pocket, 65 per cent. of that, and only 35 per cent. has been capitalized.

One of the reasons for going to New York to get money in the period I have stated, at 3.11 per cent., was because we took the \$58 million to which I have referred earlier, and applied it to a

“mortgage on the farm.” That is why we do it now, and that is why we shall do it in the future. In other words, we have used our surpluses above ordinary expenditures wisely to build up sinking funds and retire debt, as an offset against the cost of these large capital undertakings. It is our intention to continue this policy, but it is apparent that with our capital spending geared to such a high level and our revenue showing considerably less buoyancy, we shall be obliged to keep an even tighter rein on our expenditures, and exercise the most diligent care in husbanding our revenues.

Some people say that as a Treasurer I have a different personality than I have in any other place, but that has to be the case.

We have been able to add to the physical assets of the province the value of \$466.9 million—and this does not include the grants paid out for the construction of schools, universities, hospitals and charitable institutions. Those things have been paid for by us out of cash, in addition to the 65 per cent. of these capital commitments which we paid in cash. That again, is one of the keys to our physical position. I am able to report that the net debt per capita is still considerably less than it was when I first became Treasurer. It is true that the net debt rose from \$495.4 million on March 31st, 1943, to \$604.1 million on March 31st, 1953, but on a per capita basis, it dropped from \$126.71 to \$123.91, and, of course, in terms of real purchasing power the reduction was even greater. Remember, that when we had \$495 million debt, we had a revenue of about \$118 million. Today, with a \$604 million debt, we have a revenue of \$370 million, so there is a very great difference there, and there is a very great difference in the value of the dollar.

I point out to the hon. members who will be taking this budget apart, the truth of the statement I have made. It is by such a policy of applying every dollar of current revenue surplus to sinking funds, debt reduction or capital expenditures that we are able to assure the province a high reputation among

the investing public, and thus facilitate our borrowing at low rates of interest.

For the sixth consecutive year, I am able to announce that there will be no additional tax burdens imposed upon the people. Indeed, for 6 years we have been able to make some minor tax reductions. It is proposed to amend the Security Transfer Tax Act to provide that bonds and debentures guaranteed by the Government of Canada or any of the provincial governments will be exempt from this tax. This will mean that Ontario Hydro bonds guaranteed by the province will be exempt from the security transfer tax. There will also be certain minor reductions in succession duties and the race tracks' tax for the next fiscal year will be 7 per cent.

I am sure hon. members of the House are familiar with the problem which has often been discussed here. The high tax level of 15 per cent. plus the additional costs race tracks have had to meet, has a tendency to increase the book-making problem in this province, and we have endeavoured to bring the tax down to help eliminate that problem. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is always a debatable problem, but I think the indication is that is being accomplished.

Ontario has about the lowest provincial tax structure of any of the provinces. Although there are over 62,000 miles of paved or hard-surfaced highways in Ontario—more than double that of any other province—our gasoline tax is some 2 to 4 cents per gallon less than that in 5 of the provinces. Our motor vehicle licence rates are the lowest in any of the Canadian provinces. For the last 3 years our revenue from gasoline tax and motor vehicle licences has been less than our expenditure on highways. Half the provinces of Canada impose a general sales tax, where rates range up to 5 per cent. of the retail price.

I have no criticism of that except to point out that in Ontario we have no sales tax imposed by the Provincial Government. We have not taxed meals, cigarettes, tobacco, or liquor. Those things do not apply in this province. Ontario has no general sales tax, nor

any specific taxes on such commodities. In other fields, our rates are comparable with those in the rest of Canada. Although our budget has increased very rapidly, we are actually spending a smaller proportion of the taxpayers' income than before World War II.

In giving you the Estimates for the coming year, our Estimates of net ordinary expenditures for next year are \$353,863,000, and net ordinary revenue \$354,402,000; I am therefore budgeting for a surplus on ordinary account of \$539,000, which, if realized, will be our twelfth consecutive annual surplus.

Budgeting is at all times full of uncertainties. As I stressed in my address 2 years ago, our Estimates are predicated on sound grounds. Any change in federal taxation or the imposition of restrictions on trade affects our revenues. Changes in income or in the driving or beverage-drinking habits of our people will also influence our revenues. For these reasons, our Estimates are made on the safe side.

We hope to do better, and if we do, we will apply it in the way I have indicated. I will not give further details, because it is all there for the hon. members to read.

However, in conclusion, I should like to say a few things about the highlights of this budget. Again, I do not want to burden the hon. members, as the highlights consist of 40 different items, appearing on pages 28 to 33, to which I commend your reading, but I may say this is the eleventh surplus of this government.

Supplementary grants of \$7 million will be paid to hospitals, amounting to \$300 per bed. \$1 million will be paid to the Cancer Research Foundation. \$1 million will be paid to the Dental Faculty of the University of Toronto. \$100,000 will be paid to the Royal Botanical Gardens. Special grants will also be paid both for capital and maintenance to our universities. \$350,000 will be paid to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. To strengthen the Public Service Superannuation Fund and the Teachers' Superannuation Fund,

\$1 million will be paid into each of those funds.

Highways expenditures are as I have outlined them. Expenditures this year for education totalling almost \$82 million, for the great humanitarian services, nearly \$160 million; our assistance to the municipalities this year, \$134 million. The fact that we have been able to pay out of cash 65 per cent. of our capital commitments; the fact that we have raised 85 per cent. of our physical requirements right here in Canada, and only \$285 million abroad; the fact we have been able to do such a striking job in connection with New York financing; the fact that our per capita debt, even after all these extensions, is less than it was 10 years ago; the fact that our grants to rural hydro over the 10-year period have been \$65.0 million, and nearly \$10.0 million this year; the fact we are adding rural subscribers and users to our lines by the tens of thousands, and the fact that next year we are budgeting for another surplus, the twelfth consecutive surplus; the fact that our grants will amount to \$134.0 million to the municipalities, that we are giving great assistance to charitable institutions for their beds, that we are providing \$16.5 million for the conservation plans; that we have a shelf of \$52 million which can be used as required; that our maintenance grants for universities are being increased, are only some of the 40 points which I mention in this budget, and which I give to the hon. members of this House for consideration.

In conclusion, throughout the present fiscal year, this government has established a high record of achievement—one which has rarely been equalled. To some, this may appear as a challenging statement, but we believe the claim will be accepted by reason of its fidelity to fact. Those who have followed the account of the year's conduct of the business of the province will recognize that the government has not been unmindful of the needs of the people.

With Ontario's unprecedented growth in population, new problems and new responsibilities have confronted the

government. Insofar as human foresight could be exercised, most of these problems have been anticipated and every possible preparation made to deal with them effectively. Some indication of this awareness on the part of the government may be found by recalling a pledge made in the Budget Statement delivered in this House one year ago tomorrow when I said:

Entering as we are upon another year of opportunity, we dedicate ourselves to the task of making 1953-54 a notable year of progress—a year outstripping the best of our former years.

That was a promise made. Today, I affirm that the promise made is now the promise kept.

Today for the fiscal year 1954-55, I make a pledge equal to the one I gave in this House one year ago. I believe that I speak for my colleagues. I assure you I voice my own convictions when I assert that, supported by the united efforts of the hon. members of this Legislature, and with the help and guidance of Divine Providence, we shall acquit this—our solemn obligation—to the satisfaction of the people of Ontario, whose servants we are.

In striving for the betterment of all the people of this great province, we shall not approach our tasks in any narrow spirit of provincialism. We who live in Ontario love this grand old province and are proud of her contribution to the building of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, we are Canadians, first, last and always!

We have a goodly heritage. For what we have inherited from our fathers, we can never repay. Theirs was not only a triumph over the hardships which belonged to a pioneer life. Theirs was, in fact, a miracle of the spirit. Inspired by the example of those who have laid the foundations of Canada, we shall find the inner strength to prove worthy of our heritage.

In keeping with these sentiments, I ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, to close, by quoting words used by another, on a former occasion. These words I

commend to you in the hope that they will never lose their meaning for the Canadian people:

Realizing the inherent greatness of Canada as a nation and recognizing the strength that can come only from unity of purpose, we believe that all the peoples of Canada should unite in fostering a common pride in Canadian achievement and institutions and a common loyalty to our ancestral traditions of equality, justice and toleration, and should seek with due regard for constitutional rights to achieve that profound sense of the importance of national interests which will ensure harmony and co-operation and that future for our country which was the aim of Confederation.

MR. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, before the motion to adjourn the House is moved, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) from whom he was quoting?

HON. MR. FROST: I was quoting my late brother Cecil.

MR. NIXON moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Before the House adjourns, Mr. Speaker, I desire to give hon. members a notice of motion, and in so doing may I make these observations.

At the opening of the session I made reference to the Public Accounts Committee and the highway investigation. Four weeks have now elapsed, and the investigation is continuing, as was evidenced by the announcement on Monday.

It has not been practicable to have the auditor and the investigators appear before the committee, as yet. In the normal course of events about 3 weeks remain of this session. They are going to be very busy weeks and any dealings with the highway matter would have to be hurried and perhaps inconclusive. That, Mr. Speaker, is not what I had hoped for. I am therefore going to present a motion in order not to take from Parliament—the peoples' representatives

—the right of full disclosure to which they are entitled, by reason of the course of the present investigation and the nearness of the normal prorogation.

The committee which I propose to have appointed will be given the widest terms of reference. I am not one who believes a committee of the Legislature is bound by the sub judice rule. It is only bound by the limitation of good sense, judgment, and fair play. Parliament is supreme in these matters, and I have every reason to believe that any committee of this House will use good sense, judgment and fair play. I know it will observe these standards.

I have said before the investigation was started by the government. Those in charge have done, and will do, their full duty. The object will be, among other things, to see that the methods employed by the Department of Highways, and by every other department, and in all other places will be no less than the very best and an opportunity will be given for the committee to investigate all those things, and make such recommendations to the House as it sees fit.

Therefore, I give notice of this resolution:

That a Select Committee of the House be appointed to study all phases of the plan of organization and methods of operation in the Fort William Division of the Department of Highways, and in any other divisions of the said department that the committee deems necessary, and to investigate any irregularities or irregular practices in such divisions, and to recommend such improvements in the organization and administrative practices of the Department of Highways which the committee considers necessary to meet the growing volume of work of the department through the province.

And that the Select Committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and

compel attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons, and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings, and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee can be chosen later when this resolution has been adopted. I had hoped, when the House convened, that perhaps matters would be sufficiently advanced for the question to have been considered by the Public Accounts Committee. Again I say, I am not one who believes that the sub judice rule applies to proceedings of a committee of the Legislature.

Four weeks have elapsed. In the normal course, there are 3 weeks remaining of the session and, may I point out, Mr. Speaker, there were motions before the House, and it seemed to me to be proper to make this announcement when the Budget Address and the motions had been disposed of. I will move the motion at a later date, but I desired to give notice of it today.

MR. OLIVER: Has a decision been reached by the government as to how many hon. members will sit on the committee?

HON. MR. FROST: I will discuss that point with the hon. Leader of the

Opposition (Mr. Oliver), but I should think the number would probably be 11.

MR. OLIVER: What was the number which sat on the Reform Institutions Committee?

HON. MR. FROST: Eleven.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, and in so doing I may say that tomorrow the bills on the Order Paper will be considered. I think we can follow the usual custom of discussing anything on the Order Paper, but if any hon. member wants anything deferred, I will be glad to hold it over.

MR. NIXON: The Estimates are usually distributed at the time of the Budget Speech. Are they available?

HON. MR. FROST: I am sorry, sir. I will see that they are distributed at once. I will make arrangements to ensure that hon. members get copies immediately, if they so desire.

In view of the point raised by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), I think we could distribute these Estimates at the present time if you, Mr. Speaker, would withhold adjourning the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.51 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, March 12, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, March 12, 1954.

Mental Health Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Phillips, first reading	509
Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading	509
Frontenac High School District, bill to amend, third reading	510
Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital, bill respecting, third reading	510
Town of Fergus, bill respecting, third reading	510
Town of Mimico, bill respecting, third reading	510
Sao Paulo Light and Power Company Limited, bill respecting, third reading	510
Town of Palmerston, bill respecting, third reading	510
City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, Mr. Jolley, second reading	510
City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Weaver, second reading	510
Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association, bill respecting, Mr. Fullerton, second reading	510
Township of Scarborough, bill respecting, Mr. Beckett, second reading	511
Schools Administration Act, 1954, Mr. Dunlop, second reading	511
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, second reading	511
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, second reading	511
Teachers Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, second reading	511
Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, second reading	511
Corporations Information Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, second reading ..	511
Unemployment Relief Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	511
Professional Engineers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, second reading	512
Infants Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	512
Credit Unions Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	512
Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954, Mr. Porter, second reading	513
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	513
Trees Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gemmell, second reading	517
Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gemmell, second reading	517
Crown Timber Act, 1952, bill to amend, Mr. Gemmell, second reading	517
Territorial Division Act, bill to amend, reported	518
Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, held	518
Municipal Act, bill to amend, reported	519
Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act, bill to amend, reported	522
Municipal Drainage Act, bill to amend, reported	523
Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, reported	523
Operating Engineers Act, 1953, bill to amend, reported	524
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	524

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1954.

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We have as our guests today, students from the Ridgetown High School, the Oakridge School, and the St. Clair Junior High School, and a little later on, we will have students from the Bishop Strachan School, Toronto.

We are very pleased to welcome you here today, especially those from out of town. We hope you have enjoyed your stay, and will continue to have a very profitable time this afternoon.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT, 1954

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Mental Health Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) tell us the purpose of this bill?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The Mental Hospitals Amendment Act of 1954 consists of three parts. The first has to do

with what is known as "Observation Units." Those are units within the psychiatric unit for disturbed patients. This bill is really a further development in the field of community mental health, and authorizes a number of public hospitals to extend their psychiatric treatment service.

The second part has to do with municipal rates, especially as it affects the Ontario Hospital at Woodstock, that is, the epileptic division. It is proposed to relieve the municipality of the charge of 50 cents per day for the treatment of indigent patients in the Ontario Hospital, Woodstock. This is the only Ontario Hospital where this charge was previously made.

The third part provides for certification.

The amendment is designed to authorize municipalities to increase the maximum payable for examinations and certifications of mentally-ill and mentally-defective persons, from \$5 to \$10. This only involves a very small number of patients, really those ordered to be examined by the magistrates.

The maximum fee of \$5 was originally fixed in 1882 and I really think it is reasonable the maximum fee should be increased to \$10.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Mental Hospitals Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in case of both the Mental Health Act and now the

Mental Hospitals Act, 1954; they will both be referred, after second reading, to the Committee on Health.

This bill is a further development in the community mental health programme. By this bill, we are establishing the means whereby the best advice and assistance in regard to mental health will be available to local public health agencies, local hospitals, and others throughout the province, in respect of this very important field of public health.

Thirdly, in addition, the bill recognizes the participation of public hospitals in the community mental health programme. In this regard, we are establishing the machinery necessary to supervise and assist public hospitals in this field.

In the Budget Address yesterday, the hon. Prime Minister and Treasurer of this province, stated we had already approved of or put into operation, psychiatric units in 10 general hospitals, located in 6 different cities, which would provide 311 beds.

To that, I might add that at the present time we have 4 units in operation, that is, 123 beds in the 4 units. We have also another 6 units with 188 beds, which have been approved and are now in varying degrees of planning and development. That makes up the total of 311, about which the hon. Prime Minister spoke yesterday.

I may say further that, in a measure, the proposal follows established principles laid down many years ago, and which have been found, by lengthy experience, to be satisfactory, both in the interests of the patients and the institutions concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

The following bills were separately given third readings, and passed as intitled in the motions:

Bill No. 1, An Act respecting The Frontenac High School District.

Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital.

Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Town of Fergus.

Bill No. 6, An Act respecting the Town of Mimico.

Bill No. 15, An Act respecting the Sao Paulo Light and Power Company Limited.

Bill No. 29, An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston.

THE CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

MR. JOLLEY moves second reading of bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF TORONTO

MR. E. L. WEAVER (St. David): Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto," I would like to inform the hon. members that pursuant to Rule 87, I have given the Clerk of the House notice of motion to amend the second clause of the bill, when the bill comes to Committee stage, by adding thereto, the following words:

provided that the full value of such land and buildings, except the land and buildings that are exempt from taxation under section 4 of The Assessment Act, shall be included in the assessment of the city for the purpose of the apportionment of the levies of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto among the area municipalities under The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 26.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

YOUNG MEN'S, YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

MR. J. A. FULLERTON moves second reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the Sudbury Community

Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

MR. H. E. BECKETT moves second reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves second reading of Bill No. 84, "The Schools Administration Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves second reading of Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 85, I would like to mention again that this bill, together with the others, will go before the Committee on Education.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP, with the same qualification, moves second reading of Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TEACHERS SUPERANNUATION ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves second reading of Bill No. 87, "An Act to amend The Teachers Superannuation Act."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) care to explain

to the House what arrangements have been made, or are planned to be made, for the protection of that small but important group of elderly teachers, whose superannuation allowances are extremely low, and totally inadequate for their minimum living requirements?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), may I inform the House that the Committee on Education heard a delegation from the group mentioned by the hon. member, last Wednesday, and discussed the matter fully, but did not arrive at a decision, and proposes to discuss the matter within the committee itself at its next meeting, when the bill will again come before it, and it is expected a decision then will be made.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT, 1953

HON. MR. WELSH moves second reading of Bill No. 65, "An Act to amend The Corporations Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CORPORATIONS INFORMATION ACT, 1953

HON. MR. WELSH moves second reading of Bill No. 66, "An Act to amend The Corporations Information Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 67, "An Act to amend The Unemployment Relief Act."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) whether this is the only legislation to which we can look forward to in this session dealing with the problem of the

unemployed and needed relief? This bill deals only with the amount required for the burial of indigents. I would be very sorry to think this is all the government will have to say in this critical year in regard to the matter of relief for the unemployed.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Prime Minister has made it abundantly clear as to the position we take in connection with the unemployment situation.

This is a very minor amendment to the Unemployment Relief Act, and, as the hon. member well knows, only applies to unemployable people.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, what was the practice previously?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, previously we have had an item in the Estimates to take care of burials of indigents. We have transferred that to the Unemployment Relief Branch, and burials in unorganized areas will be paid from the Unemployment Relief vote.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves second reading of Bill No. 69, "An Act to amend The Professional Engineers Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INFANTS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend The Infants Act."

He said: This bill provides for investigations and reports to be made by the Official Guardian in any case relating to the custody, maintenance and education of a child where the custody of the child is involved. Under an amendment of the Matrimonial Causes Act, passed in 1949, similar provision was enacted

to assist the courts in dealing with the custody of children in divorce actions of the parents. This amendment will extend that procedure to all cases which involve the custody of children. I propose that this bill, as well as the next three bills to be called for second readings, shall be referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT, 1953

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask whether the Credit Union organizations have been consulted with respect to this bill?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. The change in procedure provided in this amendment, and which is substantially all that is involved in the bill, has been discussed with the association, and they are satisfied with it.

MR. OLIVER: They will be acquainted with the fact that the bill is going to a committee?

HON. MR. PORTER: I shall see that they are. The bill enacts certain desirable changes of procedure. As the House will recall, last session provision was made for the transference of the administration of Credit Unions from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Insurance. This transfer has been made, and the Department of Insurance has been functioning under the provisions of that statute. The amendments contained in this bill are designed to bring the Act into line with the new administrative policies of the Department of Insurance and the present practices of Credit Unions. There is a slight change in the definition, and there is also provision for the appointment of a new officer to perform

the duties which are now performed by the registrar of the department. All the amendments are procedural.

MR. OLIVER: Has the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) any information at hand which would indicate the growth of Credit Unions?

HON. MR. PORTER: I have not it here, but I would be glad to supply it—

MR. OLIVER: In the committee stage?

HON. MR. PORTER: I will obtain the information and produce it in committee stage.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT, 1954

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of bill intituled, "The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Is it the intention of the government to establish these courts in every county of the Province of Ontario?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, eventually that will come about. As a matter of fact, there has been a considerable extension of the juvenile courts system. Up to the present time, no action is taken unless the municipality, or some organization concerned with child-welfare matters, requests that a juvenile court be established. In some counties, there is as yet so small a volume of work of this kind, that they have not asked for this court, but we expect that eventually, even though gradually, one will be established in every county.

MR. CHARTRAND: How are these problems handled in jurisdictions where there is no juvenile or family court? Are they dealt with by the magistrate's court, the county court judge, or by what tribunal?

HON. MR. PORTER: Cases come before the magistrate in the ordinary way. When a charge is laid against a

juvenile, the magistrate disposes of the case, either by acquittal, suspended sentence, probation, or otherwise.

MR. CHARTRAND: Where there is no special family court tribunal, how are these family cases handled?

HON. MR. PORTER: Very often, where a juvenile and family court is established, a juvenile court judge is appointed, and frequently he is the magistrate. Or it may be that the county court judge is clothed with jurisdiction to act as juvenile judge, in addition to his other functions. In the City of Toronto, where there is a very large volume of work in the juvenile and family court, the organization is entirely separate, with a juvenile judge, a deputy judge, and quite an elaborate staff. In Ottawa there is a similar organization. The juvenile court judge in Ottawa is not a magistrate or a county court judge. He has been appointed specifically as a full-time judge for this purpose. But where the work is not too heavy, it is customary to have one of the existing judicial officers appointed to carry it on.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, in districts where the amount of work is not sufficient to require a separate court, the magistrate will clear the court and hold the hearing in camera. That is really the only difference.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, that is really the only difference. He is given authority to deal with these matters in the special way provided for under the juvenile courts legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: I have, by allowing this discussion, practically permitted this bill to go to committee stage.

THE REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act."

MR. OLIVER: Will it go to committee?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. All these bills, the second readings of which I have just moved, will go to committee. I explained, on first reading, the purposes of the bill. It contains several rather minor amendments to The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act which have been recommended by the department under which that Act is administered; and it will be further considered in committee.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on this bill, and I hope to get some enlightenment from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). I have in mind especially certain practices which we thought we had eliminated as a result of legislation adopted by the House in the last few years, but which, I am afraid, have not been wholly done away with. As recently as the past week or two, a case was brought to my notice of a man who, having bought a house through a licenced real estate broker, found, after a considerable period of time, that the person from whom he bought it had received \$2,000 less than the sum he—the purchaser—had paid. This was discovered as a result of a quite accidental meeting of the vendor and the purchaser. Upon investigating the transaction, they found that, somewhere during the course of negotiations, there entered a fictitious "Mrs. Smith," from Hamilton, who was supposed to have purchased the house from the former owner and in turn, had sold it to the present owner at a profit of \$2,000. No one was aware of the existence of any "Mrs. Smith." Obviously, what happened was that the agent, realizing that he could get more for the house than the then owner was asking, made this fictitious transaction and charged the purchaser the extra \$2,000. I was asked whether this proceeding was legal, and what could be done about it. At this moment both the former owner and the present owner are ready to co-operate in order to lay claim to the \$2,000. The former owner would like to get it, since obviously it was paid for the property; the new owner would like to regain it, because

obviously it was not received by the former owner. The incident indicates the existence of a loophole which I had supposed was pretty well plugged by the legislation passed a few years ago for the purpose of making it more difficult to carry on such unsavoury practices in the real estate business. But if these things are still possible, evidently the Act requires more amendments than are now being presented to us, and I would earnestly ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) to look into this matter and, before the session is over, to introduce such additional amendments as may be necessary to safeguard the interests of people of the class I have mentioned.

HON. MR. PORTER: If what the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has told us did actually happen, and if complaint was made to the Department of Insurance, I am sure the licence of that broker would be cancelled immediately.

MR. SALSBERG: Of course, Mr. Speaker, there may be a difficulty, owing to the injection of a third party, in proving what was done according to my information.

HON. MR. PORTER: Action would be taken if the facts as stated by the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) are correct. But he has not given the names of the parties. He has never complained to me about this matter. I do not know whether anyone has made complaints to the department about it. The department has power to licence people, whether brokers or salesmen, who deal in real estate with the public; and if any fraudulent practice of this kind takes place, the licence of the man responsible would be immediately cancelled. I cannot understand anybody allowing a thing of that kind to develop, and harbouring it in his breast for months, without anything being done about it. We have not had information from anyone. How could we do anything about it? If the hon. member wants to facilitate a proper disposition of this matter, let him tell us who the parties are, and where they are, and we will go after them.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney-General need not be so belligerent and so demanding.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am not belligerent at all. I want to ascertain what took place.

MR. SALSBERG: I can assure him that nobody "harboured it in his breast" for any length of time.

HON. MR. PORTER: When did it happen?

MR. SALSBERG: This thing came up without the "harbouring" of a secret in the breast of anybody.

HON. MR. PORTER: When did it happen?

MR. SALSBERG: Two people met.

HON. MR. PORTER: When did it happen?

MR. SALSBERG: I can give you all the information given me by my constituents. But since you are—

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member when did this happen?

MR. SALSBERG: I suggest that the hon. Attorney-General should not get excited about it.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am not. I want to know when it happened.

MR. SALSBERG: He should only show concern, not excitement—

HON. MR. PORTER: I am showing great concern.

MR. SALSBERG: —because he is not being blamed for it. I am merely inquiring whether our present legislation is sufficient to safeguard people in a transaction of this kind. He will know if it does, and in what manner.

HON. MR. PORTER: The legislation is completely sufficient for the purpose, if the hon. member (Mr.

Salsberg) will take the necessary steps under it, to lay the facts before us. But how can we get after anybody if we do not know who the parties are, and where the transaction took place? All we know is that he says there is a fictitious "Mrs. Smith" and that "Mrs. Smith," apparently, does not exist. What are we to do about it? We do not even know yet whether there is a house.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a house. The hon. Attorney-General and his friends might not call it a house, but for 90 per cent. of factory workers that is a house and that is a home.

HON. MR. PORTER: We have never seen it.

MR. SALSBERG: So far the hon. Attorney-General has not been charged with neglect of duty, so he should not "get hot." I am inquiring of him as the chief law advisor of this government whether there is sufficient protection in such cases. As for the suggestion of hearsay, Mr. Speaker, what happened was that two people met accidentally at a social gathering; one asked the other where he lived and the other told him. The first man said, "That is the house which I sold." "Why," says the other, "are you Mr. So-and-so?" "Yes."

HON. MR. PORTER: Mister whom?

MR. SALSBERG: "I have bought it from him." So they began exchanging notes, and they found to their amazement that they were cheated somehow: one got less than he was supposed to have received, and the other evidently paid more than he was supposed to pay. I will bring the information to the hon. Attorney-General's office. I am very glad to know that in the hon. Minister's opinion our present legislation is sufficient. But he did not answer my question, whether under the existing law the party who improperly obtained this additional \$2,000 can be forced to return it.

HON. MR. PORTER: I would say, yes, if the proper procedure is taken.

But first I must hear the facts of the case. I have not heard one fact yet.

MR. SALSBERG: Despite the brilliance for which the hon. Attorney-General is famous among his own supporters, I do not expect him to know the facts of a case I have not presented to him.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am glad the hon. member feels that he has not presented them.

MR. SALSBERG: And I am glad he understands the nature of the complaint, and I hope he will take the necessary action to protect the best interests of our citizens in these matters.

MR. T. L. KENNEDY (Peel): Who is "harbouring" the \$2,000?

HON. MR. W. K. WARRENDER (Minister of Planning and Development): May I ask the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) if the contract entered into was offer to purchase for a specific sum of money? If there was a contract for a specific sum, how could the purchaser pay more than the sum specified in the contract, or the vendor receive less?

MR. SALSBERG: I shall be extremely glad, in the interests of the people affected, to bring all the documents to the desk of the hon. Attorney-General. According to the information given to me by these citizens, the agent offered this house at a certain price. The prospective purchaser thought the price was a little too high, but indicated his readiness to purchase at around the price asked. It seems that the agent then went to the owner and put through a sale to a "Mrs. Smith" for \$2,000 less than the prospective purchaser was prepared to pay, and then came to this man and sold it to him. Whether all the documents are in order, I cannot say. Unfortunately, I am not a lawyer; fortunately, I am a member of the Legislature who is always ready to defend the interests of his constituents.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is all anonymous.

MR. SALSBERG: But my constituents are not anonymous at all; they are very well known.

HON. MR. PORTER: We will go into the case immediately we know what it is.

MR. SALSBERG: I will bring the material.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we have had a very enjoyable and amusing time—

MR. SALSBERG: It is the fault of the government!

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): As I understand it, the amendment proposed in this bill is intended to differentiate between "broker" and "salesman". I do not know whether different bonds are to be filed by a salesman and by a broker, but it seems to me that we should not make objections or raise barriers to a salesman becoming a broker. Will the hon. Attorney-General tell us whether this is merely a matter of what bonds shall be filed, or has he any objections—and if so, what—to a salesman becoming a broker?

HON. MR. PORTER: Very often, of course, a salesman is a man who has not the qualifications of a broker. A broker is a man who has to take the responsibility if a salesman makes a mistake or does anything wrong. A salesman is an employee of a broker. A man who might be suitably qualified as a salesman might not have the qualifications which would enable him to become a broker. On the other hand—I am not quite sure, but I think there is a higher bond required for a broker than a salesman. If the hon. member wants complete details of the procedure under this Act, he can attend the committee meeting. We shall have Mr. Whitehead there to answer any questions—and perhaps "Mrs. Smith" will be there as a witness.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TREES ACT

HON. WELLAND S. GEMMELL moves second reading of Bill No. 82 intituled, "An Act to amend the Trees Act."

MR. H. C. NIXON: Would the hon. Minister give the House some explanation of the bill?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: This is more or less a tightening up of existing legislation. Under the original Act the organized municipalities, or most of them, had the privilege of passing by-laws to regulate the cutting of trees within their boundaries.

It has been discovered that certain municipalities and townships in Northern Ontario were not covered by the Act, and this Act gives them the legal authority to pass these by-laws regulating the cutting of trees.

The Act also gives the municipalities the power to appoint inspecting officers in addition, to ensure that the by-laws are carried out. It was discovered that in certain sections of Southern Ontario, some people were evading the by-laws by using fire, bulldozers, and other means to destroy wood lots, causing destruction in order to get the land for agricultural purposes. This measure would give to municipalities and townships the privilege of passing by-laws and enforcing them.

MR. OLIVER: Does the hon. Minister (Hon. Mr. Gemmell) suggest some cities come under this Act?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I believe the matter first arose in connection with one of our organized municipalities which was not legally entitled to pass a by-law in connection with the cutting of trees. That is when it was brought to our attention. In studying the Act it was discovered that certain organized municipalities did not have the authority to pass by-laws.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

THE WOLF AND BEAR BOUNTY ACT

HON. MR. GEMMELL moves second reading of Bill No. 88 intituled "An Act to amend the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act."

MR. OLIVER: Is the hon. Minister going to raise the bounty this year?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: No. As I explained the other day, this bill will now permit trappers to present the head of the animal only. Previously they had to present the whole carcass in order to collect the bounty in territorial districts.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

THE CROWN TIMBER ACT, 1952

HON. MR. GEMMELL moves second reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act, 1952."

MR. OLIVER: I think the hon. Minister should say something on this. The explanatory note is not very helpful.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Mr. Speaker, I should say that all these bills will go to the Lands and Forests Committee. The original 1952 bill, as I explained the other day, provided that concessionaires holding concessions of 50 square miles and over, must prepare plans for our department, to cover cutting in the concession area. Such plans, after they are submitted, must have the approval of the department. Secondly, concessionaires must present annual cutting plans, and we thought, in order to ensure that proper schemes for reforestation were provided, the Minister should be given power to require the submission of information as to how concessionaires are going to handle the regeneration and reforestation of the cut-over area. The bill will also give the Minister power, if the submission is not in accordance with the wishes of the department, to require further work to ensure the adequate regeneration of the forest area held by concessionaires.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways) moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in committee; Mr. Roberts in the chair.

TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 32, "An Act to amend the Territorial Division Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 32 reported.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 55, "An Act to amend the Department of Municipal Affairs Act."

On section 1.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I just want to ask the hon. Minister whether it is really necessary to include the last two lines of section 1:

and the department may require the inclusion in the notice of such other information as it deems advisable.

After all, in addition you have to account for every 5 cents you ever gave to the municipality. Surely you do not require words which say, in effect, "Or anything the department might think of." Surely it is enough to say that the amounts which are given to the municipalities shall be included on the tax bill, and I would say that some hypothetical matter ought not to be included afterwards.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): For no reason, as far as I can see, other than there might be a change in the Act. But the slips have been sent out to each municipality and I am sure these slips contain the information normally sought. I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that there is nothing what-

ever at the back of this. I have no objection to those lines being deleted—none whatever—because there is nothing in my mind except that we continue doing what we have been doing in the past. I suppose the staff of the department, in preparing the section, thought perhaps some occasion for the use of those words might arise in the future, but at the present time I can see no reason for them.

MR. OLIVER: Above those words it says:

By which the municipality and local boards benefit by reason of payments by the province to a metropolitan municipality or a county, or a local board thereof, or to a local board which functions in more than one municipality.

That would cover completely, I would suggest, any revision or change which might be contemplated. I say the last two lines are unnecessary, and should not be included.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Oliver). It is not necessary to have them in at all. If my legal advisers hold they should not be there—

MR. OLIVER: I move that the last two lines be deleted.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I want to assure the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) that on my part there was no intention to take any power other than that which has always been exercised.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): While the Minister is making up his mind—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I do not need any time to make up my mind. Do not be personal.

MR. SALSBERG: This is nothing personal. I am giving you time.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I will hold the bill.

Bill No. 55 held.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 56,
"An Act to amend the Municipal Act."

MR. H. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine) :
Can this bill be held over for a couple
of weeks?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Would the
hon. member give an explanation? Why
does he say "a couple of weeks" when
this has gone before the committee and
been agreed to?

MR. FISHLEIGH: The Town of
Malton desires time to appear before a
county hearing at a meeting on the 18th.
If we pass this bill they cannot appear
before their own County Council to
request to become a village in accord-
ance with a procedure which has gone
on for 100 years. This bill will preclude
them from ever becoming a village. If
you bring this bill in after the 18th they
will have a chance.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon.
member's words demonstrate he has
misunderstood the issue. We did not
have a Municipal Board 100 years ago.
Does the hon. member not think that
when a village makes a request of this
sort, it should come before the Municipal
Board?

A municipality may have issued a
great many debentures. Debentures may
have been sold—and no doubt were—at
a price which took into consideration the
fact that Malton was "in," and that the
sewers and water mains had been con-
structed. Does the hon. member not
think it is fair, then, to have a public
hearing before the Municipal Board, so
that all parties concerned can put their
cards on the table?

I suggest to the hon. member it is not
proper to say that Malton should not be
considered by the Municipal Board but
that the County Council should deal with
it. The County Council does not have
to deal with it. You cannot tie the hands
of a County Council. They are not
obliged to deal with a matter at their
first meeting, or at their second meeting.
They may delay their meeting for a
time.

I think the fair way for all concerned
is to go to the Municipal Board, and for
a public hearing to be conducted, so that
a decision on what is to be done may be
arrived at on the basis of expenditure,
and on the basis of Malton being in the
township.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane
South) : I agree with the hon. Minister
(Mr. Dunbar) in the discussion that
has so far taken place in connection
with this bill. But this discussion simply
shows up what happens in connection
with our present procedure of sending
bills to committee. All along I have been
in favour of sending bills to the appro-
priate committee, but there is just one
weakness. Those of us who are not in
attendance do not know what takes
place.

Hon. members attending one parti-
cular committee may constitute one-
tenth or perhaps one-fifteenth of the
membership of the House and the rest
of us do not know what takes place.
Some hon. members may say that I have
the opportunity of attending committee
meetings, even if I am not a member of
a particular committee, in order to hear
what matters are being discussed. But
this is not correct. Some of us are
members of 8 or 9 standing committees.
It is impossible for me, for instance, to
attend a meeting of a committee of
which I am not a member. Thus I am
unable to know what discussion took
place.

I believe there is one way in which
we could remedy this situation: When
the bill comes back from the Standing
Committee and comes before the Com-
mittee of the Whole House, one member
of the committee, perhaps the chairman,
could make a report to the House.

I would like to know what discussion
took place, but it is impossible for me
to know, and our present procedure
limits discussion on a bill which usually
takes place on second readings.

I agree with the limitation all right,
but I would like to see something done
which would give hon. members some
knowledge of just what happened in
the Standing Committee's discussion. I

would like some further explanation of the bill, perhaps from the hon. Minister, or perhaps from the chairman of the committee or from some hon. member. I agree wholeheartedly with the procedure of sending these bills to committee, but there is just the limitation that we lose touch in some way with the whole principle and subject matter that is contained in the bill.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to say something about it. I was not present at the committee meeting because we had a meeting of the Cabinet.

MR. GRUMMETT: Neither was I, Mr. Chairman, but I was interested in the problem. I agree with what the hon. Minister has said today, but I would have liked to have known what took place at the meeting.

MR. BECKETT: As chairman of the committee, I would say a very fair discussion was held with regard to this section of the bill. Everybody was heard, and I think it was explained what the procedure was under the present Act, and what it would be after this amendment.

At the present time, when an application is received by the County Council, and they want to press that application, there is hearing before the County Council, to hear all aspects of the application before it becomes law. Everybody understood the situation very clearly, and I do not think any further explanation can be given. They were told what the procedure is today and what it will be after this amendment is passed.

MR. GRUMMETT: The hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett) has just pointed out what I was trying to say. He says in the committee meeting everything was explained very clearly. That is quite correct. All the hon. members attending the meeting of that committee understood it, but what about the other 50 or 60 hon. members of the House who were not present at that committee meeting and want to know what happened?

MR. BECKETT: As a matter of fact, we had a very good attendance. Practically every member in attendance had something to say and they fully understood what the procedure would be after this amendment went through.

What else can I tell the hon. member? We had a very thorough discussion of the entire matter.

MR. OLIVER: Could I ask the hon. member if there was a vote, if there was a division of opinion on this particular matter in committee?

MR. BECKETT: No, there was no vote taken. It was not necessary, because everybody seemed to be in agreement.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Do you not think it unfair to ask a County Council to decide a thing like that? The Municipal Board has been sitting on all these hearings regarding sewers, debentures and water mains, and they know what it means to that particular township if they lose it, or not. Everything has been brought before them. As the hon. member has stated, Mr. Chairman, this has been on the books for 100 years. We are accused, very often, of the Municipal Act not being brought up to date.

MR. BECKETT: Another point I should mention: under the present legislation, there is no opportunity for the municipality to express its views. Now, they will be able to do it more than before.

The only opportunity existing now is for the respective reeve or deputy reeve to sit in County Council, where they can only express their views if the Statute is mandatory. Under the present legislation, anybody can appear before the board.

THE CHAIRMAN: An hon. member has made a request that the bill be held, and that is now the decision.

MR. SALSBERG: Is it not a fact that even if this bill goes through committee stage, it will not necessarily deprive the village of its right to appear

before the County Council, because it will not have had third reading, and even if the bill receives third reading, it will not necessarily come into effect unless and until it is proclaimed? I doubt if that will take place before the 18th of the month, which is the date, I gather, on which the County Council is meeting. That would be the case unless the government has the intention of proclaiming the bill as quickly as it can get it through the various stages of consideration; otherwise, in the normal run of events, it will not be effective on the 18th.

MR. FISHLEIGH: If that is the case, I am perfectly happy. I am anxious to give them a chance to appear. They seem to feel we are hasty in this, and moreover, I believe, it is very important because the Town of Malton has representatives of industries from the Old Land who wish to come here. A decision has to be made by them whether they have that, or whether they do not; whether they build apartment houses out there for their 14,000 employees, or whether it will be a "mud town."

MR. OLIVER: Could I ask the hon. Minister if it is the government's intention to push the legislation through and proclaim it before the 18th?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I have no idea. I have not heard.

MR. OLIVER: Are you anxious to have it proclaimed?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No.

HON. MR. PORTER: So far as we know, there is no intention of calling the Lieutenant-Governor in before the end of the session.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: This was not "cut and dried" for Malton.

HON. MR. PORTER: Malton just happened to come in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On section 4.

MR. SALSBERG: Just before the bill is passed, I want to say the following. Without taking exception to any portion of the bill, I think it should be stated, as it was in committee, that quite a few of the hon. members of the House, and quite a few people outside the House, are seriously concerned over the tendency of designating additional power and authority to the Municipal Board.

I confess I share that feeling. I say this without having any specific objection to the board as it is composed, as individuals, or to its entire administration, but it has a tendency which gives me and a great many other people great concern, in that we allow an appointed board to assume powers over the life of municipalities which was never dreamed of, and which makes it necessary for large communities, such as Toronto, to come to them for approval, before the corporation can proceed with the fixing of sidewalks, for instance, if the payment for that operation is not going to be made in the year the work is done.

I think it is time we came to grips with this problem, and give it most serious consideration. I say these few words because I think they must be said, and this may be as good a time as any. The hon. Minister feels you cannot amend or change the Municipal Act, because it is a very big Act and has been in operation for a long time and additions have been made to it.

I respectfully suggest to the hon. Minister that precisely because the Municipal Act has grown in the manner it has, by meeting exigencies of the day and problems of the moment which arose because of certain specific developments, precisely because of this history, the time is long overdue for a most thorough study and examination of the Municipal Act, and the role and responsibilities of the Municipal Board. This Act merely gives additional power to that appointed board.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It has grown, but there is one thing I would like to say about the Municipal Board.

It never enters any municipality without being asked.

The hon. member has said, they have control over the municipality. The City of Toronto can build all the sidewalks and roads it desires if it wants to pay for them. It can raise the tax rate and pay for that work. But if the city wants to borrow money on debentures, do you not think the ratepayers should have some little security? They have to go to some board before they borrow money, and mortgage a man's house, because if you put a debenture on that, that is the first mortgage. You may think some other fellow has the first mortgage on a house, but he has not. That debenture is the first mortgage, and if a municipality goes into default, that is the first mortgage. It does not matter about anything else.

I think that is a very serious situation. I think it is very necessary to have a Municipal Board, which, before they issue debentures, look up the financial standing of the municipality and give their "yes" or "no" on the issue of the debentures. It would be a sorry day for the Province of Ontario, if that power was ever taken away from the Municipal Board, and the municipalities were allowed to borrow all the money they could—knowing municipalities as I know some of them—and putting a first mortgage on the home owner.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I am interested in subsection 7:

The vice-chairman of the board, during the absence of the chairman through illness or otherwise or if the office of chairman is vacant, shall have all the powers and perform the duties of the chairman except that he shall not act in the place of the chairman on a County Council.

In my riding we have the Improvement District of Ajax. The district was set up about 3 years ago; the chairman of that board is Mr. Hunt, who is a very fine man and the president of Doughty Construction Company at Ajax. During the summer, he will be away from Ajax for 2, 3 or 4 months. According to that section, during the time Mr. Hunt is

away from Ajax, the vice-chairman of the board is not allowed to sit on County Council, which means the Improvement District of Ajax has no representation on County Council during that period.

The Improvement District of Ajax contributes \$40,000 a year to the County of Ontario. Surely, there must be some way for a chairman of a board, while away from his district or area for any length of time, to delegate some other person to take his place on County Council, to see the interests of the local community are protected.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has considered that angle at all?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, it was considered in every way. The deputy reeve does not attend County Council, as many hon. members in this Assembly know. This man should not be the chairman of a board if he is absent from the municipality for that length of time. What could be done is appoint him a member of the board, which should be just as good for him, and appoint another man, who would attend the County Council regularly, as chairman. What difference does it make if he is chairman, or simply a member of the board? We are prepared to make the other man, who can be present at the County Council, chairman, and make him a member of the board.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): What would be the procedure? How long would that take?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We amended the Act for the entire Province of Ontario, so that the deputy reeve is not allowed to sit in County Council.

Section 4 agreed to.

Bill No. 56 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS QUIETING ORDERS ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend The Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act."

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member may keep quiet now.

MR. SALSBERG: If the reference was to me, I want to inform the hon. Attorney-General that because I was a member of this committee, I learned all the secret meanings of this "Quieting Act" which he, and other lawyers, managed to inject into normal procedures between men. I have learned it, and now I know what it means.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 70 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 71 reported.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act."

On section 1.

MR. SALSBERG: In view of the fact the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is in the House, but was unavoidably absent from the committee when this bill was discussed, I would like to ask a question which was raised in committee by some of the hon. members.

The question raised was: Whether the government would agree to drop the present practice of charging \$1 for a birth certificate and send the certificates out automatically with the receipt of the registration forms properly presented and signed, so that every new-born child would receive his or her birth certificate and would not have to come back in later years and pay \$1 for it.

We were advised by the officials of the department it was a matter of policy—and I think we were quite correct—and only the government can make that decision. We were told, also, it results in an income of about \$250,000 a year for all the certificates issued.

That idea appealed to me, and now the hon. Minister is here, I think this question should be raised officially.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It has not been considered. Of course, it would have to be considered by the government.

MR. SALSBERG: What is your opinion?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: My opinion is, no. I think it might be handled in this way, that the birth certificate could be sent out on the payment of \$1. The clerk could issue the birth certificate, and we would send it out. \$1 could be paid to the clerk, and not have a delay in receiving it.

I do not think the people of Ontario expect us to maintain our offices, carry out our duties, pay our help, and so on, without some charge for the birth certificates. They are worth something.

MR. SALSBERG: Why do you want to charge little babies? Leave the children out of it.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It would not affect you one bit.

MR. R. E. ELLIOTT (Hamilton East): With regard to that point in the bill, it was discussed with Mr. Orr and the other officials of the department at the committee meeting. In fact it was I who brought it up, and not the hon. member for St. Andrew. They said they would take into consideration giving birth certificates to the children after a certain date, written on printed forms, when they were born, so that throughout their lives the parents and family could keep them, and if they needed them in school, or when changing from one district to another, they would have them.

That was taken up with Mr. Orr and his staff, who said they would investigate the matter and bring it forward next year, and they would see if they could give some consideration to doing the very thing the hon. member has suggested.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the hon. member for Hamilton East has spoken, and I now recall it was he who originally raised the point. However, I thought since the officials of the department eventually have to go to the hon. Minister, and since we have the hon. Minister here now, there is no time like the present for striking while the iron is hot.

I had hoped the hon. Minister would agree to drop the nuisance charge of \$1 for a birth certificate on a little child, because after school is closed in the summer he must buy it, and I think it is unfair.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Do not get me to weeping.

MR. SALSBERG: I think it is unfair. A young boy who wants to play on a baseball team or join the Scouts, has to come here, because his birth certificate was not issued in the first place, and you hold him up for \$1. It is unfair.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 72 reported.

THE OPERATING ENGINEERS ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend The Operating Engineers Act, 1953."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 54 reported.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report certain bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes: the Acting Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.32 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, March 15, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, March 15, 1954.

First Report Standing Committee on Lands and Forests, Mr. Cathcart	527
Passing of Charles Gordon MacOdrum, expressions of regret, Mr. Frost, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Salsberg	527
Tribute to Charles Gordon MacOdrum, Speaker	529
Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, second reading	530
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, second reading	531
Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954, Mr. Doucett, second reading	536
Provincial Parks Act, 1954, Mr. Challies, second reading	537
Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, second reading	544
Re Report of Select Committee on Cemeteries Act, Mr. Macaulay	547
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	550

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. BRYAN L. CATHCART (Lambton West): I beg leave to present the first report of the Committee on Lands and Forests, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Cathcart from the Standing Committee on Lands and Forests presents the committee's first report as follows:

"Your committee begs leave to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Trees Act.

Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Wolf and Bear Bounty Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act, 1952.

All of which is respectfully submitted."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that in the midst of life, we are in death, and I must say, sir, that I feel inadequate to the task of paying tribute this afternoon to a young man of only 46 or 47 years of age, a man of great brilliance and personality.

I am reminded of that famous reference of John Bright who, under different circumstances, on a great occasion, referred to the Angel of Death being so close that he could hear the beat of its wings.

We all regret the passing of Charles Gordon MacOdrum, B.A., Q.C., member of the Legislature for the great riding of Leeds, and a resident of the great City of Brockville. A son of the Manse, he came from a distinguished family. His late father was, in 1938, the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. His brother, well-known to us—Doctor M. M. MacOdrum—serves as President of Carleton College, and another brother—Rev. A. S. MacOdrum—is the minister of Kydd Memorial Presbyterian Church in the Rosemount District of Montreal.

A young man, with the background of the clergy, coming, as so many distinguished Canadians have come, from the atmosphere of the Presbyterian Manse, he was born at Moncton, in the great old Province of New Brunswick, was educated at Dalhousie University, and at Osgoode Hall, Toronto. He was first elected to the Legislature in 1951. The manner in which he discharged his duties since then, indicated him to be a worthy

representative of a great riding, that of Leeds, which goes back in history to the very beginnings of this province.

He had a genial and understanding personality, and was possessed in abundant measure of those great and human qualities of heart and mind which endeared him to all those with whom he came in contact. Gordon MacOdrum's first concern was for his country, and his province. He was always interested in the welfare of his constituents, and that characteristic was evidenced to the very last, and they held him in the highest regard. Indeed, the confidence thus reposed in him has been reflected far beyond the confines of his riding of Leeds. His passing evokes today feelings of great regret, and a prayer for his everlasting memory in the hearts of the many who felt the touch of his warm and engaging personality and understanding.

In the realm of his chosen profession of law, he had a distinguished career. Community activities also allowed full scope for all the attributes by which he demonstrated his true worth as a good citizen. He did not spare himself in the service of his municipality of Brockville, which he served first as an alderman, and subsequently as mayor for the years 1939 to 1943 inclusive.

Mere words are futile on an occasion such as this to express our deep personal loss here today. It is in his own household, however, where he shone as a good husband and father, that the blow will be most severely felt. To his wife and two sons, and others of the family including his distinguished brothers, goes our deep sympathy on this occasion, as we mark the passing of a distinguished Canadian, whose great service in so many capacities has benefited the province and the community over the years. We all owe him a deep debt of gratitude which it is our privilege to acknowledge, sad though the occasion may be.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition: I join with the hon. Prime Minister in expressing our sympathy to the family of Gordon MacOdrum, and to say to the House that in the last

few weeks the hand of death has stricken two of our number, both in the prime of life, and both in their greatest period of usefulness.

The government also has suffered, I would say, very greatly in the loss of the late hon. member for Leeds because it was significant that as the days went on, more and more confidence was being placed in the late hon. member for Leeds, by the government, in the House. He was, as the hon. members will recall, chosen as chairman of the Redistribution Committee, which is an indication of the merit which the man had, and the ability which he possessed. He was a good debater, and was, as the hon. Prime Minister suggests, a man of the people, whose first thoughts were for the people, and was always staunch in supporting and in advocating legislation which would be for the benefit of the people as a whole.

The hon. members of this House mourn the passing of Gordon MacOdrum, and extend to his family and friends their sympathy on this occasion.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker. I wish to join with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Leader of the Opposition in extending our sympathy to the family of the late Gordon MacOdrum. This has been another serious blow to the members of the Legislature. Those of us who knew Gordon MacOdrum, knew him as a friend, as an able member of the Legislature, and an able debater, and one who played his part in all the activities of the Legislature, in committees, and in the House. He was a member who discharged his duties faithfully on behalf of his constituency.

As the hon. Prime Minister has correctly stated, words of ours cannot express our feeling of loss at the passing of this able, young member.

It may be significant that both of the hon. members who have recently passed away were approximately the same age, I believe, about 47. They were in the prime of their manhood, when they would be giving of their very best in the service of the country. Both Gordon

MacOdrum and "Bill" Harvey have passed on during this session.

The veterans have also lost a great friend in the passing of Mr. MacOdrum, and I am sure those of us who are ex-legionnaires—members of the Legion—mourn the passing of a young officer and soldier who served so well during World War II.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, will you permit me to join with the hon. members who have spoken? I, as have other hon. members, felt the sudden shock of the passing of the late hon. member for Leeds (Mr. MacOdrum). It is only a couple of days ago when we were together in committee, and it seems like yesterday when we were sitting side by side at a luncheon—only three days ago. It is shocking and painful to realize how quickly one may go.

I do want to add, however, something which has not been mentioned, but which I believe is to the honour of his memory. Mr. MacOdrum, to the best of my knowledge, took a very keen interest in the problems of labour in his community and served it as a lawyer.

It should also be added—and again to his credit—that he undertook to act on behalf of labour at a time when the organized trade union movement in his community was not strong, and was not able to offer him any substantial remuneration for his services. He, nevertheless, acted on behalf of quite a number of labour unions in his community and in his area, up to the very last days of his life.

MR. SPEAKER: May I, on behalf of all the hon. members of the House, add my word on the passing of the late hon. member for Leeds.

The honourable members of this House have experienced this morning the profound sorrow through the passing of one of our most esteemed and kindly members of our Assembly in the person of Charles Gordon MacOdrum. To be called away in the midst of an active and useful life reminds us so forcibly of the shortness and uncertainty

of human life. Yet, there is always the firm assurance of our reasonable religious and holy hope, which enables us to accept the return of a soul to its Maker with a sense of gratitude and thanksgiving. Gordon MacOdrum was one whom every honourable member of this Assembly came to admire, respect and honour. His keen interest in his own people and in the larger welfare of his province made him stand out, as these qualities expressed themselves in his life. Ever aware of these responsibilities, he literally gave himself to his task with enthusiasm, earnestness and devotion. We give thanks for the gift of his life to our day and generation, and to his family extend our understanding, sympathy and prayers for strength and faith and courage.

May we observe one minute's silence please, in grateful recognition of the life of Charles Gordon MacOdrum.

One minute's silence: all standing.

Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of those that depart hence, we most humbly beseech Thee to look in love and mercy upon the soul of Thy child, Charles Gordon, whom Thou hast called from the cares and duties of this world, into Thine Eternal Presence. Grant that as we believe in the reality of Life Eternal, so too may we, his friends and associates, find comfort in that same knowledge for him. Graciously look upon those bereaved by their loss, and may they find in Thee—the God of all mankind—a sure refuge and strength in their time of sorrow. For all his weaknesses and shortcomings we beg Thy mercy. For all his good deeds performed in the midst of this world may he be a lasting memory of thanksgiving and may his human understanding add to the betterment of all with whom he came in contact. May he find Eternal Rest in Thine unbounded love. All of which we ask in the name and for the sake of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, who is the Resurrection and the Life. Amen.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would request you revert to "Motions," and I would like to move the following:

That out of respect for the memory of the late hon. member for Leeds, Mr. Charles Gordon MacOdrum, whose funeral service will be held on Wednesday of this week, that when this House adjourns tomorrow, Tuesday, it do stand adjourned until 3 of the clock on Thursday afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that the funeral service for the late Mr. MacOdrum was set for 2.30 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, at the First Presbyterian Church, Brockville.

Of course, I would not in any way suggest interference with the time, but I have asked the Clerk of the House to get in touch with the family relative to holding the service at three o'clock, or later, because of the train service from Toronto. This would enable hon. members to go down in the morning, and return in the evening. I think that was done at the time of the passing of the late Mr. Reynolds, one time member for Leeds, some years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CEMETERIES ACT

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I was asked to adjourn the debate on this matter because one or two hon. members wanted to speak. I notice they are not here today, so I will adjourn the debate.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves second reading of Bill No. 81, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill the other day, I stated we had four recommendations to make to the House. They are as follows:

Section 1: The purpose of this section is to make it clear that a county council may pass a consolidating by-law with respect to the county road system. At present the Act provides as follows:

Section 11: (17) Where a by-law has been passed for the purpose of establishing a county road system, the council of the county with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may amend the by-law by adding roads to or removing roads from the county road system, or in any other manner.

This does not say specifically that the council may pass a consolidating by-law. I think it should be clearly stated in the Act that the council has that power. There is a very real necessity for the passing of consolidating by-laws because, after a number of amending by-laws have been passed, the records become unwieldy and confusing. In 1925, all counties passed amending by-laws revising the county road systems which in effect were consolidating by-laws. Since then a number of counties have passed consolidating by-laws and others find it necessary to do so.

The amendment is intended to remove all doubts by stating specifically that the county council may from time to time pass a by-law consolidating its county road by-laws.

The purpose of section 2, is to confer on the council of a county the power to regulate, by by-law, the use of land abutting on a county road for a distance of 150 feet from any limit of the road subject to the approval of the Municipal Board.

In the development of the county road systems it has been found that the width of the established road allowance is, in many cases, inadequate for the purposes of a county road. A number of counties have, therefore, embarked on a programme of widening to 86 feet. This is difficult and expensive where buildings have been erected too close to the limits of the road and, therefore, the counties desire to control the erection of buildings or other structures on land abutting on the road. They find, however, that they haven't the power to do so and must rely on the co-operation of the local municipalities within which the road is situate. The local municipalities have that power under section 390 of The Municipal Act, but, due to the need for

uniformity in the regulations, reliance on the local municipalities is not satisfactory.

In section 92 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, this power is conferred on the Metropolitan Council with respect to land abutting on a metropolitan road. Section 2 of this bill has been drafted in the same form. As a safeguard, approval by the Municipal Board is required which affords ample opportunity for review.

Section 3 and 4 are complementary and their object is to control the use of land adjacent to a controlled-access highway for the purposes of a stadium, fair ground, race track, circus, drive-in theatre or any similar purpose. The control will be exercised by permit and is intended to ensure that the free movement of traffic on the controlled-access highway will not be impeded.

The Minister will have power to give notice to the owner or occupant of such land, which is used for the said purposes, after the day on which the amendment comes into force, and has not been used for those purposes before that date requiring him to cease using the land for those purposes.

Any land used for the said purposes before the day on which the amendment comes into force will not be affected, nor will any land situate at a greater distance than one-half mile from the controlled-access highway.

In regard to section 5: In order to provide proper facilities for the free movement of traffic, various planning boards throughout the province recommend the establishment of controlled-access roads in any municipality where the need exists. The purpose of this section is to give effect to this recommendation by permitting any municipality to pass by-laws, subject to the approval of the Municipal Board,

(a) to designate any new road established under section 469 of The Municipal Act as a controlled-access road;

(b) to close any municipal road which intersects or runs into such controlled-access road; and

(c) to prohibit or regulate the construction or use of any private road, entranceway or gate which is connected with or opens upon such controlled-access road.

Mr. Speaker, I think this sets forth the four changes we have recommended.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves second reading of Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act."

MR. H. C. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, did the hon. Minister have in mind saying something on this bill?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

In moving second reading of Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act," I would like to enlarge upon the explanation made the other day on the introduction of the bill.

We have several changes we are recommending, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Legislature. In regard to the first section, the maximum speed limit for motor vehicles operated in built-up areas, outside of cities, towns, villages or police villages, is the same as that provided for such places; i.e., 30 miles per hour. The definition of a built-up area is amended so as to make it clear that both churches and schools are included with dwellings and places of business in determining whether or not the area is built-up as required.

Previously, Mr. Speaker, it was a little ambiguous as to whether a church or school was included in a "built-up area," that is, within the designated 300 feet on each side, or 600 feet in all. This clarifies that, and makes it definite that churches and schools are included.

Section 2 of the bill: At present, it is an offence for a person to make any false statement of fact in any application, declaration, affidavit or paper writing in order to procure the issuance to him of a licence, permit or certificate of registration. This section is amended so

as to make it an offence for any person to make such a false statement either for the purpose of securing a permit or licence in his own name or any other person's name.

We have cases of this kind, from time to time.

The next section, section 3: At present, two separate means of attachment are required when a motor vehicle is drawing a trailer or other device upon a highway. This section is amended so as to require farm tractors when hauling farm wagons, implements of husbandry, etc., to also have two separate means of attachment so as to prevent the possibility of accidents caused by the wagon or implement becoming detached while on the highway.

Section 4: Many serious accidents are caused by reason of a passenger car running into the rear of a motor truck or trailer, the bottom of the body of which is considerable distance from the ground. To date, no suitable method has been found for the attachment of bumpers to all vehicles of this type. I am advised however, that one trailer manufacturer has devised a method of attaching rear bumpers to his equipment and the subject is one which is receiving consideration in many directions. The amendment will authorize the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to require such equipment on motor vehicles of this type, if a suitable means of attachment can be found without awaiting an amendment to the Act. The amendment will also serve as a notice to both the manufacturers and the users of these vehicles that such a regulation is under consideration.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we feel possibly by next year we can do this by regulation, and eliminate many of these very disastrous tragedies.

Section 5 provides: These amendments provide that the council of a city, town or village and the trustees of a police village, may by by-law, approved by the department, reduce the present maximum speed limit of 30 miles per hour for motor vehicles to 25 miles per hour, such speed limit to be applicable to all highways under the jurisdiction

of the council, and the council of a township may, by by-law, reduce the maximum speed limit from 30 to 25 miles per hour in built-up areas within their township. The councils of cities, towns and villages and the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the trustees of a police village may, by by-law, increase the present speed limit of 30 miles per hour. Such by-laws are also subject to approval by the department. The purpose of this amendment is to authorize the City of Toronto and the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto to increase the permissible speed on certain designated highways, where such increased speed would appear to be safe and the volume of traffic to be moved requires that it move at a greater rate than 30 miles per hour.

May I add, in the event they may have roads, such as controlled-access roads, it may be they will want to move the traffic much faster on those roads.

Section 6 is the so-called "right-of-way rule." This was made necessary by reason of a decision of the Supreme Court that the section, as worded, although it has been in effect for many years, does not prescribe a penalty for one who fails to yield the right-of-way to the person on the right. This amendment rectifies this apparent error.

Sections 2, 3 and 4 of the bill deal with the matter of signals to be given for right turns and when decreasing the speed of a motor vehicle, or stopping same. At the present time, the law requires a signal for the left turn only and the reason for not having required signals for stopping and for right turns is that there has been a lack of uniformity in the various provinces and in the United States in this regard. Gradually, the legislation in effect in other jurisdictions has become uniform and now most of the states and most of the provinces of Canada require the signals prescribed in this section for left turns, right turns and for stopping or decreasing speed.

The signals may be given either by the hand and arm, as indicated, or by an electrical or mechanical device. The enactment of these provisions does not

make it compulsory for all vehicles to be equipped with a signalling device. If the signals can be given by hand, such a device is not compulsory.

Subsection 5 of this section is also amended as a result of a court decision which indicates the necessity of clarifying the point at which a motor vehicle must stop before entering a through highway. At the present time, the law requires that the stop be made immediately before entering the nearest cross-walk. Inasmuch as there are many rural highways where there are no cross-walks, it is necessary in such cases that the point of stopping must be designated. This is accomplished by requiring the stop to be made immediately before entering the nearest cross-walk, or, if there is no cross-walk, at a clearly marked stop line, or if there is no cross-walk or stop line, then immediately before entering the travelled portion of the through highway.

Section 7 is a new section designed to validate signs now being displayed on the King's Highway, such as "Detour", "Keep in Single Line", "Keep to Right", "No Left Turns", "Keep Off Boulevard". While such are now being displayed, there is at the present time no authority for erecting them and no requirement that they be obeyed. This is a matter of legalizing, Mr. Speaker, what we have been doing for some years. Many hon. members who travel in the St. Andrew's district will have seen the signs at the swing bridge by means of which we try to bring motorists into a single line. The present Act makes no provision to enforce this.

Section 8 is an amendment to the present section which prohibits the throwing of glass, nails, tacks, scraps of metal, etc., which may be injurious to tires. It is enlarged to include rubbish of any kind. There has been quite a campaign started, I think, by the Women's Institute against litter bugs and we come up against this litter nuisance especially in our roadside parks where picnickers and others have created a number of unsightly places. We think that this provision will help to clean up this state of affairs.

Under section 9, the penalty for failure to remain at the scene of an accident and render all possible assistance is increased. The penalties at the present time are:

Not less than \$25 and not more than \$100, imprisonment for a term of not more than 30 days and suspension of licence or permit for a period of not more than 60 days for the first offence.

For any subsequent offence, a penalty of not less than \$100 and not more than \$500, imprisonment for a term of not more than 6 months and licence suspension for a period not exceeding 1 year.

As this is a most despicable offence, we are recommending that the minimum penalty be increased to \$100 and the maximum to \$500, plus imprisonment for 6 months and suspension of licence for 1 year for the first or any offence. This amendment will give the magistrate wider discretionary authority to impose a severe penalty if the circumstances of the offence would appear to justify same.

Section 10 deals with the distribution of penalties collected for violations of the Highway Traffic Act. At the present time, if the offence is committed on the King's Highway, the penalty is payable to the department, and if on a county highway, to the county; in all other cases, to the local municipality in which the offence was committed.

As many sections of the King's Highway now extend into or through cities, towns and villages who maintain their own police departments for the enforcement of the law, it would seem to be proper that a penalty collected for an offence committed on the King's Highway within such urban municipalities should be paid to the municipality.

As police forces for the enforcement of the Highway Traffic Act are not now maintained at the county level, it would also seem to be proper that penalties collected for offences on other than the King's Highway, should be paid to the municipality in which the offence was committed.

In regard to sections 11, 12 and 13 of the bill: These 3 sections provide for amendments to the Unsatisfied Judgment provisions of the Highway Traffic Act, which amendments are designed to further protect the fund. The first section provides that any amount paid out of the fund on a judgment, shall not include compensation or indemnity already collected by the judgment creditor, from any one other than the driver or owner of the motor vehicle which occasioned the injury or damage, such as amounts paid under an accident or sickness policy, or under the Workmen's Compensation Act. A similar provision was enacted in 1950, but, unfortunately, was made applicable only to judgments arising out of so-called "hit-and-run accidents", in which the Registrar of Motor Vehicles was the defendant. The next section is similar to one enacted last year prohibiting payments out of the fund to non-residents of the province, unless the province or state of the judgment creditor has a similar law in effect for the protection of residents of Ontario. This amendment applies the same rule to so-called "hit-and-run accidents" where action is taken against the registrar.

The third amendment makes it clear that in the case of judgments secured against the registrar, no amount shall be paid out for interest on the judgment, or interest on costs.

In regard to section 14, may I say that the section of the Act being amended was enacted in 1930 and under it every accident resulting in personal injuries or in damage to property apparently exceeding \$50, was required to be reported to the department. At that time, if a motor vehicle was damaged to the extent of \$50, it indicated rather a severe accident. That is not the case today. Parts or repairs which would have cost \$50 in 1930 would in all probability cost \$150 today.

The amendment provides that accidents reportable under this section will be for personal injuries or death or property damage apparently exceeding \$100. This amendment has the

support of police departments generally, including the Ontario Provincial Police Commissioner, and is in line with amendments being made to similar accident-reporting laws in effect in the other provinces and in the United States.

Uniformity in this matter is desirable so as to enable comparisons to be made between various authorities compiling statistics relative to accidents. The amendment will also relieve police officers of a great deal of paper work which now seriously affects their time for patrolling streets and highways.

That is the explanation of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete agreement with most of the suggestions in this bill except, of course, the ones which step on my toes. I suppose that is only human.

With regard to leaving rubbish on the highway, I wonder whether the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has considered the situation where road users toss their rubbish over the fences into the farms on either side of the highway? This has been one of my troubles since tables were erected alongside the highways at which tourists could stop and enjoy their luncheons in the shade. Instead of carrying their rubbish to the receptacles which have been provided, they simply throw their cans, papers and other rubbish over the fences, creating an eyesore and a nuisance. Certainly, I myself have found it a real nuisance.

With respect to the provision for increasing by by-law the speed in built-up areas where ordinarily the speed is 30 miles an hour, I am in agreement that there should be some provision for that. On almost every occasion when I motor into this city on duties at this building, I find myself travelling in or going out during the rush hours. Along the Lakeshore Highway the signs are very plentiful warning motorists that the speed limit is 30 miles an hour. But they do not drive at that speed, Mr. Speaker. If anyone does, he is a real menace to the traffic as it now proceeds

in those sections. A legislator who helps to make these laws naturally tries to observe them as far as possible, particularly when a traffic officer has an eye on him, but if a driver slows down to 30 miles an hour, other traffic cuts in front of him on both sides and he becomes a real hazard on the road.

On one occasion, Mr. Speaker, I saw an officer looking at me and I slowed down to approximately 30 miles an hour. He ordered me to close up the gap and get out of there fast, because I was obstructing the traffic. So if traffic does drive at 40 miles an hour on a particular section, University Avenue or Lakeshore Drive, let us have that as the speed limit so that we shall not feel we are breaking the law if we are driving along there at the same speed as the rest of the traffic seems to have adopted as a matter of course.

For some years the speed limit now proposed seems to have met with the approval of the Toronto police force, though I have had instances in the past when members of my family have received summonses for driving at speeds anywhere from 34 to 37 miles an hour.

Section 3, Mr. Speaker, brings a new principle into the Highway Traffic Act which is of great concern to all of us who live on highways, particularly to those who use farm tractors to haul the implements of farm husbandry either across or along the highway for short distances. May I ask the hon. Minister if the term "highway" includes county highways?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes. I think in this case the principle would apply to travel on any road. But I would not think that on back roads, they would be too particular. I may say, Mr. Speaker, we have had many applications concerning this. There have been some accidents caused by this. We are not interested in people crossing the road, but in some sections it is a common practice for people to draw their produce to market. I myself saw a bad accident in the Kent area when I was there attending a meeting, and it was because of such happenings that we

decided to make the change we are recommending to the House.

MR. NIXON: The hon. Minister for Highways will, of course, remember that he brought this provision in some 3 or 4 years ago and then agreed to remove it before the bill was enacted by the House. At that time my understanding was it only applied to provincial highways. As I interpret the term "highways" it would certainly apply now to all other important roads, and particularly to county roads. For some of us who are so unfortunate as to have to live beside one of these highways, the provision will constitute a real hardship, as I am sure the hon. Minister appreciates, if it is going to be interpreted by the officers of the law in accordance with the direct letter of the Act.

My own farm, Mr. Speaker, is bisected by No. 5 highway, which is a very important and thickly-travelled road, and also by the CNR railway line, so that I cannot get across to 80 per cent. of my land without going on the highway. Most of it is on the opposite side of the road or on the opposite side of the railroad. I foresee I am going to be in great difficulty if everything I take out on the highway in future is required to have these attachments.

Horses in rural Ontario today are becoming almost as scarce as buffalo and hauling on the roads is practically all done by tractors. I would like to see some saving provision brought into this bill exempting all manner of implements of agricultural husbandry from the necessity of having these attachments, at least when they were crossing directly over a road. The regular practice is, of course, when we are cutting across, to bring in the hay 4 loads at once. We hook one wagon behind the other and use two tractors. And I can assure the hon. Minister that I am afraid that if I do not keep an eagle eye on those who are attaching the wagons I shall find myself in the police court very regularly indeed. In fact, I was wondering just what penalty this section of the Act provides?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I see it is not a jail sentence anyway.

Motion agreed to. Second reading of the bill.

PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT, 1954

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves second reading of Bill No. 80 intituled, "The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954."

He said: I do not know whether I mentioned the other day when we were discussing the change in provincial aid to drainage, that our proposals had met with the approval of those who are doing the work. We brought in 3 men who have a great deal of experience—Mr. W. G. McGeorge, of Chatham, Mr. L. P. Steadwell, of Cornwall, and Mr. R. Blake Irwin of Niagara Falls, all men who have wide, practical experience of this Act, and they have gone into it fairly thoroughly and agreed that the changes are commendable.

None of them is drastic. One of them is to emphasize that only drainage schemes being done under The Municipal Drainage Act, for which an engineer's or surveyor's report has been obtained, will be accepted for consideration of a grant.

We have defined the word "Minister," who is given a share of certain powers under this new Act that were vested solely in the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under the previous Act.

The 1950 Act states that the Act shall apply to the construction, improvement and reconstruction of drainage works, but left out major repairs. Instead of adding "repairs" it is considered better to leave the class of work open, so that it will be all-inclusive.

Since the removal of the \$5,000 cost minimum in 1950, "branch" drains can be submitted for aid on their own merits as "trunk" drains in their own individual drainage areas. This would multiply administration work greatly. It is considered wise to remove the "branch" requirement, and accept the complete drainage system, which may contain one or more branches, in one application.

Secondly, this amendment allows a grant to be paid on the agricultural sections of a drainage work that may have a section disallowed because of its use for sanitary or domestic purposes. A drainage work used wholly for storm or sanitary service is still not allowed for consideration of a grant. That has been in force for many years.

Thirdly, where grants are payable, under any other Act, towards a portion or the whole of a drainage work, the Public Works Department will pay the grant on the whole of the cost of the drainage project and then an adjustment will be made of the grants payable under the other Act when the statements of the municipalities are checked each year.

The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, was that the Department of Works did not have the facilities, and most of these other grants are made by the Department of Highways.

Coming to section 4, which was section 3 of the former Act: the experience in administering the Act during the past 4 years shows the municipalities find it very difficult to have the petition forwarded before passing the by-law for undertaking the work. The 3-months' grace will greatly assist the municipalities, especially during periods of great drainage activity, such as at the present time.

Some municipalities feel they should not be required to supply information

setting forth the reasons why the whole cost of the work should not be assessed upon the land which would be liable to assessment therefor under The Municipal Drainage Act, and that it should, therefore, be granted as required under the 1950 Act.

They consider that grants should apply without a "means test." This section of the 1950 Act is, therefore, deleted.

The new Act directs that petitions be forwarded to the hon. Minister, rather than to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This will remove a considerable burden of incoming correspondence from the office of the Clerk of the Executive Council.

It is considered proper that the engineer or surveyor should be required to differentiate, on the plan and in his report, between sections of drainage work which are to be used for agricultural or sanitary purposes, which will tie in with section 2 (2).

To make provision for emergency work to be eligible for a grant, where it is impossible to obtain an engineer's report and to forward the petition for aid before the commencement of the work. That, Mr. Speaker, is for emergency work only. This is the only condition under which the municipalities will be able to submit a petition, after commencing the work, but they must notify the Department of Public Works of their intention to submit a petition, within 10 days of the commencement of the emergency work.

Section 5 substitutes the "Minister" for the "Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council." Also some slight re-wording for simplification.

"To give the Minister power to pay grants not exceeding \$5,000." This would greatly relieve the Cabinet Council of the burden of a large number of Orders-in-Council regarding grants towards the cost of drainage works. This amendment will allow about 98 per cent. of the grants to be authorized by the Minister.

(a) No change.

(b) No change.

A few words are added in section 3 to simplify the meaning.

Section 6 authorizes the hon. Minister to pay grants not exceeding \$5,000 for the same reasons as stated in section 5(2), to bring them both into uniformity.

MR. CHARLES E. JANES (Lambton East): I would like to express the thanks of our municipality to the government for bringing in these amendments to The Drainage Act. This Act is a very fine piece of legislation. It has been especially beneficial to the farmers of our section of the province. It has been rather difficult during the last number of years to get the work done, to get our applications to the hon.

Minister in time, and get them back without too much delay. At the present time, I think we have about 25 applications which have been sent to the Department of Public Works for various reasons, particularly, reasons which section 4 will clear up, which are at present being delayed for months before they are returned.

I do want to express the thanks of our municipalities to the hon. Minister for these amendments.

Motion agreed to.

THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT, 1954

HON. MR. CHALLIES moves second reading of Bill No. 79, "The Provincial Parks Act, 1954."

He said: On the introduction of the bill, I went into a rather lengthy description of the purpose of the bill, and I think it is hardly necessary to re-state the principles of the new bill.

It is a bill, which I am sure will meet with the approval of all hon. members of the Legislature. Its purpose, to state it very simply, is to provide better and more parks for the Province of Ontario.

Because of the social and economic strides the province is making, there are more people who have more leisure time and more finances to enjoy themselves out-of-doors in the summer months. There are a great many people, who, for various reasons, do not feel they can own a cottage on a lake, and who like to move around from one place to another, and see different parts of the province.

We have a beautiful province, and I think a good motto for the Department of Travel and Publicity would be "Ontario people to see Ontario."

There are a great many week-end trips which our people can take in the Province of Ontario, and they would be agreeably surprised at the scenery. The main idea is to provide places to which families can go by car, for as many hours as they like, some out-of-the-way place, where they can build a fire for cooking a meal, and enjoy the swimming and the out-of-doors atmosphere.

This will not only be of great value to the people, from an educational point of view, but from a health point of view as well.

As I have said, the purpose of the Act is to provide more and better parks for our people in the Province of Ontario. The Act has not been revised for some years, and this bill is a compilation of a number of Acts and enactments.

Firstly, it deals with the larger parks, such as Algonquin, Quetico, Timagami, and others belonging to the Department of Lands and Forests. Part 1 of the bill definitely states that these shall remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Forests.

However, it does contain a new provision, not in any other Act, which provides that, in the wisdom of the government, any of these parks which are now under the Department of Lands and Forests may be transferred to another jurisdiction.

Part 1 provides that these parks, now called "Provincial Parks" shall remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Forests until such time as they may be transferred to another department, and makes provision for Presqu'île Park and Long Point Park to be brought under parts 2 and 3 of the Act. Further, by Order-in-Council, any new park can be placed under parts 2 or 3. If the government in its wisdom wishes to set aside any park, such as Algonquin park, naturally, it can do so without a special Act. Part 1, as I have stated, is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Forests.

Part 2 provides for a commission form of administration for each park designated as being under the control and management of the hon. Minister, and which shall be under the charge of a commission to be appointed by the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council and composed of such number of persons as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may determine.

It provides for the appointment of a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, etc. for the collection of revenue. This would

apply to any park from which revenue would accrue, such as Presqu'île. Part 2 also provides that there shall be an approved audit. The audit shall be made yearly, and a yearly report shall also be made to the Provincial Secretary, which shall be placed on the table of the House.

It also provides for parks, such as Presqu'île where there is a combination of open space, and very excellent bathing beaches, a section of which may be set aside for summer cottages on a rental basis. The purpose of the bill which, I think, represents the policy of the government, provides that any further leases of lands in these parks, when new parks are set aside, must be cautiously leased, and only for a short period of time, because, after all, it is very difficult in a park to combine the ownership of the lease on a piece of property, without the party who sold the lease feeling he has a primary right to a fair share of all the rest of it. This applies to areas where there is a large amount of space for both classes of visitors to the park.

In part 2, the duties and rights, and what can be done, by the passing of a by-law, is set out, providing for the laying out, improving, developing and enclosing parks, the construction of buildings, wharves and so on. The operating on public lands of dressing rooms, bathing facilities, cooking facilities and so on; the construction and operation of public picnic grounds, the acquisition of boats, vessels, motor vehicles and everything else which could be done in a rather large-sized park, can be done under this bill. As I have said, the commission has the right and is authorized to act, almost as a council in a municipality, for looking after the highways.

Part 3 deals with smaller parks where there are not so many administrative duties to be carried out, and there may not be the same number of cottages, and so forth. Under part 3, they could be administered by a superintendent, or by some other official, call him what you like.

That gives you the 3 different types of parks in the province.

Then there is the general part of the bill, part 4, which gives you a general outline of what can be done regarding enquiring into leases, and so on. The hon. Minister is to decide that right. Cancellation of a lease may be desirable at some time, in certain parks. This also provides for acquiring possession, and this bill also provides, for the first time, that the hon. Minister may purchase or expropriate land for park purposes.

The question of fish and game is covered. Fish and game regulations now under the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests of the Fish and Game Division, and the laws in any parks are to be the same as the general laws for the rest of the province, so far as fish and game are concerned.

MR. NIXON: You should bring yourself up-to-date. That is now "Fish and Wildlife."

HON. MR. CHALLIES: It is called "The Fish and Game Act," nevertheless. The Fish and Game Act shall apply to the entire province.

I think that covers the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a bill in which we should prepare now for what may be required by our people many years in the future. We should congratulate the municipality of North York for purchasing a farm bordering on Lake Simcoe. In talking to the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie), he said, even now they have begun to realize it is getting too small. Although there is considerable mileage along the shore line of Lake Simcoe, it is regrettable that on a large lake such as that, the general public can only use a small fraction of the shore line for their public enjoyment.

The more we have of these parks in the province, the happier our people will be, and I think they will have a greater appreciation of our great province.

MR. JANES: I would like to say a word about parks. I think this is one of the finest pieces of legislation we have had in years, and one that has been needed for a long time.

I might say, parks have been a "baby" of mine for some years. When I was

first elected to this House, I found it was necessary for me to look after a park called "Ipperwash Park."

It was in a very bad state of repair, and had been badly neglected. The result was I started to make a nuisance of myself in the Department of Lands and Forests, but the former hon. Minister turned out to be a very good friend, and was kind to Ipperwash Park.

I also want to extend my thanks to Mr. Cram, who has gone, for his support.

I can well remember when I started coming down and telling the department about Ipperwash, and what it needed, I was laughed at. I know they did not believe what I was telling them. Finally I asked Mr. Cram to come up and I would show him the conditions.

The day he came up there happened to be a very nice day, and it was estimated there were over 40,000 people there.

This is a very small park and we are very lucky to have a very fine beach stretching several miles each way from the park and because of that we can accommodate a large crowd.

Lake Huron is one of our finest lakes for bathing because of its long length and the north wind brings in the warm water, at the surface, and we nearly always have warm water there.

After Mr. Cram saw the crowd he came back and said: "I will support you in anything you want"—which was quite a big order.

Then, I found there was another division to which I had to go, at St. William, where Mr. Newman was forester in that area. Still hoping to get things through, I went to see Mr. Newman and said: "Frank, how long has it been since you were at Ipperwash?" and he said, "Oh, about 20 years." I asked him to come up on Sunday. He said, "all right, I will be there."

I met him there and drove him all around the park, and showed him the people who were up there holidaying. When he was leaving, he said: "I must confess to you, I didn't believe you, but I know now you were not exaggerating

in any way. You have over 40,000 people there today." The result was I was able to get quite a number of things done for Ipperwash Park.

We have had many compliments paid to the government and the province for the condition the park is in today.

We are situated in an area where at one time we had quite a few private parks operating, but they are all closed but one. We are near an area containing a large population, and are fortunate in that we have a very fine bath-house.

We keep a book there in which we ask people to sign their names. These names fan out over an area including Goderich, Waterloo, Kitchener, Brantford, Hamilton and down through Windsor, Detroit, Port Huron and all intervening points.

It has been my ambition to have some place to which any garage operator, farmer or labourer can take his wife and family, to the lakeshore, and unless we soon take action the government is now contemplating, it will be too late.

There is another very fine area in my riding, known as the "Pinery," mentioned in this House many times. It lies about 9 miles from Ipperwash Park. It has a very fine beach, and an area of 4,000 acres. Most of this area must be retained as bushland because it is covered with sand and sand dunes sometimes as high as 125 feet.

Directly adjacent to this area we have what used to be called the "flood lands," now called "bog land." It is some of the highest-priced land in Ontario, and very productive. At any time, if this land gets into private hands and they strip the timber off, our foresters tell us—and I am sure they are right—the sand would move across this very valuable land, so, it must be kept under forest cover.

We can use the beach—and a very fine beach it is—as a playground for the people of Ontario, and I hope action will be taken very soon by the government to take over this area.

There are two other matters I would like to mention. I am a little disappointed with the bill, in one sense; it does not say that parks shall pay taxes.

I feel that can create a real hardship. In one important township, with an Indian name, they have the Ipperwash Military Camp, Ipperwash Park and a large Indian reserve and they have a large Boy Scout area, all exempt from taxation, which creates a real hardship for the people in that area, and to come in and take over the Pinery and make it tax exempt would create further hardship. They now get between \$4,000 and \$5,000 in taxes from that area, and to deprive them of that money is going to create a further hardship for these people.

As hon. members know, I always flare up when they talk about "tax exemptions". I believe every building, no matter what it is, and every piece of property should pay taxes. Also, I think parks should be self-supporting, and I am sure they will be, if a slight charge is made—it need not be very much—for people using the parks.

If you cross this country and enter a federal park, you pay an admission fee of \$2, which will take you into any federal park.

If we are going to have a line of provincial parks—and, as I have said before, it is one of the smartest moves we have made in years—there should be a charge at the first park entered, which will cover all the parks. If a charge is made, the parks can be taxed.

When the department takes over land for reforestation, they pay taxes on that land.

I have had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of being a member of the Ausable Authority, and have been chairman of the Parks Board for several years. If the government had not taken action, we were going to take over the Pinery. We had not the slightest idea where we would find the money, but we would have borrowed it somewhere, and I am sure it would have paid its way.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take any more time, except to say how happy I am at the action taken by the government. I will add just one more word, that I hope none of the parks will ever become a Coney Island.

MR. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on the parks question. We have some very beautiful parks in our section of the country, one in particular, Sibley Peninsula, being reached by a road some 30 miles long, through a very beautiful area, going to Silver Islet, on Lake Superior. We have many smaller parks, all of which are a great asset to our citizens.

Not only are we interested in them, because of their commercial value alone, but we are interested in the great beauty and attractiveness, which wild life and fish bring to our lakes and rivers, our forest areas and our air, our parks' preserves, and all these things.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very good bill indeed, in that it will preserve our parks, and beautify them for the benefit of the people of Ontario. I think the government is to be congratulated on the step it has taken.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the government does not acquaint the House with its plans for the administration of the provincial parks. We learned from the press that the government may create a new Ministry, and may make certain changes in several departments, but I do think, when the House is in session, and we are debating this bill, we should be told how it will be administered, whether by this or the other department. Normally, it would be taken for granted that the Department of Lands and Forests would be charged with the administration of this bill, indeed, it should have been introduced by the hon. Minister of that Department. However, that was not done, and ever since the bill was introduced, there has been speculation in the press as to the Ministerial responsibility for it, and speculation as to the intention of the government.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, it would be far more appropriate for the government to tell the hon. members of this House what its intentions are, rather than having us learn what little we

know from speculations appearing in the press.

After all, we are not between sessions when this is taking place, and there is such a thing as responsibility to the House.

I do not want to read to the government such a statement as was made by Mr. Diefenbaker to the Liberal Government at Ottawa about "ignoring the House," "governing by Cabinet," and so on, but this is not an unimportant matter, and I do not see why we should be kept in the dark about it.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. member for St. Andrew, and to the other hon. members of the House, that consideration has not been given to a final point in connection with this bill.

I think it will be apparent that the situation shows it involves at the present time, three departments, the Department of Lands and Forests, with such parks as Algonquin Park; to an extent, the Department of Municipal Affairs in connection with some of the smaller parks at Rondeau and Presqu'île, and others, and the Department of Highways in relation to the roadside parks. There is also the Department of Planning and Development which is involved to some extent in this matter.

I may assure the hon. members that very careful consideration will be given to this. I have some hesitation in mentioning any of the larger departments, such as the Department of Planning and Development, and further adding a burden to that very busy department, concerned with matters of very great importance, as this is.

I am not overlooking the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) who introduced this bill, and who is very greatly interested in parks.

MR. SALSBERG: He would not let you overlook him.

HON. MR. FROST: These matters will all be given careful consideration.

MR. SALSBERG: Is it correct to conclude that a new department will be established?

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no, there is no suggestion of a new department.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister has not that under consideration?

HON. MR. FROST: No. I would like to make that plain, Mr. Speaker. The question by the hon. member for St. Andrew implies the setting up of a new department. To that, I would say emphatically "no."

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) for bringing in this bill. I certainly agree it is a very forward step, and offers great opportunities for a great deal to be done in the park situation throughout the Province of Ontario. I particularly have in mind that some of these parks could be developed, even in the northern areas around some of the larger centres, although there are great spaces available there for recreation now, but there may not be in years to come, and this will afford an opportunity to provide for the future.

Speaking of the Metropolitan Toronto area; I would like to offer a suggestion for the consideration of the hon. Minister, which has to do with the Zoological and Botanical Gardens. We have had a great deal of discussion about it in the City of Toronto as the facilities are totally inadequate, and a proper Zoological and Botanical Garden would provide amusement and recreation for people from all over the province, and it seems to me this new legislation might be enlarged or be programmed in such a way that something could be done to assist in establishing this much-needed Zoological and Botanical Garden on the outskirts of the Metropolitan Area of Toronto.

I had the pleasure, while a member of the City Council, of serving on a special committee set up to study this matter. Although we still have Riverdale Zoo in Toronto, it is totally inadequate to meet the needs of the people, so I am offering the suggestion to the hon. Minister that when consider-

ing parks for the Province of Ontario, it might be a splendid idea to consider something along the type I have mentioned for the outskirts of this city, which would serve a great need, and care for many thousands of tourists from the other sections of Ontario.

I think it is a wonderful bill.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to say a word about this bill. I said in the House last year that in Essex County, we had a real shortage of public beaches, and those we already have are municipally-controlled and owned, and present quite a problem to these municipalities.

I thought, when the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) rose to his feet, he might try to say a word or two for the "little people," which seems to be his habit, but he got away from that in connection with this bill, and was simply trying to "needle" the government.

MR. SALSBERG: The little people can "needle" the government, too.

MR. MURDOCH: It is a fact that a great many of our public parks are close to centres with large populations. I appreciate having the Point Pelee National Park in Essex County, which serves a good purpose, and attracts many thousands of people every year.

I would like to offer the suggestion that perhaps when we get a little farther into the park situation, we might go one more step and do something to help these municipalities to maintain public beaches on our lake shores, for other people to enjoy, that is, people from other municipalities.

I know that in Essex County people come from Detroit and Windsor to these municipal beaches at Leamington, Kingsville, and Colchester South, and almost crowd out the taxpayers of the municipalities, and it would appear to me that some consideration should be given to studying this question, and making some form of grants available to such municipalities, because, after all, it is a provincial problem, rather than that of a municipality.

MR. A. T. WARD (Kent East) : Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in these parks, because we have one of the greatest parks in Ontario situated in my own riding. We have a park there of 5,000 acres, on one of the best fishing bays in the southwestern part of Ontario, and, like many other places we have many American tourists, even from as far away as Texas—although I think we get them from every state of the union—who have cottages there. I refer to Rondeau Provincial Park.

I am quite in sympathy with this bill. I think it is one of the greatest bills which have been brought up in the Legislature, in regard to parks for some time. I am very much in favour of it, I think we are on the right track and I think also that such parks should be made to pay their own way at least, which Rondeau has not been doing.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite in accord with this bill, and I hope to see such proposals continue so that parks may be brought to the forefront, where, I think, they belong.

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West) : Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all very much pleased at this particular piece of legislation which we are discussing at this time. When one thinks of parks, one immediately associates with that term recreation and the benefits which it will provide to the citizens of this province.

In the County of York, as was mentioned a few moments ago, we have one of the largest parks in this section of the province, which was purchased by the County of York in 1950, and consists of approximately 500 acres of land on the shore of Lake Simcoe. This park site is for all practical purposes the last of the large acreages which are available for park purposes, and, as I have indicated, was purchased by the County of York in 1950, which was prior to the introduction of the Metropolitan Toronto Act.

At that time the County of York consisted of 26 municipalities which included 12 of those municipalities which are now part of Metropolitan Toronto.

It was felt by those in the County of York at that time, that this was a most desirable purchase for a park site and very desirable for the citizens of York County. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made this suggestion before, and I make it again, because I think it is a very practical one. I consider that it would be a step forward if that park were to be purchased by the Provincial Government from the County of York and made a provincial park, rather than a county park as it now is.

The reasons for that are multiple. In the first instance, the investment is very substantial, but inasmuch as the County of York as it is presently constituted is somewhat less in municipal numbers than it was in 1950, it has been suggested that the present County of York may have difficulty in developing the park to the extent and as quickly as it was originally intended.

The park, as I say, consists of some 500 acres on the south shore of Lake Simcoe, beautiful land, sandy beaches, with some buildings; it has all the potentialities which any park site could develop or anyone could hope to see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of hon. members of this House that we have, within a 40-mile radius of the City of Toronto, a park site which can very adequately service not only the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto, but also the citizens of the Province of Ontario.

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron) : Mr. Speaker, it is evident this bill is finding much favour amongst hon. members of this House. So many have had something to say about it, because it affects so many people.

We in Huron County do not have any great stretch of land available for park purposes. The only one which we have, and in which we are interested, is the one to which the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Janes) referred, "The Pinery," which is of vital importance to all the people of Western Ontario.

The hon. member for Lambton East as a member of the Ausable Authority said it was the intention of that authority

to take this piece of land over if there was no action taken by the government. In my opinion that was a very large project, possibly too large for the Ausable Authority to handle themselves, and I hope something will be done to take this into the provincial parks system as is now provided for in this bill.

I am pleased to have this opportunity of saying something in favour of the measure that is before the House.

There is only one other small public park available in Huron County. All the land on the lake shore is privately owned with the exception of one small park in the village of Bayfield. That property was taken over and preserved for public use by a small group in that village, who put on events of one kind and another to raise money in order to preserve that little piece of lake front for public use. That is another thing, although it may be very small, yet when this bill becomes law I hope something will be done to help people of that kind, who are trying to preserve small pieces of land in a lake front for public use.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word about this subject. All references have been in connection with Southern and Central Ontario. No person has said a word about Eastern Ontario.

I should like to mention something about Eastern Ontario and about Renfrew County in particular. In the centre of the Ottawa River just below Pembroke, is an island, 684 acres in extent. A bridge from Quebec is going to touch that island this year, and it will be a most beautiful location for a park, right in the centre of the Ottawa River.

Some time when hon. members are in that district, we should be glad to take them on a little drive and show them some of the beauty spots we have.

Since we are on the subject of parks, and no person mentioned Eastern Ontario and in view of the fact that the representatives from Renfrew are not in their seats today, I thought I would take the opportunity of saying that we

should not overlook this great old part of Ontario, by the Ottawa River.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

HON. CHARLES DALEY moves second reading of Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I made a brief explanation of the contents of this bill on introducing it at first reading, but I think a little further explanation at this time would be in order.

The first section increases from \$100,000 to \$200,000 the amount which the board may spend in any calendar year for rehabilitation. That is quite an important feature of the Workmen's Compensation Act, it has to do with finding suitable employment for the injured workmen, in keeping with the nature of his disability, jobs of like work or sometimes entirely different kinds of work from that which he has been formerly doing. It has been found that \$100,000 is not sufficient, as of today, to do the job we want to do in this connection.

This does not include the cost of operating the Malton Rehabilitation Centre. At this point I should like to advise you, Mr. Speaker, and through you the hon. members of the Legislature, what we contemplate for Malton.

Some years ago, when the Malton Clinic was established, we purchased the buildings from the federal government. We could not purchase the land, as it was not available, as it was supposed to be reserved for any increase in airport facilities, or any activity the federal government, who own it, might deem desirable. However, they did sell us the buildings, which were of a temporary nature, being built for war purposes, and as such not being of a kind which tends to make maintenance easy.

We now have some 540 people in this centre being cared for, who have

been brought from all parts of the province, housed, fed and given what we think is the very finest treatment available to anyone, in an endeavour not only to heal their injuries, but to improve their morale and bring them back where they would be capable of taking their normal place in society. That I believe is a very important work. We have had tremendous assistance from the medical profession. In addition to our own staff we have had the advice of the most eminent practical people, in connection with the injuries of these people. While we started out a few years ago in the temporary buildings on more or less of a "trial-and-error" basis, it has proven itself to be of inestimable value. Mr. Speaker, to the injured people of this province. As a result we are confronted now with huge expenditures in connection with maintaining these buildings. The foundations are not adequate, and it will be readily understood that with 540 injured people, and all the necessary staff required, it is quite a big institution.

Therefore we are looking for a property on which to build a permanent and more suitable rehabilitation centre. We have looked at a piece of property which we believe would be very adequate and suitable, located to the rear of Sunnybrook Hospital. There is a big area of land there, with some buildings on it which are now occupied by some part of the army. I went to Ottawa and interviewed hon. Mr. Lapointe, and hon. Mr. Gregg, in an endeavour to get them to assist us to acquire this property, as a great deal of our work is actually connected with Sunnybrook Hospital, in that every day we transport patients from the Malton Centre to Sunnybrook and back, so this projected site would make an ideal location.

I thought it might be of interest to the House to know that the Rehabilitation Centre at Malton, which I presume most hon. members of the Legislature have seen—and if they have not, I suggest it would be worthwhile to visit it—has proved to be a successful venture, after some years. It is now inadequate, and we are going to have to build

on a new location, at a cost which we estimate to be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3 million or \$4 million. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this money comes from the compensation assessment. It does not cost the public any money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The money is derived from assessments of industry, and, as a matter of fact, we have the money and I am very anxious to move along with the project, as I feel if we come to—which I do not think at the moment we are in any sense of the word—a period of recession or levelling out, about which I will have a little more to say later, this might be a very excellent time to get on with this project and I do hope the federal authorities, the department of National Defence, and those who have control of this property, will seriously consider letting us have it for this purpose.

The second section of the bill is a very simple one. It provides that when the secretary of the board is absent for any reason, the board may appoint some other officer to certify copies of, or extracts from the board's books. That is really an internal proposition, and while necessary, is not shattering any principles.

However, sections 3 and 4 are quite important, inasmuch as they serve to clarify the position the board is in, in connection with penalizing through their pockets, industry which has shown itself lackadaisical, or has not attempted to provide protection from accidents by good housekeeping, and safety measures, which are advocated by our Factory Inspection Branch, and by our accident-prevention inspectors.

People who neglect to do the things they actually are required to do in the interest of the worker, can be penalized in this way. There is a class set up of a certain group of employers who are in the same category, and who have approximately the same amount of hazard in industry, and in this class there is a fixed assessment. Under this bill, the board will be able to say to an industry: "Your accidents are occurring at a high rate. You have been in a class which

sets your assessment at so much, but your record of accidents has been at a higher rate." This does not mean over a year or two, because anyone may have a little bad luck, they may go along for quite some time without an accident, and, all of a sudden, have 3 or 4. I do not refer to that type. I am referring to cases where it is generally known to the board and the accident-prevention people that carelessness is rampant, and that little or no heed is being paid to active participation in preventive measures. In such cases, the board may penalize that industry by assessing its members at a much higher rate.

I think that explains the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): If hon. members wish to applaud the hon. Minister (Hon. Mr. Daley), I shall wait a minute.

Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the bill, I would like to make a few comments. First I want to protest, as strongly as I can, against the policy of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) of refusing to bring such bills to the Standing Committee on Labour. I cannot understand it, and I, for one, will never condone it. There is no earthly reason why legislation of this sort should not be presented at the Committee on Labour and all interested parties be given an opportunity to express an opinion. That is what that Standing Committee is supposed to do, and it seems to me to be an evasion of responsibility and duty, to dodge this elementary process which is adhered to, I should say, by all other hon. Ministers and all other departments, and employed with respect to measures which are far less important than labour legislation of the sort we have before us.

I want to appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) to see that an end be put to this practice of having a Standing Committee on Labour which meets once in 3 or 4 years—whole sessions are allowed to go by without a meeting being called—even though we have labour legislation with which to deal. I do not know why the hon.

Minister (Mr. Daley) continues to be afraid to face the committee or to face the deputations of organized labour who might care to appear before the committee in dealing with this legislation.

The second remark I want to make is about an aspect of the work of the Workmen's Compensation Board which we may not have another chance to discuss again this session. I do not know whether there will be other legislation, and only the Estimates may give us an opportunity to speak about it, but this bill deals in part with the treatment of working men who have met with accidents. There is of course no objection to the amendment brought in to increase the amount of money the board may employ to treat those who need special help to recuperate and become useful again, that is, to be rehabilitated. I suggest, however, that the biggest offence of the whole scheme—and it is an offence for which the government rather than the board is responsible—is the failure to implement the recommendation of the Royal Commission for the complete changing of accident-prevention work as now carried on. It is known—and if not, it should be made known to every hon. member in this House—that the organized workers have for years been protesting against the present method.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg)? I have presented here a bill of which 3 or 4 sections have to do with policy, and, therefore, there is no point, as I believe I explained, in taking it before the Committee on Labour.

MR. SALSBERG: It will be?

HON. MR. DALEY: No, I say I do not think there is any point in doing so. It is very definite and I do not see where there is anything to be gained.

The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has introduced another matter, that of accident prevention. It would seem to me there will be a time for that, and I would be very happy to discuss the matter then, but I do not think it should be done now, in connection with this bill. In my opinion it is not in order.

MR. SALSBERG: I stated before that I do not think there will be another opportunity. If the hon. Minister tells me that there will be, I am quite willing to have a full-dress discussion on this matter at any time.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has full latitude in the budget debate to speak on anything. The discussion is wide open, as was the debate on the Speech from the Throne, but the matter he is mentioning is not relative to this.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister does not realize how many matters I want to speak on during the budget debate. I would seek your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this is in order or not.

MR. SPEAKER: If this is an entirely irrelevant matter, as the hon. Minister has explained, it is naturally out of order. It is not, of course, the hon. member's concern whether other legislation will come before the House which would give him an opportunity to discuss this question, but there is the budget debate ahead of us and I think the hon. member will have ample opportunity to speak then on any subject he may choose. Ample opportunity is given for the discussion of any part of the Estimates. I must ask the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) to confine himself to the bill.

MR. SALSBERG: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But since this deals with the result of accidents, I thought I might be able to deal with accident prevention.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not making any exception to my ruling. The hon. member must confine himself to it.

MR. SALSBERG: Very well.

MR. LEAVINE (Waterloo North): As one who, in the main, is behind the compensation provisions, which I consider desirable, I find myself as a loss how to explain that section which includes the words:

Where in the opinion of the board sufficient precautions have not been taken,

That means that industry will get a little slap on the wrist if it creates a hazard. If it allows an individual to be hurt or even killed, the authorities say: "Your assessment goes up."

I must admit I cannot support this, because it seems to me only fair that the board should have the right to step in and say: "You repair this, you correct your omission and we will bill you with the cost."

That is my feeling, and that is the form in which I will support this.

HON. MR. DALEY: We could have a full discussion on this during the committee stage. I would suggest the hon. member (Mr. Leavine) discuss that particular item in committee when an appropriate amendment could be put in to change it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CEMETERIES ACT

The House resumed consideration of the report of the Select Committee on the Cemeteries Act.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): I am grateful, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity which has been afforded me of speaking on this subject. I am aware of the great ability and affability of my learned colleagues who sat as members of this Cemetery Committee, and I have a tremendously high regard for them. In addition to this, the report was unanimous, this therefore makes it difficult for any hon. member, and particularly for myself, to offer observations in relation to it.

Nevertheless, I would feel I had not executed the responsibility I undertook when I became a member of this House if I did not make one or two comments in relation to the report for the consideration of the government and of the committee, if and when legislation is undertaken.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, in regard to item III (II), which recommends that

the organizations which maintain cemeteries should be limited in the number of salesmen they may employ at any one time. I recognize that the operation of a cemetery is in a special category, because there is the composite requirement which it must fulfill. It must meet the public demand and the public need, but at the same time some consideration should be given to some of the precepts upon which our country operates, namely, certain degrees of freedom of trade. Public need must be satisfied, and, at the same time, some freedom must be given to the industry itself.

Bearing that in mind, the first recommendation of the Cemeteries' Committee to which I would like to refer is the recommendation that there should be a limitation of the number of salesmen who may be employed at any one time by a particular cemetery. I appreciate the purpose the committee had in mind. I believe the committee felt that by limiting the number of salesmen it could reduce the pressure which salesmen might exert on behalf of some of these cemeteries.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we must strike a balance between public need and the need of the industry. In doing this we should keep in mind some of the inherent characteristics for which our Party has stood for more than 100 years since the 1840s. It should not be forgotten that we, above all Parties in Canada, have stood for the protection of the individual, and for his right, under the hand of God and of society, to follow his own interests having regard to the safety and protection of the public.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has not done that. The CCF has not done that. Our Party has. The question is whether several of the recommendations contained in this report encroach upon those principles. I humbly and respectfully submit, unless there is some great need for limiting the number of salesmen who may be employed by the institutions, consideration should be given to the desirability of this particular section.

There is a second section to which I

desire to make reference. The committee recommends that if a purchaser is solicited, and has not personally viewed a plot before entering into an agreement to purchase it, all monies paid by the purchaser must be refunded on the purchaser's request in writing within 60 days of entering the agreement to purchase, and the contract shall be considered null and void.

With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I question whether the 60-day period is not, perhaps, too long. I also wonder whether it is desirable.

I realize, again, that the section has been put in so as to limit pressure salesmanship. Whether any other industry or public service has to operate under similar rules, I do not know. But I would ask the government and members of the committee to consider the desirability of including this particular recommendation in any legislation which might flow from this report. It is surely incumbent on the purchaser of a cemetery plot to pay some attention to the object of his purchase, particularly when he is purchasing something as sacred as a resting place for himself or for members of his family.

I do not think these things should be bought lightly, in the same way as trinkets for children are obtained by sending in bottle tops. And I do not think such a recommendation is consistent with the sound planning of cemeteries. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not own a cemetery and have no connection with anyone who owns cemeteries; I am more interested in the principles of my Party than I am in cemeteries as such. I approach these recommendations not so much to consider their effect upon cemeteries as to see how they affect the principles which are inherent in the very existence of the Party which forms this government. I say again, I question whether the 60-day period should be included in the legislation, or whether it should be as long, if a period has to be allowed.

There are two other recommendations which I wish to draw to the attention of the House. One of the big problems of operating a cemetery, as I understand

it, is the tremendous capital outlay at the start. There is land to purchase. Before plots can be sold there has to be an extensive amount of surveying done. Roads must be driven through the property, a certain amount of sculptural decoration is required, and extensive drainage may have to be undertaken, all of which costs a great deal of money.

Nevertheless, the next recommendation, number 3, subsection (5), says in effect:

That in the event of any purchaser buying a plot, that purchaser may always get back his money so long as the cemetery has not been sold out 95 per cent. In those circumstances the purchaser can get back all of his money with the exception of certain administrative expenses.

I cannot myself see how a cemetery, which is required to undertake the tremendous capital investment necessary for its organization, can put any money into capital investment if it must, at the same time, accept that, at any time, a purchaser to whom a plot has been sold can obtain his money back.

The recommendation states that a purchaser should be able to recover anything he has paid less administrative costs. If the cemetery has spent money on capital improvements those cannot be called administrative costs. I submit that, notwithstanding a cemetery may have paid out money on capital improvements, the administrative costs provision would not permit retention of these payments.

The last point to which I want to make reference is with the necessity of placing 35 per cent. of the payments into a perpetual care fund. With great respect to the hon. members who sat on this committee, I think the government and the House should consider carefully whether this proportion of 35 per cent. is not rather high. If 35 per cent. of these payments has to be placed in a perpetual care fund, and if, at the same time, there is to be an obligation to return all the money paid in, save for a sum which may be retained for administrative expenses, I question whether the

effect of this in practice will be in the interests either of these institutions, or of the public itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion, that one of the great arguments of our Party—and I hope it will remain so—is there should be a limitation upon Ministerial discretion. We have asked for that on a national scale, and I think it is also applicable wherever it may apply provincially. Several of these recommendations. I feel, emphasize perhaps unnecessarily or extensively Ministerial discretion. The only question is as to the thinness of the line between its desirability and its lack of desirability.

I have submitted these observations, not thinking of whether they were popular or unpopular, but merely because they were the observations of a young man who feels strongly his responsibility in this House, regardless of how that responsibility may appear to the public to have been shouldered. I would have deceived my riding and this House, feeling as I do, if I had not taken this stand in regard to this report regardless of whether that stand may find favour in any quarter.

MR. SPEAKER: There being no further speakers on this report, I declare the discussion of the report of the Select Committee on Cemeteries now concluded.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House. In so doing I may say tomorrow we will proceed with the Budget Debate. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), I think are both going to speak on this matter. It will be a hard day for the government.

At the conclusion of their addresses if there is time—and I by no means would suggest they limit their addresses, because what they both say is always well worthwhile—I should like to deal with Estimates, that is, the Estimates for next year, and the supplementary Estimates to the end of this fiscal year,

which should be the first Estimates to be dealt with.

I should like the House to be prepared to consider the Estimates in the order in which they appear in the printed Estimates. I have asked all the hon. Ministers to be ready to go ahead without further notice in connection with these matters, and we will deal with the Estimates as we have the opportunity.

May I say that on Wednesday, of course, the House will not sit in the afternoon, but the committees can meet in the ordinary course, because they have made arrangements, as they did 10 days

ago under similar circumstances. I just received word that the funeral, instead of being at 2.30, will be held at 3.30 on Wednesday, at the First Presbyterian Church in Brockville. The railway is making arrangements to provide accommodation on the train leaving here at 9.15 a.m., arriving at Brockville at 2.40 p.m., and leaving Brockville at 5.30 p.m., or thereabouts, arriving back in Toronto at 9.45 p.m.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.25 of the clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, March 16, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 16, 1954.

Fifth Report Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Nickle	554
Ontario Fuel Board, bill to establish, introduced by Mr. Porter, first reading	554
Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	558
Municipal Franchises Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	558
Gas Pipe Line Act, 1951, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	558
Those Persons Who Bore or Drill Wells for Water, bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Porter, first reading	558
Petty Trespass Act, introduced by Mr. Porter, first reading	558
Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading	559
Ontario Schools Trustees Councils Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading ..	559
Trench Excavators Protection Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Daley, first reading ..	559
Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, first reading	559
Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, first reading	560
Planning Amendment Act, 1954, bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, first reading	561
Resumption of debate on the Budget Address, Mr. Nixon	562
Report of Committee re Reform Institutions, Mr. Nickle, Mr. Leavine, Mr. Pryde, Mr. Dempsey	574
Motion to adjourn discussion, Mr. Salsberg, agreed to	584
Mental Health Act, 1954, Mr. Phillips, second reading	584
Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, second reading	584
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	584

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the meeting of the Select Committee on Bill No. 88, "An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly," which was arranged for tomorrow, has been cancelled in view of the death of the chairman Mr. MacOdrum.

I wish to welcome on behalf of the hon. members of this Assembly, students from the Bowmore Road School, Toronto, and the Cathedral High School, Hamilton. I can assure you, it is always a distinct pleasure for us to have students from various parts of the province visiting us during one of our sessions. We hope that you will thoroughly enjoy your visit to our Assembly this afternoon.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will not rule me out of order at this time, but while you are giving your customary welcome to the school children, who sit in the galleries of the Assembly, may I take this opportunity of welcoming on behalf of the hon. members of this Assembly a representative from the Legislature of Quebec, Mr. Desjardins. It has been our pleasure, Mr. Speaker, at various times to welcome to this Assembly hon. ministers and hon. members from the other provinces of Canada, but I cannot recollect having had the privilege and pleasure of extending our greetings to one from the Prov-

ince of Quebec. However, today, it is my pleasure to welcome the gentleman, who is sitting beneath the clock, an hon. member of the Legislature of Quebec, our sister province, which has been our close partner now for at least 162 years.

As a matter of fact, the Province of Quebec was our partner long before that, but more especially since Canada began to take shape and form through the Constitutional Act of 1791, and since the first legislatures met. Quebec has had its own legislature, which is a successor to the legislature which met in Quebec City in December, 1792. The Legislature of Upper Canada met on the banks of the Niagara River in September, 1792.

It is always a great thing to note the histories of Ontario and Quebec, the old Upper and Lower Canada—and the names of those men of the different periods, who have been closely associated in the development of this country. Some people say, we are divided by the Ottawa River. We are joined by the Ottawa River, Mr. Speaker, as two of the partners in the great confederation project the strength of which is evidence of the success which has been attained in the development of Canada today.

It is a very great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to welcome an hon. member of the Parliament of Quebec to the Parliament of Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): I beg leave to present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Nickle from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the Committee's fifth report as follows:

"Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 7, An Act respecting The Home of the Friendless and Infants' Home.

Bill No. 12, An Act respecting Royal Botanical Gardens.

Your committee would recommend that the following bills be not reported and would further recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted:

Bill No. 8, An Act respecting the Town of Hespeler.

Bill No. 11, An Act respecting the Town of Paris.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting The Home of the Friendless and Infants' Home," and on Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting Royal Botanical Gardens."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO FUEL BOARD ACT

HON. MR. DANA PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, I should like to present a general view of the future fuel requirements of Ontario as a background to the special problems to be dealt with in the bill

itself, and secondly, I propose to outline in a general way some of the problems to be faced in the introduction of Alberta gas to the Central Canada market, and thirdly, I shall outline the terms of the bill.

First, let us look at the growth of consumption of energy of all kinds, coal, oil, water power and natural gas over the last 12 years. With this in mind we may conjecture what an expanding economy will need to support its development in the future. In 1940, with a population of somewhat less than 4 million, Ontario used approximately 500,000 billions of energy units (British Thermal Units). In 1952, with a population approaching 5 million people, we used about 850,000 billions of BTU's. Thus with a population increase of 25 per cent., our increase in energy consumption was in the neighbourhood of 70 per cent. If then we anticipate a continuous population growth on a similar scale from 1952 to 1964, accompanied by a similar industrial expansion, we may expect to use in the year 1964, at least 1,450,000 billions of energy units, or nearly 3 times as much as we did in 1942.

Let us see what this amounts to in terms of coal. In 1952, we used about 22 million tons of coal in Ontario. With the exception of 650,000 tons, this coal was imported, almost entirely from the United States. It represented about one-half of the energy consumed. The balance consisted of petroleum fuel—about 40 per cent., hydro electric power—about 9 per cent., and a quantity of natural gas distributed in Southwestern Ontario, west of Hamilton, Ontario.

In 1940, the amount of coal used was about the same, but it represented more than 65 per cent. of the total energy. The other sources of energy were considerably less. The greatest increase in sources of energy was in petroleum products, which were tripled.

It is apparent, in comparing the quantity of fuel used in 1952 with that of 1940, that with increased hydro electric power and oil, the quantity of coal consumed did not decline. The

hydro electric power and oil supplemented coal which remains still the largest single source of energy. With the further growth of population and the increasing demand for fuel of all kinds, it is expected that coal in the long run will tend to increase in its use rather than diminish. It will be vital to the successful continued industrial and population expansion of Ontario, that provision be made for the introduction of all possible forms of energy. It is therefore essential that this province co-operate in every conceivable way to bring about the transportation and sale of natural gas from Alberta insofar as it can be done on an economic basis.

Central Canada is almost entirely dependent upon the United States for its supply of coal. I may interject that during the war years, when the North American continent faced shortages of coal for wartime industrial expansion, the authorities in the United States saw to it that Canada would have its fair share of the coal supply. We may look back upon this incident as one of the many significant examples of the good-neighbour policy of the United States as applied to this country. We shall, as far as we can foresee, continue to be dependent on the United States for coal and may confidently expect the fair dealing that we have experienced in the past.

Nevertheless, it is undoubtedly in the national interest that we should supplement this source of imported energy to the greatest degree possible with all types of energy such as hydro electric power, oil and natural gas produced within Canada, and the disposition of which we are in a position to control. With respect to hydro electric power, it is obvious that there is a physical limit to the amount of water-power resources within our province, and this limit may soon be reached. Our natural gas resources in Southwestern Ontario have been small in relation to the total amount of energy required. Although there is always the possibility of new developments of natural gas produced in our own province, it is considered unlikely that it will be sufficient to meet the vast expansion that is underway. At the

present time it is insufficient to meet the demands of the southwestern part of the province where its distribution takes place.

Secondly, to touch upon some of the factors involved in the supply of western natural gas to the eastern market. No pipeline has ever been built in the world of the combined length and capacity of the proposed pipeline from Alberta through Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario to Quebec. It will run a distance of more than 2,000 miles. Its capacity must be large if it is to supply a sufficient quantity of gas to justify its existence. It will probably be a line of at least 30 inches in diameter. It will be sufficient to deliver at least 100 billion cubic feet a year and considerably more. To obtain some conception of what the maximum deliverable quantity amounts to in energy, it would be equivalent in BTU's, to between 7 million and 8 million tons of coal. Since a considerable proportion will be delivered to points in the Province of Quebec, the gain to Ontario would be the equivalent of say one-half of this; approximately 4 million tons of coal.

Thirdly, let us turn for a moment to the problems of supply and distribution. The prospects for increasing supplies of natural gas in the western provinces is immense. There appears now to be sufficient reserves of gas that may be allotted to the trans-Canada pipeline to provide for a continuous annual flow of at least 100 billion cubic feet of gas for 20 years. In view of the fact that this is approximately the amount that might be presently available so as to guarantee the continued operation of the line for that period of time, the financing of the enterprise must be figured on this basis. Although we may have confidence that within the next few years, the supplies of gas in Western Canada will continue to increase at a rapid rate, in raising money for a project of this magnitude, the scope of operation must be conditioned to the actual amount of gas presently in sight. However, if there was not reasonable ground for confidence in the future expansion of gas supplies in the west, it would hardly be worthwhile to build this long and costly

line to supply markets in the east for a mere 20-year period.

To indicate the future prospects may I indicate the possibilities in a very simple way. The sedimentary rock formation on the North American continent favourable to the accumulation of oil and gas extends throughout the south of the United States and into the western provinces of Canada far to the north. The general formation is similar; the rate of discovery per footage for drilling is much the same in Canada as the United States. In the United States there is about twice the area of this formation as we have in Canada. In the United States, of course, exploration and development have proceeded over a much longer period and much more extensively than in Canada. There are now 500,000 producing oil and gas wells in the United States. So far, there are only 10,000 in Canada. It is fairly safe to conclude that the present known reserves of gas and oil in Canada are only a small fraction of what ultimately will be found. We may, therefore, anticipate that as the years go by, further supplies of gas will become available for the eastern market as the demand develops and that when necessary the now projected pipeline will be supplemented by increasing and additional piping.

The basic problem of financing and operation of the line will be to deliver gas in Central Canada at a price that will be competitive with coal and oil. The problems of financing must take into account certain essential items; first there is the cost of the gas at the production source. The producers of gas will expect, and will be entitled to an economic price. That means a price which is related to the general level of prices that they may obtain for other outlets in other directions and it should be a price sufficient to encourage further exploration and drilling.

The producer must not only bear the capital and other costs involved in drilling for gas and oil, but also he must be ready to deliver gas of a quality that will meet the conditions of the market. Gas in its natural state in Alberta contains a number of constituent elements,

such as butane, propane and sulphur, and other elements, all of which must be separated from the gas that is to be delivered. This is a further costly project which involves large capital outlay for a plant, and the price to the producer must be sufficient to cover this cost.

Then further, a gathering system will be required to pipe the gas from the source of supply to the trans-Canada pipeline. This will mean a network of smaller pipelines of varying lengths and sizes. It is very roughly estimated that the capital cost of the works required in the Province of Alberta to produce and deliver gas to the main pipeline in a suitable condition may amount to something in the neighbourhood of \$200 million. Thus at the Alberta end the cost of the gas delivered to the pipeline would have to be sufficient to cover these substantial items.

It is estimated that the trans-Canada pipeline itself will cost approximately \$300 million or perhaps more. There will be in addition costs of operation involving the working of machinery for maintaining adequate pressures, inspection, repairs, and the capital cost of the line will have to be depreciated and interest paid. When the gas reaches the points of delivery in Ontario, further expenditure will be required to bring it to the ultimate consumers. If we visualize a number of municipalities that are not served with any form of gas at the present time, providing for the distribution of gas within their borders, a substantial capital investment will be required. Capital investment will also be required to deliver the gas from the main pipeline to many of these municipalities and again further capital expenditure will be involved in changing over systems now distributing manufactured gas to equip them to substitute natural gas therefore. It is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy what this additional capital cost will amount to, but it may not be far from the mark to say that a possible \$200 million will be required in capital investments in Central Canada, that is Ontario and Quebec, for the purpose of local distribution here. Thus the whole project will represent a total investment that may

reach, within the next few years, a total of \$700 million dollars. This does not include the capital outlays that may be involved in other provinces between Alberta and Ontario.

The trans-Canada pipelines, running across the boundaries of several provinces, is a work and undertaking within the legislative jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. It comes within the scope of section 92 (10) (a) of the British North America Act. The Federal Government has decided that the line should be built and operated by a corporation now formed and functioning under an Act of Parliament. The lines that will have to be built in Ontario to connect it may be constructed either by the Trans Canada Company itself as part of its enterprise, or by the utilities that wish to buy the gas. It is not the intention of this government to enter directly into any phase of the distribution of gas. Nevertheless there is need for regulation of many aspects of the distribution.

The bill contains a number of sections which will no doubt be considered in due course. The main purpose of the bill is to provide a comprehensive system of control over the distribution, transmission and storage of gas, and the local franchises which will no doubt be given from time to time to govern the conditions of supply, and rates to be charged to the ultimate consumers.

Provision is made for appeals from certain decisions of the board. I may also mention that the Well Diggers' Act, together with the Fuel Supply Act, the Natural Gas Conservation Act and the Natural Gas Conservation Amendment Act are repealed, and under the provisions of this proposed legislation, are incorporated in this bill. This measure really enlarges and expands the policy which has already been applied, in many respects, to the distribution of natural gas in Southwestern Ontario.

To supplement this bill, a number of other amendments have been made to certain other Acts, such as the Public Utilities Act and the Municipal Franchises Act. It was considered desirable that anything having to do with the control of natural gas should be placed

under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Fuel Board.

The Well Diggers' Act contains certain provisions respecting persons who bore or drill wells for water. It was not considered proper this should be included in this bill, so I propose to introduce a bill which will take over these provisions which have to do with the wells dug for water.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Are there provisions in the bill which bear upon the present production of gas within this province?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, it covers that.

MR. OLIVER: Is the market protected in any way? How are you going to protect the present production of gas within the province?

HON. MR. PORTER: The present situation will be controlled in the same way as it has been in the past, except that the board will be controlling it, as part of its operations.

MR. OLIVER: There will still be a market for all we produce?

HON. MR. PORTER: Oh, yes. It is not anticipated that the importation of Alberta gas will interfere with the market for Ontario gas. It will supplement it. I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) of that.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Will the proposed legislation give the government authority over the proposed pipeline that the Consumers' Gas Company is planning to build in the Province of Ontario?

HON. MR. PORTER: The legislation gives certain powers as to the control of pipelines within Ontario.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member might wait and read the bill.

MR. SALSBERG: I suggest the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) can answer a simple question like that.

HON. MR. PORTER: I would say that is just the same as any other.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Granted, of course, by federal charter.

HON. MR. PORTER: So far as it is inter-provincial. The proposed pipeline, I believe, connects with some pipeline in the United States, and I do not know whether it is in two parts, or is all one. I do not know that at the moment—or whether it is going to be done at all.

MR. SALSBERG: The only thing is whether we will have any control over the construction of this pipeline. Do they need any authority from us?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not imagine they do. As long as it is an inter-provincial pipeline, or an international pipeline, they probably do not. But, as I say, I do not know what is going to be done. I do not think anybody does.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bills I am about to introduce are complementary to the others, as I have explained. I presume all these bills dealing with the gas business should be referred to the gas sub-committee of the Committee on Mining for consideration.

THE MUNICIPAL FRANCHISES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE GAS PIPE LINE ACT, 1951

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Gas Pipe Line Act, 1951."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PERSONS WHO BORE OR DRILL WELLS FOR WATER

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act Respecting Those Persons Who Bore or Drill Wells For Water."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of selling water in grocery stores.

THE PETTY TRESPASS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Petty Trespass Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill, which is of an entirely different nature from the bills which have been introduced, has to do with a situation often arising in certain municipalities, where people park their cars on other people's front lawns and trespass in one way or another, but under the present law there is no effective way of dealing with them.

Every time there is a rugby game in Toronto, there are cars parked up the side streets, on people's front and back lawns, and there is nothing people can do, unless they sue in a civil court for damages, and sometimes the amount involved does not warrant such action.

The Petty Trespass Act is an Act which has been on the Statute Books for years, but it did not go quite far enough to cover this type of trespass. The new provisions now proposed will make it unlawful to park an automobile on private property where notice has been given. If a notice has been posted saying there must be no parking or trespassing, it is provided that the municipality may pass a by-law covering that, and a person will be liable to a fine of not less than \$1.00 or more than \$10.00.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, does that cover the parts of a boulevard, not really private property, but belonging to the municipality?

MR. PORTER: Municipalities can look after their own property, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SALSBERG: I hope so.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Health Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is simply enabling legislation to authorize regulations prescribing arrangements for the care of poliomyelitis patients.

Secondly, the proposed amendment is designed to give legislative authority to the scheme for the care of poliomyelitis sufferers, originally instituted in 1937.

After the second reading of this bill I would like the consent of the House to refer it to the Committee on Health.

THE ONTARIO SCHOOLS TRUSTEES COUNCILS ACT

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Ontario Schools Trustees Councils Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Ontario School Trustees Council is made up of 7 Trustee Organizations, each of which appoint two members to the council. The purpose of this amendment is that these Trustee Organizations, at their first meeting, may appoint not only their representatives, but alternates to their representatives, so they will always be represented, in case of illness or anything else which may occur.

The alternate who is appointed, must be a qualified trustee, and a member of the organization.

It also provides that vacancies, which may occur, can be filled immediately by other appointments.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will go to the Committee on Education.

THE TRENCH EXCAVATORS PROTECTION ACT, 1954

HON. MR. DALEY moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Trench Excavators Protection Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a new bill designed to provide protection for persons working in trenches. It can be recalled by most hon. members, that too often we read of some fatality taking place in a trench or sewer being constructed.

This bill provides that sewers and trenches must be planked and shored in accordance with the standard regulations and provides for an inspection system, to be administered by the municipalities, and in territories without municipal organizations, by inspectors appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. It further prohibits the employment in trenches of persons under 16 years of age.

THE ELEVATORS AND LIFTS ACT, 1953

HON. MR. DALEY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is one bill which is often termed a "tidying up Act." We passed this Elevators and Lifts Act as of last year. We have provided a number of inspectors, and a chief inspector, who are inspecting the elevators of the province, and now find the Act needs amendments, which are of some importance, in connection with administering this Act, as proposed here, and will be explained on second reading.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) whether he intends to send this bill and the previous bill, to the Standing Committee on Labour.

MR. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, is there no limit to the number of times an hon. member can ask the same question?

MR. SALSBERG: That does not answer the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, these are Acts which are pronouncements of government policy, and, in my opinion, should be discussed right here in the House, and I will be quite happy to have that done.

MR. SALSBERG: So was the gas-line bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: I think it is a shameful procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I will have order. The question has been answered.

Orders of the day.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

HON. MR. W. K. WARRENDER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, may I say with respect to sections 1 and 3 in the proposed amendment, although this Act has been administered by the Minister of Planning and Development, the creation of the Authority, and perhaps other matters, have been dealt with by the hon. Minister of Public Works. In other words, a number of applications have come to the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has been forwarding them to the Department of Planning and Development, and we took over from there. This proposed amendment provides that they shall come directly to the Minister of Planning and Development.

Section 2: section 2 of the Act, which now provides that the Act does not apply to any part of Ontario lying

within a territorial district, is repealed so that the Act will in future apply anywhere in Ontario.

Section 4: at present 3 is the maximum number of representatives that a municipality may send to a meeting for the creation of an Authority and the maximum number of members a municipality may appoint to an Authority. Section 3 is amended to authorize 4 representatives and members from a municipality having a population between 100,000 and 250,000 and 5 representatives and members from a municipality having a population of 250,000 or more.

Section 5: a new section (6a) is added to authorize the amalgamation of 2 or more authorities established for 2 or more adjoining watersheds.

This has arisen on several occasions, where Conservation Authorities would like to combine their activities for some common purpose.

In regard to section 6: new provisions are added to section 15 of the Act to give Authorities power to enter into agreements with private landowners to facilitate schemes or projects and to acquire and use lands for recreation purposes.

We think this is desirable, because on many occasions we have not been able to deal with private landowners, and this section will give us the legal power to do so.

Section No. 7: when an Authority has apportioned the benefit of a scheme among the participating municipalities it is required under subsection 1 of section 16 to notify the municipalities and under subsection 2 any dissatisfied municipality may on 10 days' notice to the Authority apply to the Municipal Board for a review of the apportionment. Subsection 2 of section 16 is rewritten to require that the application for review be made within 1 month after the municipality is notified of the apportionment.

We have had some occasions where, after 10 days' notice, nothing has been done by the municipalities at all. This is simply to limit the time within which some action must be taken.

THE PLANNING AMENDMENT ACT, 1954

HON. MR. WARRENDER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Planning Amendment Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are several small amendments here to several sections in the present Act, which I will explain briefly.

Section 1: the present definition of planning area refers only to municipalities. As a planning area may now include territory without municipal organization, the definition is rewritten.

Section 2: the authority to establish subsidiary planning areas is rewritten to provide for such areas consisting of more than one municipality and to provide authority for the Minister to define the functions of the board of a subsidiary planning area.

Section 3: the appointments of members of certain Planning Boards require the approval of the Minister. This amendment ensures that in such cases a member holds office not only until his successor is appointed but also, to ensure that there is no interval during which a vacancy would exist, until the appointment of the successor is approved.

Section 4: this amendment corrects a typographical error.

Section 5: under subsection 2 of section 245 of The Municipal Act, where a local board functions in more than one municipality, its accounts and transactions shall be audited by an auditor of the municipality in which the local board functions most. This does not work satisfactorily with respect to Planning Boards so a new section is added providing that the auditor shall be an auditor of the designated municipality in the planning area.

Section 6: the present subsection 1 of section 11 requires the deposit of a certified copy of an official plan in the office of the clerk of every municipality in the planning area. Since that official plan may not in some cases affect all the municipalities in the planning area, the

provision is amended so that the copy will be lodged only in such municipalities as the Minister designates.

The requirement in subsection 2 for lodging duplicate originals of official plans in registry offices is limited to the lodging of one duplicate original.

Section 7: the present subsections state that the Planning Board may constitute itself or not less than 3 of its members as a Committee of Adjustment. The amendments are to make it clear that what the board really does is constitute "its members" or not less than 3 of them as the committee.

In other words, it was thought, by the previous interpretation, when the Planning Board constituted itself as a Committee of Adjustment, both members were to hold exactly the same office, as they did on the Planning Board. By this amendment, they may be shifted around.

Section 8, subsection 1: the power of a Committee of Adjustment to permit a change in use of land which, on the day of the passing of a zoning by-law, was used for a purpose prohibited by the by-law, is revised so that the committee may authorize a change to a similar use or to a use that is more compatible with the permitted uses. The present authority is limited to authorizing a change to a use that conforms more closely to the permitted uses.

The thought we have in mind here, Mr. Speaker, is that under the present Act, it is considered by a great many Committees of Adjustment as being too inflexible, and it is our hope by this amendment to make it a little more flexible; on the other hand, not to make it so broad that the whole effect of the zoning by-laws will be lost.

Subsection 2: under subsections 10 to 19 of section 15a, an appeal may be taken to the Municipal Board from a decision of a Committee of Adjustment. If no appeal is taken the Minister has the option of either approving the decision or referring the matter to the Municipal Board. These subsections are rewritten to simplify and shorten the procedure. The Minister is now given a right of appeal from the decision of

the committee. If no appeal is taken by the Minister or any other person within the required time the decision of the committee is final, and there is no need of obtaining the Minister's approval.

Section 9: the definition of "redevelopment" is amended to make it clear that a redevelopment plan may be carried out in respect of an area which, although perhaps not built-up, is improperly subdivided for the uses for which the area is suited.

Section 10: subsection 1a of section 24 now authorizes a subdivision control by-law to provide that where land is within a registered plan of subdivision, no person shall convey the land by part lot description without the consent of the Planning Board or, where there is no Planning Board, of the Minister. The amendment will authorize a by-law to designate specific plans of subdivision or parts thereof, to which the prohibition will apply.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, section 11: the provision requiring applications for approval of subdivision plans is amended so that the applicant must be the owner or must be authorized by the owner to make the application. This will avoid the work that has been involved in the past in processing applications by unauthorized persons which are later abandoned.

We have had cases where people have come to our department representing themselves as being the owner of certain land, and we have found out, after a great deal of detailed work, that they were not the owners at all, and had no authority to deal with that property. This section will cover that situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, as I did not participate in the previous debate, I should like to give myself the pleasure of extending my felicitations to you in your official capacity, and my very warm personal regards. It is a matter of a great measure of satisfaction to all of us that

you are again with us, with your gracious lady, enjoying good health, and discharging the important duties of your office in such an acceptable manner.

This day is saddening to us all, by the passing of our friend, Mr. MacOdrum, and I find it quite a shock to look across the floor of the House at his desk, where I always found an interesting and friendly face, even sometimes an approving eye when I was addressing you, and to find today that desk draped in mourning for the untimely passing of this most esteemed member. Surely it is a great loss to his family, and his community, and particularly to this House, and the province at large.

He had a very brilliant future in the public service, had he been spared to have been with us for a greater time.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest and profit to many of the addresses, most of them in the previous debate, and I would have liked to have had time to comment on many of them today. There were interesting and profitable suggestions brought forward, but in hurriedly passing, I would like to mention one part of an address delivered by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay). I am always particularly interested in him, because I sat opposite his good father in this Legislature for many years, when he was a member of the government and I was in Opposition, and when he was in Opposition, and I in Government, and I hope to have the same pleasure regarding the hon. member for Riverdale, his worthy son.

It is a matter of regret I cannot commend wholly this particular address. I had hoped I could. He did bring forth some suggestions of great value, which a Select Committee of this House will, I believe, enquire into during the recess. His charges against the administration of justice and the Toronto police force have already been dealt with by the hon. Attorney-General, and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) who are certainly more capable to deal with this than I, and I find myself in complete accord with the attitude taken

by the hon. Attorney-General, and the hon. member for Kingston.

I do deprecate the attack on the Toronto police force. I have known many of them individually for a great number of years, and I consider they constitute one of the finest police forces on this continent, and I think the hon. member (Mr. Macaulay) should have said, when he laid the charge that a confession was taken by torture from this particular defendant, that the police officers denied under oath that any torture was used, or that they had laid a hand in violence on the man in any way.

But it is with respect to an amazing attack he made on the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), upon which I would wish to make a few comments.

I have sat in this House with my honourable friend and leader for many, many years—26 or 27 now—and in all that time he has been one of the most popular members of this Legislature, and has certainly never invited the comments the hon. member for Riverdale saw fit to direct to him in his remarks.

May I refer to one or two of them? At page 184 of *Hansard* we find the following:

He next turned the might of his water pistol upon the hospital plan of Ontario, which he said he felt we should have.

I cannot pass such a comment without saying that if the debating ability of the hon. Leader of the Opposition can be termed a "water pistol," I am sure that I, and some other hon. members of this House, would like to have one also.

Then he went on to say:

I should have thought my hon. friend had been smacked across his electoral bottom less than two years ago—

That is certainly a very debatable point, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Riverdale will find out before 2 years have passed that it is a very easy matter to be elected to this House when riding on the crest of a landslide, but

when one has to climb against the landslide, and still is able to be elected, that is really a remarkable victory.

Instead of the hon. Leader of the Opposition being "smacked," as the hon. member for Riverdale suggests, I submit that his victory was one of the most notable in his long career, with many elections to this House.

Then we go on. On page 185, the hon. member for Riverdale said:

What we want is more houses, not money, of which the hon. Leader of the Opposition I think perhaps has more than he knows what to do with.

Mr. Speaker, that is the worst attack of all. Why should the hon. member accuse the hon. Leader of the Opposition of "having more money than he knows what to do with"? Is that just talk, or what? That statement particularly amazed me.

I have known the hon. Leader of the Opposition for many, many years, and have been a frequent visitor at his farm on the back concessions of Grey South, and, believe me, Mr. Speaker, any money he has, he earned the hard way. I wish the hon. member for Riverdale would try making money that way for about 10 years, and he would appreciate it when he got it.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has been a very successful farmer. I think that is something upon which we should congratulate him. I know of no more difficult way of making a living than wresting it from the top 6 inches of soil. That has been my avocation, and that of my forebears for many generations in this country.

Then we go on, and we come to a word which is certainly offensive, if it was intended to be. At page 186, we find:

What I think is so despicable, is for the hon. Leader of the Opposition to stand there and say, "We want a Royal Commission."

The definition of the word "despicable" is, as I understand it, "contemptible; fit or deserving to be despised."

The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) used the term, I thought in a very proper way, when referring to offenders who leave the scenes of accidents, and do not remain to take their share of responsibility, assist the injured, and so on.

But to apply the word "despicable" to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I say comes very close to the margin of being unparliamentary and offensive.

Then we can pass on to other comments. He accused the hon. Leader of the Opposition of "trying to suck and whistle in the same breath" and said that his "suggestions were vacuums, that his policy is a hiccough on the breath of progress," and so on.

Then, he mentioned in another portion of his address,

I may be wrong, and I am prepared to stand here and apologize in public.

I suggest to the hon. member for Riverdale that he was wrong, and it would be very graceful indeed if he stood and apologized here in public, as he promised to do.

I cannot say what motivated this, Mr. Speaker. We all know, of course, the hon. Leader of the Opposition—the hon. member for Grey South—will, in a few weeks' time, be contesting at a very important convention in this city, the leadership of the Liberal Party. I know there will be no doubt but what he will have my unqualified support. I have enjoyed sitting under his able leadership, on this side of the House, and I hope, in the near future, to be sitting under his leadership on the opposite side. I assure the hon. members that I will support the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as long as I am able to discharge my duties as member of this House.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Let us be fair about it.

MR. NIXON: I have taken the liberty in times past, in addressing you on the budget, to divert to some mention of problems in my own riding, and you

have been very kind in giving me leeway in this matter.

Last year, you will recall, at this time, I brought to your attention the problems of the Indians in Brant, and the hon. Prime Minister showed very great interest, indeed, in the matter, and indicated in his address on the budget that he still had a great interest in the problems of the Indians, and we will shortly have presented to us a report from the Select Committee which was dealing with the problem.

I want to convey to the hon. Prime Minister and this House the appreciation of some 6,500 Indians in my riding for the interest the House has evidenced in their problems, and the great encouragement this has given them.

To show this appreciation, last year they invited the hon. Prime Minister to become an honorary Chief in the Band of the Six Nations of the Iroquois in Canada. It is a matter of very great regret to me that mutually acceptable occasion could not be found upon which the hon. Prime Minister could accept this great honour—and it is a very great honour, Mr. Speaker.

In the course of a somewhat lengthy public life, I have enjoyed my share of ups and downs, but I can say in all sincerity that there is no honour I have received which I value more highly than being an honorary Chieftain in this great Iroquois Band. These honours are not lightly cast around, I can assure you of that. Since the beginning of time, there have been only 33 granted, and only about 20 or 21 who have received the honour, are still living. The honour they conferred upon me was as Chief Sha-deh-gah-Ren-hes, "Trees of equal height"—and you will be surprised I have to refer to my notes to remember my own name. Nevertheless, it is a very great honour, and I hope during this coming year they will have an opportunity to induct the hon. Prime Minister into the tribe. While I have never been able to convert him into being a Liberal, I would consider it a very great honour indeed to assist in his induction as an honorary Chief of this tribe.

HON. MR. FROST: It would be a very great honour indeed. I would appreciate that.

MR. HANNA (Huron-Bruce): They are very fine Indians in Brant.

MR. NIXON: We are very proud of them.

MR. HANNA: We were there in December with our committee.

MR. NIXON: This House has passed the Theatres Act, and I would like to point out, from its application to my riding during this last year, that I do not consider it is in the public interest that the Act should be applied as it is.

This matter had to do with the granting of a provincial licence for a drive-in theatre just north of the City of Brantford in my riding, off highway No. 24. This was the second theatre of this nature—a drive-in theatre—which has been forced upon one township. There is another one a few miles to the west on highway No. 53, on the road to Burford.

This application was opposed by the local council, but they were informed by long-distance telephone from Toronto from the Theatres Branch I believe, that as the branch had approved the application of this drive-in theatre, the local council had no authority or power in the matter whatever and must, as a matter of law, issue a permit for the building. The council refused to issue that permit, and the applicants took the case to court here in Toronto, by way of a writ of mandamus. I would like to read you this report from the *Brantford Expositor*:

Court Over-rules Township Regarding Drive-in Theatre

A writ of mandamus, over-ruling the Brantford Township Council, has been issued at Osgoode Hall, Toronto, ordering that a building permit be issued to Allan Gazer, Brantford, to erect a drive-in theatre south of the Power Line road in the Tranquility district.

This district has been called, "Tranquility" for a century. I can assure you it was not very tranquil when they found this theatre was to be forced upon them.

The order, handed down by Mr. Justice R. A. Danis of the Supreme Court of Ontario, directs the township and its building inspector to issue the permit. It over-rides the council's formal revocation of an earlier decision to grant the permit.

On November 23, the council heard objections from a delegation protesting the building of the theatre in what the residents of the area termed a residential district, traffic from the theatre causing unnecessary hazards to children. That night, the council conditionally revoked its earlier decision to grant the permit. On December 9, the earlier decision was formally revoked.

I respectfully submit that the local council, if they have no discretion in the matter, should not be put in the position of having to be the "goat" for the protests from all the outraged citizens and home-owners of the district, which centres upon them instead of upon the Theatres Branch here in Toronto, where it should centre.

In piloting this bill through the House, the hon. Minister of Planning and Development had this to say:

When I was speaking with regard to the bill covering public halls, I said the people closest to the local situation should be the ones to say whether a licence should be granted or not.

And this is with regard to theatres:

There is a wide general principle under which the government has control, and we say to the municipalities they may not refuse a licence if we think it should be granted.

The municipality is only looking at it from some local aspect such as fire hazard or something of that nature. We say that we have gone into it thoroughly and the municipality may not refuse the licence.

If they cannot refuse the licence, I submit they should not be pulled into the picture in any way. But I think they should have authority to refuse that licence, and the provision we passed in the Theatres Act of last year that

no municipality shall refuse to licence a theatre when a licence therefor is in force under this Act,

should be removed.

Certainly, there is no case of necessity made out for hoisting this theatre upon us. Brantford is well supplied with splendid theatres, which are all having a difficult time today to keep up with the competition of television and so on. These drive-in theatres are particularly undesirable, I think, to be forced on any community, and to have two of them forced on one township is, I submit, Mr. Speaker, extremely unfair.

The year 1954 constitutes something of a milestone in my own public life. Should I be spared by merciful Providence until this fall, and should the electors of Brant also spare me, and if there is a general election in the meantime—those are two pretty big “ifs,” I will admit—on the 20th of October I will have completed 35 years of public life. That period includes 10 general elections and one by-election, as in former days when you were appointed to the Cabinet you had to go back to your constituency, as your seat was automatically vacated.

I thought it might be of interest to you, Mr. Speaker, in directing your attention to the budget, to direct your attention to the Public Accounts of 1919.

Those Public Accounts, were, of course, prepared by the government of Sir William Hearst and the hon. Mr. McGarry, Provincial Treasurer, both of whom were defeated in the 1919 general election. In fact, as I remember, we only came 60 votes short of “taking” Mr. Ferguson, too, on that occasion.

It is of interest to note that this budget, the first on which we worked 35 years ago, had a revenue of less than \$20 million. Some \$19,900,000 was the ordinary revenue of the province at that time, and it took over 1,000 pages of

Public Accounts to deal with that comparatively very small expenditure.

It might also be of interest to note that the entire annual revenue from the Board of Liquor Commissioners, which included sales, fines, transference of franchise, and what-have-you, amounted to \$316,000, whereas today it is \$44 million.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Did you have the four-point programme?

MR. NIXON: Not until later. Perhaps we did not get much revenue from it, either. However, we had no gasoline tax. The public highways produced \$1,500,000 where now they produce \$110 million. Those figures will give you some idea of what the passing of a few years has meant in the development of the revenues of the Province of Ontario.

The contingent liabilities guaranteed debt was \$19 million at that time, the complete direct debt was \$97.5 million.

One of the interesting items of revenue was that of \$2 million as a direct assessment by the government against the real property of the province. So when the hon. Prime Minister wants to get back to fundamental policies, he should go back to the Public Accounts of Mr. McGarry and the government of that day, which had taken some \$2 million by direct assessment against real property.

HON. MR. FROST: I am a Progressive Conservative. I gave \$134 million to them.

MR. NIXON: I would like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) upon his presentation of the budget this year. He recalled, to my embarrassment, that I criticized it very moderately last year, when, for the first time in my experience, he had simply closed the budget, laid it on the table, and then proceeded to give a desk-thumping partisan address to this Legislature.

This year he improved his presentation very much indeed, to my way of thinking. It might not have given the

hon. members as much chance to applaud by pounding their desks, but he has many opportunities and he takes advantage of them. I enjoyed it as much as any of the hon. members. Possibly the presentation of the budget is not one of the occasions for that type of demonstration. Personally, I did like his factual analysis of the budget and thought it was a very decided improvement.

He presented to us a budget setting out tax revenues of some \$362 million. They have progressed many, many times from those we enjoyed when I first entered this House, as I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker. He presented a gross debt of \$1,038,000,000—one thousand million dollars—which is truly a staggering figure.

I remember well just about 30 years ago when the hon. William Price was Provincial Treasurer. In presenting his budget, he brought in a debt retirement scheme by which a certain sum was to be set aside each year to the credit of the debt retirement, which at the end of 30 years would retire all the debt of the province. I suggested to him then that after this scheme had been in effect for 30 years, the way I understood it, the way he was borrowing money to put to the credit of the debt retirement scheme, and after it had worked itself out for 30 years, and the debt was all retired under that scheme, we would have a debt of \$1 billion.

I had no idea, at that time, how accurately I was predicting the course of events, but 30 years after the first institution of the debt retirement scheme, that is exactly what we have, a debt of \$1,000 million and an additional \$38 million.

I find each year a cause for continuing alarm in the rapidly increasing debt of the Province of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, this debt can be reduced, as one will see in the Auditors Report in the early years of the present government. In 1944, the gross debt was \$666 million; the next year, \$646 million; the next year, \$639 million, a very healthy decrease in the gross debt every year; and the net debt \$482 million, \$480

million, \$478 million—a decrease in those 3 years of some \$6 million or \$7 million in the net debt, a very healthy condition if it could only have been maintained.

However, for some reason in 1947 and from then on, the brakes were simply taken off and the machine of government has been accelerating and accelerating, and the debt has increased every year since then.

HON. MR. FROST: I think the hon. member will see the reason for that. In those years which he mentioned there was no hydro construction. In the years following 1946, there has been tremendous hydro construction with the result that the cost of that construction is reflected in the gross debt.

I may say to the hon. member that I would not want to do anything but tell him what I think will happen with the coming of the St. Lawrence and the great capital investment which will have to be made there. I should say that by 1958 or 1959 our gross debt, very probably, will be one and one-half billion dollars, but we would hold against that a great revenue-producing asset in the hydro plants and other works of the St. Lawrence project.

MR. NIXON: Yes, I agree with the hon. Prime Minister in that, Mr. Speaker, but that does not enter into the picture of the net debt because the net debt is that debt against which you have no realizable assets.

HON. MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member for Brant that there appears to be enough in reserve. To say that we should supply all of our capital commitments from cash seems to be going a little far. We are paying 65 per cent. of that now. It is not unreasonable that we should pay no more than 65 per cent. of our capital costs out of ordinary revenue. I think the hon. member is taking a very extreme view. We are capitalizing about 35 per cent.

MR. NIXON: Well, those are the debt figures, Mr. Speaker. The auditor has prepared a very interesting chart showing how the gross debt has gone

up from 1944 to 1954. It is right on the last line now. Another 2 years and it simply goes off into space and there is no more room for it in the report.

I am always interested, when the auditor's report comes down, to see how accurate our Treasurer has been in his Estimates in the past year. He has not a good record, as he will himself admit. The auditor seems to find this very interesting too. A very substantial part of his report consists in bringing to the attention of hon. members of this House differences between the expenditures forecast in the budget and the actual expenditures, and between the interim statement we have now and the actual figures as they eventually turn out. We shall not know this final figure until we meet in session next year. But in the year just past, the year ended March 31st, 1953, the budget Estimate for ordinary revenue was \$291 million. The actual revenue received was \$349 million, a surplus over the budget estimate of \$58,500,000.

The hon. Prime Minister shrugs that off with a smile. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, in the school in which I was brought up, a sum like that was not considered "peanuts." We would certainly have liked to have seen a revenue of \$58 million, quite apart from a surplus of revenue over the budget Estimate of that tremendous amount.

HON. MR. FROST: I went down to Ottawa and shook the tree.

MR. NIXON: I also note that actual expenditure over the budget Estimate amounted to \$36 million. I almost wonder, Mr. Speaker, what is the use of budgeting or guessing at all if we cannot get closer than that to the amounts as they eventually turn out? He might as well turn his financial "Brain Trust" out to grass, and take the figures as they finally are presented to us when the year is completed.

HON. MR. FROST: I would point out to the hon. member for Brant that, apart from the Ottawa Agreement, my budgeting was fairly accurate, considering everything. I did not know in

March we were going to enter into an agreement with Ottawa. We did enter into the agreement, on August 31st. I convened the House and explained it and provided for the money. I think my hon. friend cannot object to that.

MR. NIXON: Let us see how accurate the hon. Prime Minister's budgeting was, apart from the agreement with Ottawa. The Highways Department gave him the \$6 million he budgeted for. Now we come to liquor. The Prime Minister only budgeted for \$36 million, but actually received \$44 million, an increase of \$8 million there. That was not very accurate budgeting.

As a matter of fact, I distinctly remember asking at the time why the Prime Minister had budgeted for a decrease of \$8 million, whether or not he intended on taking the water out, and so making less profit.

Here we are back again, budgeting for \$36 million from the Liquor Board, and I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if that Estimate was made before or after the fusel-oil speech by the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips).

I think one paragraph is worth repeating, Mr. Speaker. Some hon. members may have missed it. This year, in connection with the tabling of the third annual report of the Alcoholism Research Foundation—it is remarkable what they can discover about alcohol in 3 short years—he said:

You may ask me, what the aging of the liquor has to do with it. First, in the distillation, if that is properly done, there should not be over an ounce and a half to 2 ounces of these so-called oils in an Imperial quart. Today, in a great number of liquors, there is as much as 2 to 2½ ounces of so-called fusel oil. What is done, is we actually shake it up. What we should do is siphon it off the top, because that part is really poison. These fusel oils—so-called—are deadly poison. What we actually do is shake them up, and we get it in a diluted form.

I suggest to the government and to the hon. Minister of Health—because this

year the statement was made by a responsible Minister before the Orders of the day—that if this “top” should be siphoned off, as the hon. Minister suggests, it should siphoned off by the hon. Prime Minister. He should do the siphoning. Certainly you cannot expect the poor customer who pays, maybe, \$5 for one bottle to siphon off the top 10 per cent. Even then he might have to siphon off 10 ounces of water which the government has put into it, from the bottom. There would not be much left for his money. With respect to this particular matter I saw a statement given to the press by some citizen of your own community, Mr. Speaker. It was headed, “Official Disputes Stated Estimate of Fusel Content.” The text read:

Health Minister Phillips’ statement in the Legislature recently that most of the liquor in Ontario contains up to 10 per cent. of fusel oil, a deadly poison, is challenged by a distillery official.

Carl T. Carson, Vice-president in charge of production, Hiram Walker & Sons Ltd., described the statement as “inaccurate and misleading.”

“It was alleged that a 26-ounce bottle of liquor contains 1 to 3 ounces of fusel oil, depending on its age,” Mr. Carson said. “This would be equivalent to 4 to 12 per cent. fusel oil content. Laboratory records show that Canadian whiskey contains only 10 to 17 parts per 100,000, that is, .01 per cent. to .017 per cent.

“In other words, the statement in the Legislature claimed that whiskey contains about 1,000 times as much fusel oil as it actually does,” Mr. Carson said.

Thus, while the hon. Prime Minister is giving his Cabinet a bad example in estimating for the budget, another responsible Minister is a thousand times out and that, I suggest, is a little far out, even for a Minister of this government.

The hon. Prime Minister has said: “What a fine budget.” He claims that his taxes are about the lowest imposed in

any province of Canada. I was very interested to read the budgets from the Western Provinces, particularly from Alberta, and compare them with our own. The Alberta budget is pretty shiny too. May I read an excerpt:

In a 1954-55 budget that featured increased pensions for the aged and blind and higher indemnities for provincial lawmakers, Premier Manning also raised the possibility that the foreseeable future would bring the elimination of all existing municipal school and hospital taxes.

He announced the province will increase by \$5 monthly—to \$15 from \$10—its supplementary payments to recipients of old-age security pensions, old-age assistance and blind allowances. The ceiling of their allowable annual income will be increased by \$60.

I suggest to the government that their revenues are very buoyant, and that their surpluses would be tremendous, if they were not packed away in the Highway Improvement Fund, and the Debt Retirement Fund. No one is more anxious than I am to see the mortgage paid off the old farm, but I do suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that this House would certainly never hesitate for a moment in voting necessary monies for the Highway Improvement programme. Why does he not consider some supplemental assistance to our old-age pensioners? Alberta is now giving \$15 in supplemental assistance. British Columbia has also increased its assistance, I believe, and Saskatchewan also gives supplemental assistance. Certainly the old-age pensioners of Ontario are having an extremely difficult time, with the cost of living as high as it is, to get by on their \$40 pension. Instead of putting \$24 million into the Highway Improvement Fund, the government might very well consider using some of this money for additional assistance to these pensioners.

Now I will turn to page 4 of the budget as presented by the treasury. And I would invite the attention of hon. members to the summary of expenditure

and revenue shown there. Our fiscal programme, ordinary and capital, now exceeds \$450 million annually. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he should not permit these terms to creep into the budget—terms that are rather confusing and misleading and which may even pull the wool over the people's eyes. I know that in almost every report which I read in the press said this was a budget of \$450 million. The word "fiscal" is certainly in ordinary use in connection with the handling of public revenue but it has attained a much wider application. It is possible to talk about a "fiscal year" in which "expenditure" as well as "revenue" is considered in addition to "taxes" and "borrowings."

What is important, of course, is that revenues, both capital and ordinary, total together away over \$450 million. But many people interpreted the reference which the Prime Minister made to "expenditure" this year as meaning that the figures of ordinary and capital expenditure as given on pages 37 and 38, added together, total \$581 million. According to the auditor, last year the government was about \$19 million short in its interim Estimates which the hon. Prime Minister presented to the House as compared with the actual total at the end of the year. So we can add \$20 million to that \$580 million, and we come out with a nice round sum of \$600 million of actual expenditure, capital and ordinary, in this current year.

I submit that the hon. Prime Minister, having totalled up the revenues, should have totalled up the expenditures side by side. The result might impress even him. The figures would show a deficiency that is leading us to an alarming debt position—an income of \$450 million, and an expenditure of \$600 million—a difference of \$150 million a year. There is nothing to be done with this deficit except to add it to existing debt. To say we are "paying off the mortgage," that we are putting \$16 million to debt requirements, and then at the same time to add \$150 million to the debt is surely, Mr. Speaker, to take an unrealistic view. We might as well take a realistic view of the situation and

admit that the debt is increasing in an alarming manner.

One of the most fruitful sources of revenue, as has been stated, is the federal agreement for the use of certain tax fields which this year produced more than \$134 million and next year will produce \$140,008,000. These are truly very substantial sums and I fancy the hon. Prime Minister must indeed regret the years which went by during which he failed to accept our sound advice that he should make this agreement with Ottawa. When he sees these fine cheques coming in he must surely regret that he did not make this agreement some years previously.

HON. MR. FROST: Under that agreement I would not have received these cheques, which are certainly coming in nicely.

MR. NIXON: I would be very much interested if we could have a breakdown of this \$134 million, making clear what part of it is corporation tax, what part of it is income tax, and what part is succession tax. Is there no succession tax?

HON. MR. FROST: No. But that is quite a good question to ask. I think we could give the hon. member for Brant a reasonably accurate statement of the break-down, both of the \$134 million and of the \$141 million. The figures would have to be approximate, because they are based on a complicated formula, but I think it could be done approximately.

MR. NIXON: At this point, Mr. Speaker, I desire to turn to the debt position again because I submit that this is the meat in the coconut. These pages which the hon. Prime Minister read with such satisfaction are really only words and alibis. This is where we find out our exact financial position. We now have \$1 billion of gross debt, and that increased this year by \$142 million, which is a tremendous increase. It is estimated on page 43 that the net debt for the year will be \$650 million, an estimated increase this year of \$45,879,000. That is part of the debt

against which we have no realizable assets. That margin is, of course, becoming narrower and narrower in proportion to the gross debt. And not only, Mr. Speaker, have we this gross debt of \$1 billion, but we have also backed the other fellow's notes for \$780 million—\$787 million of guaranteed, or indirect debt. And while we hope the province will never have to pay all that, nevertheless this is an indirect debt and if the other fellow does not pay for any reason, we shall have to pay. These commitments are now rapidly approaching the \$1 billion mark, and this year they, too, were increased by a very substantial sum of money.

I would like to make here a very brief reference to hydro. I submit that the debt position is the highlight of the budget, and for that reason I have directed the attention of hon. members to it for a longer period than I otherwise would have done. I hope my observations will not be entirely overlooked by the treasury.

Hydro this year received, as a direct advance, \$100 million, and the province guaranteed their bonds for some \$60 million, a total of some \$160 million. Hon. members will see that the hydro debt has increased very substantially, too. In my own mind there is no question but that the hon. Prime Minister is somewhat concerned when he considers the ever-increasing projects for the development of hydro. I notice in a brochure which they issued recently they say that 29 cents of every dollar earned are needed to pay the interest on their debt. Since then they have, I think, increased their debt by \$160 million, so they must now pay some 30 cents in debt interest out of every dollar of revenue received.

We were told, in connection with the conversion scheme, that it would certainly cost \$400 million and possibly \$440 million. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when the scheme was first recommended to the Legislature the estimate was \$191 million, and we were notified that it was hoped the scheme might be completed in the 1960's.

That is still 6 years away, and I would

urge upon the government and upon the Hydro Commissioner that this project should be expedited as rapidly as possible. As an island narrows, the water rises upon those who are left, and they are more or less left out on a limb. The supply houses show less and less interest in the demand for 25-cycle equipment, and certainly industry now is avoiding the 25-cycle towns and cities, but are going to those which are equipped with 60-cycle.

HON. MR. G. H. CHALLIES: Mr. Chairman, may I interject just a word? As the hon. member well knows, as far as industry is concerned, we have a supplementary cycle, 60 cycle, available to large municipalities.

MR. NIXON: Have you it in Simcoe?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I believe so.

MR. NIXON: I notice that the people in my riding are seriously objecting to industry passing them by, because they have not 60-cycle power. In any case, I, for one, would be delighted to see this matter completed, and I urge upon the government to expedite the completion of the change-over as rapidly as possible. It seems to me, in many of these cities and towns, the local Utility Commission could take on the entire job.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Brantford is doing that now.

MR. NIXON: Yes, I understand so. In that way, Comstock and the hydro could be relieved of a great deal of the actual work in connection with this change-over.

In that connection also, Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the report of the Municipal Electric Association, Mr. Saunders said:

The decrease in the total rebate could be traced to an increased levy for the change-over from 25 to 60 cycles. The increase was charged after Ontario Hydro realized the programme would far exceed the original Estimate of \$191 million.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I wonder if the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) would permit me to make a short statement as to the costs? I am making this under the authority of the Assistant General Manager in charge of Administration. Had the factors remained static up to the present time, the Estimate of \$191 million would have taken care of the cost of the frequency conversion; in other words, the unit cost is not exceeded, in fact, it is a little less. The factors of labour, materials, the normal increase in population, with the increased loads for industry and individuals remained normal, also the value of the dollar remaining normal, the estimated cost would have taken care of the cost of the conversion.

MR. NIXON: Nothing remains static in this world, Mr. Speaker. When an Estimate is being made, provision should be made for some allowance for changing factors.

We were assured, in no uncertain terms by Mr. Drew, when he recommended this scheme to the House, that the \$191 million was a fair Estimate. Furthermore, he said most emphatically, speaking in the City of Brantford on June 2nd, 1948, in the election campaign:

"No municipality in Ontario, whether now on 60-cycle, or 25-cycle, will pay one cent more because of Hydro frequency change-over," Ontario Premier George A. Drew told a Brantford audience Tuesday evening as he spoke in the BCI auditorium in the interests of C. C. Slemin, Progressive Conservative candidate here.

"No domestic user of electricity will pay one cent," said Mr. Drew. "No commercial user will pay one cent. No farmer will pay one cent for his change of equipment."

I gave to the House an instance last year where the Chairman of the Board said that some \$500,000 had already been taken from rural revenues for conversion, and here he said the charge would have been much larger had it not been for the levy made against them to pay the cost of conversion. So these

promises by Mr. Drew have not been carried out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one feature of this borrowing-and-debt question I would like to mention and then I will conclude.

You will recall last year I moved an amendment pointing out the alarming increase in the debt. I think that is an important feature of a budget. If I were to move an amendment along that line at this time, the hon. Prime Minister might say, "This is old stuff to us."

There is a feature in the budget, in regard to borrowing, in particular, to which I wish to direct the attention of the House for a moment. That is the tendency of the government to turn more and more to the New York market for its funds. That might be an easy place to secure money, and it has certainly been found to be so in the past, but, believe me, Mr. Speaker, there has always been a day of reckoning when those monies have to be repaid as to principal and interest in New York funds.

In 1932, the Henry Government, of which the hon. member, the Vice-Chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies) was a member, found it had to spend \$4,447,000 in one year to pay for the adverse exchange rate which at that time I believe was 24 per cent.

I would like to read to the hon. members a statement by a former Prime Minister and Treasurer of this province, the late Mitchell Hepburn, who listed on page 11 of his budget speech, the payments by years, for example, 1932, \$4 million, in round figures; 1933, \$2 million in round figures; and so on, and shows there was a sum of \$7,800,000 in 6 or 7 years which had to be found, under the most difficult conditions, to pay for the unfavourable American exchange, when paying off our principal and interest each year, which we had to pay.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, in those days it was difficult to find that kind of money. I brought to the attention of the House last year one occasion during this very period, when the Bank of Montreal, the official bank of the Province

of Ontario — refused to loan us \$4 million for three months at $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. That will give you some idea of the difficulties encountered.

In 1939, Mr. Hepburn said:

The foregoing summary indicates the unhappy experience of the province during the past few years in regard to its Foreign Exchange problems. The future threatens a similarly gloomy picture. American Exchange during the financial crisis of 1932-1933 reached a premium of over 20 per cent.

I am informed it was 24 per cent. at its highest. Then he goes on:

If such condition should again occur during the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1945, when we have over \$31 million to meet in the highest of these exchange markets, the province will be called upon to pay in exchange a sum of over \$6 million. I have had prepared a summary showing the Interest and Principal Maturities of Province of Ontario bonds payable in Canada, London or New York, at the holders' option.

Just now, our Canadian currency is at a premium of some 3 per cent. Mr. Speaker, so I presume we only received \$97 for every \$100 bond we sold in New York. The reason for that favourable situation—if you can call it so—is because of the tremendous investments of American funds in Canadian bonds, and our natural resources being developed, in many cases, by American investors, but the day is coming when this money will move the other way, when these investments are going to be paid back in principal, interest and dividends. And when this swing of the pendulum comes, as it has come in the past, and will certainly come in the future, we will find the rate of exchange will go the other way, and probably in 15 or 18 years, when these sums of money have to be repaid, in principal and annual interest, we will again find the exchange rate 10 per cent. against us, or may, as it was for some years, reach 15 or 16 per cent. and even 24 per cent.

So we actually do not know what we are facing.

If we sold these bonds in Ontario and in Canada—and it has never been suggested they cannot be sold here; certainly the hydro has sold bonds at a very favourable rate in the past. I think as low as $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., and their sales have always “gone over” successfully—I submit that these monies we would be owing to our people, by way of interest and principal, would then be paid to our people, and the interest would always be available to the corporations to pay corporation income tax, and to the individuals to pay individual income taxes, and we would be in a far safer and more sound position than we are when we owe these vast sums of money to foreign powers, particularly to the United States. I do not know that for many years to come, England will have an adverse exchange rate so far as our currency is concerned, which would embarrass us as it did in days gone by, when our borrowings had to be repaid in Sterling.

I do submit, Mr. Speaker, there is almost a certainty that in the future, when these sums of money are being paid back to the United States, the rate of exchange will be the other way, and may be very substantially so.

Mr. Speaker, to put myself on record in this regard, I propose to move, in conclusion:

That the Motion before the House that “Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply” be amended by adding thereto, the following words: “But this House does not approve the policy of the government in borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars in the United States repayable as to principal and interest in United States funds.”

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) moves the adjournment of the debate, may I say to the hon. members of the House that the statement made by the hon. Minister of Health

(Mr. Phillips) the other day, relative to fusel oil was all right, except the decimal point got out of place. It is very easy to happen, with a person using bifocals. The hon. Minister of Health will revise that very shortly, and I can tell the hon. members the products which are sold in the Ontario stores are up to the standards required.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. Prime Minister can revise his Estimates upward.

HON. MR. FROST: I will have to look into that.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I call the order in relation to the report of the Committee on Reform Institutions? I regret that I will have to be away for a few hours, but before leaving, perhaps you will pardon me if I refer to this headline, in the *Toronto Daily Star*, "Frost In Row With Union Men." That headline is quite inaccurate. We had a lovely meeting.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE RE REFORM INSTITUTIONS

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, before I make any comments in connection with the all-Party report in connection with Reform Institutions, I would like to say a word in reference to the death of a man who came into this House after the General Election of 1951, the late Mr. Gordon MacOdum.

He and I have been friends and members of the bar for a quarter of a century, and after the last opening of the Legislature, I was returning to my riding in Kingston on the train, with my wife, and he, at that time, was accompanied by his wife and his two little boys, aged 12 and 10.

Sometimes, as hon. members know, casual conversations take place between two friends which do not impress you at

the time, but later events cause you to recall them. As we were going eastward, he said, "You know, one of the reasons I brought the children up for the opening of this Legislature, was because I wanted them to see the sittings of Parliament at a time when their father was in his seat, and in his place, as the elected representative for the County of Leeds." Whether that was a premonition or not, I cannot say.

Tomorrow, hon. members of this House will go east to pay their respects to a very able lawyer, a loving husband, and a good father. Last Friday, before he returned to his riding of Leeds, and his home in Brockville, he dictated a letter which he never lived to sign, and as we think of him tomorrow, as we are going east, or as we think of him this afternoon—as was so ably stated by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon)—I would like to read a sentence from this letter which will never be mailed. I think it illustrates, if I may say so, a living memorial to the high integrity and sincerity of purpose of our departed friend.

This is what he said:

Please be advised that I am at all times most anxious to assist every person in the County of Leeds, and that regardless of any Party affiliations. If a cause is right, then I want to support it.

In reading that extract I would like it to be in the record for all time as a tribute to the outstanding and high qualities of a very dear friend, not only of my own, but yours, Mr. Speaker, and of every hon. member of this House.

It is my privilege this afternoon to say a few words in connection with the bill which was tabled, in connection with Reform Institutions.

As the result of having been on that committee, I would say, first of all, it is a very great pleasure to have been a member of that committee. Perhaps my reasons are personal, but I will give them to you for what they are worth.

I think one of the first reports which was ever made in either the Dominion or Provincial Parliaments in connection

with penal reform was when the Honourable C. J. Torch was the Minister of Justice. Sir Robert Borden was Prime Minister. That was a 3-man committee consisting of Mr. O. N. Baker, Mr. Charles M. Draper and my father.

The next step with relation to penal reform was something with which I had something to do. I think, Mr. Speaker, you may be a little surprised at this observation that, in my opinion, the Archambault Report would never have been written and would never have been of the value it has been to both Federal and Provincial Governments across Canada, and would never have been possible, if it had not been for the outstanding leadership given by the late Harry Anderson, who was the editor of what was known at that time as the *Globe*. With that paper I want to be associated, coupled with the Kingston *Whig-Standard*. Those two newspapers took the position there was something wrong, and which should be made right.

I could not do it alone in Kingston. I had to get some outside support, and I came to Toronto to see Mr. Harry Anderson, a man as great in heart as he was in size, who believed in the sincere and fundamental principles of humane treatment of those who were suffering.

I should like to tell you this: prior to the Archambault Report there were, what were called down in Kingston, some "riot trials" which took place in the Kingston Penitentiary. I became connected with them in a very peculiar way. I was walking through the lobby of the Court House in Kingston one day when the jailer told me there was a man charged in connection with the "riot trials" in the penitentiary, who had said he would like a lawyer.

First of all, I was not very interested in seeing him, because at the time I was busy. Then I thought to myself, "I had better go," and I did. They said to me, "Why don't you go out to the Kingston 'pen' and see the 35 or 37 men? They are separated, incarcerated in what is now the female prison, and they might want you to defend them."

I said to these 2 men the reason I had not gone out, was for the simple reason I had not been asked. I was told at the time the Warden of the day had made representations that I was not interested, was not available and could not be reached.

A day or two ago the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) made a reference about me. He said I was "beginning to mellow." I am only "mellow" when people do not get in my way and step on me. When I want to go forward, when I believe something is right and sincere in my belief, it does not make any difference to me if the crowd is against me. Principle is something which is worthwhile. I have not "mellowed," may I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and to my colleagues in this House, if something comes up and I believe I am right, they will hear from me.

I believed at the time of the riot trials things were wrong with relation to the administration of justice insofar as they concerned federal institutions. The "whitewash brush" was out, the paint mixed, and the Department of Justice did not want anyone in there. The judges were going to hurry these cases along. I thought to myself, "You won't hurry very much, because I will elect trial by jury." Since I was defending all the accused persons, I could only be in one court at one time. The Department of Justice realized that they had someone with whom to contend, who put principle ahead of everything else.

A County Court Judge, His Honour George E. Burtch of Belleville, who had courage and independence, made a finding that the riots, so-called, which took place in the Kingston Penitentiary so many years ago, started out as a peaceful demonstration, to bring to the attention of the Department of Justice certain wrongs, the righting of which were long past due, from the point of view of investigation. As a result of His Honour's findings in these trials, and the outstanding leadership given by the late Harry Anderson and the *Globe*, and Rupert Davies, now Senator, of the Kingston *Whig-Standard*, who brought

these facts to light, the government of the day was afraid not to appoint a commission, and they did appoint a 3-man commission known as the "Archambault Commission." I gave evidence before that commission because I thought there were wrongs which needed to be made right. That is how that commission came about.

One of the members of the Archambault Commission was Mr. J. C. McRuer, who is now the Chief Justice of the High Court of the Province of Ontario. To him, this afternoon, I would like to pay my respects, in that he came before our committee and submitted himself to questioning in a fearless and frank manner, answering, as best he could, questions regarding the problems we had in relation to penal reform. It is interesting to note that the Minister of Justice of Canada has appointed him as one of a committee of 5 to investigate federal institutions.

For some reason that I will never be able to understand, the committee would not, when I suggested it, come down and inspect the Kingston Penitentiary and the Collins Bay Penitentiary, because I saw improvements in those institutions as a result of the Archambault Report. When we were in Ottawa one day interviewing the Minister of Justice, hon. Stuart Garson, I suggested to him that a committee of 3, consisting of the CCF Leader (Mr. Grummett), the Liberal House Leader (Mr. Oliver) and the chairman of our committee, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart), should go down and inspect the Kingston and Collins Bay Penitentiaries. They could see for themselves what was taking place there; teaching the men trades as against laziness, teaching men to have some self-respect, which, after all, is most important in penal institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote). I am satisfied that the institutions in the Province of Ontario, from the point of view of food and care of the inmates, is good. Outside of Brampton, I think our institutions are nothing but places to encourage

laziness. I do not think there is very much progress being made with relation to teaching men trades, and I want to say that insofar as my colleague and friend, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is concerned, I think he took over a most discouraging portfolio, and I think the "mess" he assumed to try and straighten out, was something that is beyond description. I can only say, as a member supporting the government of the day, that I do hope the courage for which the hon. Minister was recognized, in the hour when the nation needed brave men, will remain with him until such time as he has a chance, with courage and faith in himself, to bring into effect some of the reforms which we have recommended.

The hon. Minister has never had a chance. He has not been there long enough to put the great policies and principles into effect. I want to make it very clear, that no matter what is contained in the report in relation to Reform Institutions, it is not critical of the hon. Minister, who has not yet had an opportunity to right the glaring wrongs which should have been attended to long before this.

Another point I would like to mention is that it seems to me there are 4 great principles which have to be considered in relation to Reform Institutions in the Province of Ontario: probation, parole, vocational training, and alcoholism. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney-General, that I think he should bring in an amendment to the Liquor Control Act at this session, providing, in the case where a man has been intoxicated 3 times within a year, he should not be sent to a reformatory for 3 months, but the sentence should be a year or such less period of time as the presiding magistrate, in his opinion, thinks should be the sentence of the court, having regard to all the circumstances. It is my view that at the present time this 3-months' period, where people go in and out for being intoxicated, come out no better than when they went in, and to try and save them, their sentences should be sufficiently long so they could go to

the hospital where alcoholics can be treated and cured.

Mr. Speaker, may I say I think the idea of sending people in for 3 months is a waste of time, energy and money. I say that the hon. Attorney-General will make no mistake in recommending to this House a "jacking up" of a sentence to help these people, so that they can be treated and cured against the desire over which apparently they have no control. Therefore, I think that will be a proper amendment.

Another thing I want to say to the hon. Attorney-General and to the hon. Prime Minister is this: I think the hon. Prime Minister, as soon as possible, having regard to the fact that amendments to the Criminal Code are now being considered by the Federal Government, should make a special trip to Ottawa to meet with the hon. Prime Minister of Canada who will be returning to Ottawa within the next 24 hours, and with whatever advisors they may each choose to have associated with them at the time, and consider amending the Criminal Code so that all people in Ontario reformatorys who are there serving a definite sentence can be granted parole, when the Ontario Parole Board deems it expedient that should be done.

I take the position with some fervour that we have the custodial care over the inmates of these institutions, and we should be able to release them at a time and on conditions we think proper. The Ticket-of-Leave Act is cumbersome and, in some cases, administered by some people who are inefficient. If we are going to constitute a new Parole Board, the sooner we can do it and deal with our own prisoners the better for them and for us.

It is all very well for us to talk about "parole" and "probation" and "trades," but there is something a little bit more important than that, of which we must never lose sight, and it has been something I have been asking myself ever since I have been on this committee. What is coming over the youth of this province? They are committing so many terrible crimes. Where is society breaking down? It is all very

well to talk about "parole" and "probation," but let there be no misunderstanding that, because we believe in those basic principles, we are going to encourage crime.

Every day you pick up newspapers and read about serious crimes against one another, murder, manslaughter, and all kind of things. I say perhaps the fault lies with the homes, perhaps education, perhaps our newspapers, perhaps the movies, perhaps magazines, I do not know. However, the thing which arrests my attention is the serious increase of crime in this country. It cannot be blamed on post-war conditions. That period is over. But, for some reason or another, the youths are not growing up, as I see it. Maybe it is the zoot-suiter, I do not know. But there is a complete disregard for law and order, and just how it is going to be dealt with is something which gives me grave concern.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say, if I may, that if we are going to have in this country an economic slump, then it necessarily follows, as day follows night, that there is going to be a surplus of labour on the market, in relation to employment, which means that the employer will not take men who have been in a reform institution, if he can get men who have not been in such a place. Therefore, I say we must try to teach the men in these reform institutions some sort of trade so when they are released, they will be able to compete with their fellow men, from the point of view of employment.

Another point I would like to mention, and about which I was thoroughly disgusted, was the fact that they discharge prisoners from our reform institutions on a Friday. That is utterly ridiculous. There is no sense in it, because the men come down to the large centres for the week-end with little or no money in their pockets, and by Monday they are broke, and in trouble again. If I were running that department, I say with respect to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, I would never discharge a man after Wednesday, and I would see to it that he not only had a ticket to the place to

which he wanted to go, to try and re-establish himself, but that sufficient money, somehow or other, could be given to him to keep him in funds until the following Monday. I would agree with the philosophy that "sometimes the long way around is the shortest way home," and this idea of giving these men \$25 or \$30, in my opinion, is very bad policy.

Those are things which I recommend for the consideration of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions.

In conclusion, I want to say as a member of the committee—which was an all-Party committee—we may have had a sharp divergence of views on one subject or another, but in the main, when we brought in our report it was with a common united front. I hope that this time next year, those of us who are spared to be in this House will look forward with satisfaction, and indeed anticipation, to see what principles and recommendations we have made, have been brought into effect.

MR. S. F. LEAVINE (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the discussion on this report of the Select Committee, I do so with some concern, following the able presentation by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle).

I think it would be only fair to state that I found the chairman of that committee all that could be desired; in fact, possibly a little more than what could be desired at times, insofar as getting work out of individuals was concerned. All the members of the committee were competent and quite willing to do their share of the work.

I suppose the findings which were made are now general knowledge, the submissions which were presented to this committee at their various sittings, and the journeys we made, even into far-off lands, but I would like to mention one phase in particular which I do not think has received sufficient mention, and that is the Menlo Park experiment which was mentioned last session by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions.

Menlo Park, of course, as you may

very well know, is a diagnostic centre in New Jersey, one in which they make an attempt to evaluate scientifically the likelihood of reclaiming each individual. So far, they only have beds or rooms for youngsters, and in that sense they resemble ourselves, as they have not reached the point of being able to accommodate adults.

The youngsters are taken there with very excellent case histories presented by social workers—possibly by their pastors or priests and teachers—and by the local police, and submitted to the superintendent, who, in this particular institution, happens to be a psychiatrist of rather unusual ability.

There is one particular means they have in New Jersey of getting people of outstanding ability for outstanding jobs, and that is by granting the Director of Welfare for the city the right to go out and hire the best possible men he can find. They are also able to make some allowance for previous experience and qualifications. On this particular occasion they obtained a man from the City of New York who had been very successful in practice, and who was very enthusiastic about the task with which he was entrusted. He was allowed to gather his own staff. This consisted of an assistant superintendent, who happened to be surgeon prior to his becoming interested in this work, a couple of psychologists and teachers, and, in a consultant capacity, two nationally-known psychologists.

When a case is presented, it is presented very much as it would be before a board. The man who has been working on the case makes his suggestions as to the likely cause of the trouble, and how it may be solved. He then has to stand up to the counter-suggestions from every other member, and at the end of this joint discussion, they come up with something very much, I presume, in the way that the Select Committee itself presented a composite report, consisting of all the best ideas of which members had thought.

And before an individual is sentenced or returned to his original place of detention, this report goes with him,

and the courts follow its recommendations to such an extent that this panel may recommend the individual be paroled or placed on suspended sentence, perhaps, even, for the full period of his lifetime, or for 10 or 20 years.

It may be quite natural I should be more interested in the diagnostic possibilities of the reclamation of juveniles. That is not to say there is no possibility of salvaging a fair proportion of the older people. Under this particular plan the adults are treated as out-patients, which necessitates their making a number of visits to the institution. There are a number of very agreeable things in connection with this hospital, not the least of which was the genuine admiration and respect shown to the members of the staff by the youngsters who were being diagnosed. I am in agreement with the previous speaker that much has been done in Ontario on behalf of reform. I would not be too critical of that which has taken place in the immediate past, but I suggest that if we were to go back into our history, we would find the first great attempt was made by the then Provincial Secretary, hon. Mr. Hanna, I believe it was. Since then we have tried to advance a great deal, but we have done it by fits and starts, departures, first in one direction, and then in another. Then we have slowed down. Possibly we have not co-ordinated these various measures as we should have done. I believe that given such co-ordination we could expect, even with our present plan, and even with only a partial acceptance of the recommendations of this committee, that the outlook for those who are unfortunate enough to be in our institutions will be much better. Diagnosis will improve, and certainly the cost to the people of Ontario will be much less and the citizens of this province will have much greater cause for satisfaction.

I make this apology. The assistant Whip said some hon. members had better speak on this subject, and I think my duty is done.

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron): The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Leavine) intimated that he was not

given too much notice that he would be required to say something in connection with this report, but we know he is always prepared, and he has made a contribution which, I am sure, all hon. members feel was worthwhile.

When the chairman of our committee made his report to the House, he indicated that the committee worked on an entirely non-partisan basis. We all worked together with the idea of bringing in a report to this House which would be of benefit to the reform institutions of the province.

The chairman also intimated the various members of the committee had been allocated certain fields of work, to which they were to give particular attention. When he first allocated the tasks, he gave me the task of reporting on the quarries. I think, possibly, we all had the idea that there would be a great deal of hard labour done in the reform institutions and that there would be quarries all over the place. This turned out not to be the case. There is only one quarry in operation, and that is at Burwash. We soon discovered that the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) knew a great deal more about quarries than I did, and he undertook to pay particular attention to them, and I will let him make his own speech on that aspect of the investigation.

I was next given the task of reporting particularly on the industries in the institutions. Information about these is contained in the report and I do not wish to take up a great deal of time in discussing them. I would like, however, to bring just a few of these activities to the notice of hon. members.

In considering these industries, there is a division of labour to be taken into account. There are industries which are producing things of value. And there are other activities which come under the heading of "vocational training." But for each man learning a trade there are many who are beyond the age where they can acquire a new skill. A great many men are just semi-skilled or unskilled. A great many of them are engaged in agriculture and forestry, and other employments which may require

some skill but do not call for it to the same extent as if the men were employed in, for example, a machine shop.

I think most hon. members are aware that in Guelph we have a very efficient plant turning out licence plates for the Department of Highways. They are turning out in the neighbourhood of 1,750,000 plates annually. They employ about 50 men, and we came to the conclusion that they were fully employed, and that this was a very efficient operation. There is also a very efficient abattoir where 35 head of cattle and 50 pigs a week are processed, on an average, for the use not only of Guelph but other government institutions across the province.

Then there is also at Guelph a very efficient cannery which employs a great many men during the canning season and throughout the remainder of the year. This factory turns out 2,500,000 lbs. of produce a year. There is also a machine shop and a factory where office furniture, school desks and articles of that nature are made. They also have a woollen mill which turns out a great number of articles each year, in addition to a laundry which handles 670,000 articles a year, and a bakery which produces 312,000 loaves.

In Mimico there is a brick and tile plant which is considered one of the most modern in the province. We were much impressed by the efficiency with which this plant was conducted and with the work it produced. They are very fortunate in having very easy clay deposits with which to work, and they produce a tremendous number of bricks and tiles.

I turn now to the reformatory at Brampton. This is not a productive project. The work engaged in there is more in the nature of vocational training. In other places, such as Burwash, the work is mostly farm work, and it was not my particular duty to report on those activities. In the institutions to which I have referred, unskilled men are employed in industry under the supervision of skilled instructors.

I do not think we should minimize the importance of these activities. They are turning out a tremendous amount of goods which are of value to the province. The committee reported on the fact that these goods are sold to other governmental departments. They also feel that they are not getting full credit for the goods produced, and I believe it was incorporated in our report, that consideration should be given to the Department of Reform Institutions receiving credit for the market value of goods which are produced. It would not mean a loss to anyone; it would only mean a bookkeeping entry, but it would give the department credit for producing something of value, and it would not appear to be entirely a spending department.

There is one other thing upon which I must comment, which was included in our report, and endorsed by everyone on the committee. That is in regard to the question of "probation." I have found that a great many people are confused over the meaning of "probation." Apparently a great many magistrates will impose suspended sentences, and when an accused is placed on suspended sentence, he more or less takes it for granted he is discharged, as he had not been sent to jail, or made to pay a fine. That is the wrong impression altogether, and the wrong attitude.

The committee felt that a magistrate should be allowed to place a man, not on suspended sentence, but on probation, where he would come under the supervision of trained probation officers, which would—to use a phrase used quite often in the committee—"take the pressure off the front doors of the institutions." With that I heartily agree, and we were very glad to see the suggestion is being acted upon, and that an increase has been made in the number of probation officers throughout the province.

We were told on many occasions there was a great need for segregation. The report has been discussed in the press and by others. The report covered many things and made many suggestions. But everything is not all wrong within the institutions. There is a great deal that

is right within them, but we may be overlooking that.

Segregation is one of the things which has been proposed as being of great importance, and with that, I heartily agree. But segregation can only be carried out if you have the money to go ahead and make the necessary changes, to make provision for proper segregation, and that can only be brought about when we have an aroused and enlightened public opinion. I feel sure the report by the committee will be of great value in arousing public opinion to the seriousness of the whole problem, and that government support should be given to the reformatory measures, and by that, I mean in regard to the expenditure of public money.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has again included a certain sum of money for the Department of Reform Institutions. That will provide for a certain amount of work, but it will not provide for the necessary expansion which has been recommended. I do not think anybody expects that.

The reason I bring that up is that we can only go as fast as public opinion dictates in this matter.

I would like to put a hypothetical question to the hon. members of this House and let them answer it each in his own mind.

For instance, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer had said, "We have \$9 million to spend on reform institutions, and \$15 million we are going to set aside for grants to municipalities to reduce their tax rates, but I will leave it to this House, and will reverse the figures, if so directed, and we will take \$9 million and give it to the municipalities to reduce their tax rates, and give \$15 million to reform institutions, which means we would give less to the municipalities to reduce tax rates, and give more to the institutions."

I think all hon. members can answer that question without hesitation.

I suppose that means when the public is aroused, and willing to back up the government in regard to the expenditure of money for reform institutions,

for the erection of new buildings, and so forth, then will they be able to carry out a greater degree of segregation. I have no doubt then but that the department will receive the necessary money.

MR. SALSBERG: A little will help along now.

MR. PRYDE: I know there is another member of the committee who wishes to say something, and I will only draw attention to one other phase of the work of reform institutions which I think deserves special credit, and that is the Alex Brown Memorial Clinic and hospital at Mimico for the treatment of alcoholics.

It is a pioneering project. There were no examples by which to go; it is the brain-child of the present hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote), and has been instituted since he became Minister. I always believe credit should go to where it is due, and I do think that a real effort is being made there to do something for those poor individuals who are unable to overcome their excessive use of alcohol, and I believe we should keep in mind that this being a pioneer project, the Department of Reform Institutions of Ontario will be able to show to other jurisdictions just how valuable it is, and I am sure it will be emulated elsewhere.

I would like to draw this to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is something of which we should be very proud.

I was very happy to be a member of this committee, Mr. Speaker, and to serve under the energetic chairmanship of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart). Much has been said about his leadership and his drive. He was known to the individual members of the committee as a "slave driver," which may sound rather rough, but he never "spared the horses," so to speak, because he was at this work early and late, never sparing himself, and I do think we should give a great deal of credit to the hon. member for Parkdale for the production of this report.

It was a very happy experience for me, and I think I may conclude by

saying that perhaps I did not contribute a great deal to the efforts of the committee, but I learned a great deal from my work on it, and I am quite sure, as the government has time to study this, and it gets public opinion behind it, more money will be devoted in the years ahead toward the improvement of these institutions.

In the meantime, I would like to say that I believe the department is doing a grand job with what it has available. We should keep in mind they are using many old buildings of a temporary nature. That has been cited by other speakers, and is contained in the report.

A portion of the report is taken up with considering a greater system of segregation, and it seems the matters of diagnosis treatment and segregation are the two essential things, but they cannot be carried out until more buildings are available, and it would seem that the people at the present time would rather see the government spending more money on hospitals and schools than building palatial homes for prisoners.

I am quite sure the report will be very valuable in the years which lie ahead.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this subject. I see our time is getting short, and while usually I do not take up too much of the time of the House, I would have liked to have had about an hour to speak on this subject, but I will try to crowd it into about 7 minutes.

When we approached this work, at our first meeting, we found we had a tremendous task ahead of us. I think every member of the committee realized the terrific problems which faced us, and we were very fortunate indeed in having the sort of chairman we had. He was most progressive, and put more time on this work than perhaps anyone else would. He put his entire energy into this work, and worked almost day and night, and apparently was not able to think of anything else except prison reform.

We toured around, and looked at the institutions, and then compared ours with some of those in the United States. We even went to Montreal and looked at the institutions there, after we had completed our visits in this province, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, if this report be studied, and implemented, it will provide something which will be for the benefit of the Province of Ontario.

I do not feel, as other people seem to, that we should spare money when trying to help these unfortunates in our institutions. The idea was to try and keep them out of jail, and I think a great deal can be done in that regard.

The question of crime is becoming a big problem in Ontario, and is requiring large expenditures, in caring for these people in our institutions, and I believe there should be some plan formulated in this province whereby we can reduce the number of inmates in these institutions, and instead of having to build more institutions, we will find that we already have enough.

I believe in segregation, keeping the "bad boys" away from those who are not quite so bad, and I believe in giving the young fellows a chance, and if he be a first offender, instead of sending him to jail, give him even 2 or 3 chances. If it is possible, we should keep them out of the jails, and we should have more people interested in seeing that they obtain work, and are able to look after themselves. But if they do get into an institution, when they get out there should be somebody there to look after them. You are well aware of the fact that society turns against those who have been in institutions, and it is very difficult for them to get employment. The government itself will not hire anyone who has been in jail, the railroads will not, and none of the big companies, and there are those in our society who never want to have anything to do with them at all.

I think the general public should bend over backwards to help these fellows, and give them a "break," and to assist them, by having those from the outside

world talk to them, endeavour to do something for them, and not turn them down, saying, "Oh, he is just a jailbird." I believe we should help any man who is even temporarily down. In that, the general public can do more than anybody else.

In our tours of inspection, we found the places very well kept, good food provided, everything kept in a clean condition, and we heard no "kicks" about cleanliness, nor about the food.

The question of idleness is one of the things which strikes me as being very important. We should find more work for these people to do. The taxpayers have to foot the bills, and I think work should be provided for those men who have to go to the institutions.

You will find quite a number who like to go in, because they are well fed, are provided with good accommodations, and so on.

There has been something said about "hard labour." I would not like to be considered too tough, but I do think these people who are sent to these institutions should be made to work, and no doubt they would not like it quite so well. Some of these men really seem to like the jails, as they find them better than running the streets, and they are satisfied to stay there.

Another thing I would like to see would be the government taking over the jails in the province, because we have found places where there were only one or two prisoners, and yet they have to have an entire staff, including the governor, to look after a very few prisoners. In fact, I think there are some places where the figure went down to one prisoner.

I understand that in the jail in the riding of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Pryde) it cost \$12.80 a day to keep a prisoner in jail. For that money, they might better have brought him down and kept him in the Royal York Hotel. I firmly believe we should do away with that jail.

I think it would be much better, if the government would take these jails over, and then they could advise each of

the counties what its share of the cost would be.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House. I was very happy to be associated in the work, with the other members of the committee, which was a very representative one. We had a clergyman on the committee, two farmers, a doctor, two lawyers, and some competent business men, and I feel that we did a good job, which is what we set out to do. Certainly we were anxious to do our very best in every way possible.

I again want to pay tribute to our worthy chairman, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart) who worked so hard on this committee. He took it very much to heart. He is one of those who is like my father, if a man lost five minutes in the morning, and did not make it up all day, he had to stay up all night to catch up. I certainly enjoyed working with him, and he demonstrated in many ways his ability to do the job.

I was very pleased to see the institutions we visited well conducted, and under the management of capable people. I do hope this report will not be shelved as so many have been, but there will be something constructive done about it, because there is a great deal of good which can come out of it.

I do not think we will be wasting any money trying to save people from going to jail. I do not think we should look at the money angle at all. I believe when the hon. Minister comes here seeking a few thousand dollars, the government should be ready to give it to him, because they are really saving souls, which, to my mind, is much more important than mere dollars.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about this. I do not know whether I should do so now. It may require from 15 to 20 minutes.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the hon. member for St. Andrew move the adjournment of the discussion.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the discussion.

Motion agreed to.

THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT,
1954

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves second reading of Bill No. 92, "The Mental Health Act, 1954."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I ask the permission of the House to have this bill referred to the Committee on Health.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves second reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, again I would ask permission to refer this bill to the Committee on Health.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 of the clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, March 18, 1954

Due to the death of Mr. Charles G. MacOdrum,
late member for Leeds, no session of the Legislature
was held on Wednesday, March 17.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 18, 1954.

Sixth Report Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Nickle	587
First Report Standing Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Root	587
Motion to Appoint Mr. Collings Chairman of Committee to Consider Bill No. 78, Mr. Frost, agreed to	588
Motion to Appoint Mr. Roberts Chairman of Committee on Legal Bills, Mr. Frost, agreed to	588
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading	588
Charitable Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	589
Mothers' Allowance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	589
Farm Products Marketing Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Goodfellow, first reading ..	590
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, first reading	590
Public Parks Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	591
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	591
Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	591
Passing of Joseph Daniel Nault, expressions of regret, Mr. Frost, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Salsberg	591
Tribute to Joseph Daniel Nault, Speaker	593
Territorial Division Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading	595
Operating Engineers Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, third reading	595
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading	595
Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading	595
Municipal Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading	595
Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading	596
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to	596
Resumption of Debate on Budget Address, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Kerr	604
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Edwards, agreed to	614
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	614

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been asked to call the attention of the members of the Standing Committee on Private Bills to a special meeting of the committee, which will be held tomorrow morning at the hour of half-past nine, in Committee Room No. 1. A special meeting of the Standing Committee tomorrow in Committee Room No. 1, at half-past nine.

We are very glad today to welcome quite a number of representatives of schools and organizations to our Chamber, the 4-H Club of Paris Plains, the Port Perry Public School, the Humber Valley Village School, and the John A. Leslie Public School. It is always a fine opportunity for us to have you as our guests, and we sincerely hope that your visit with us this afternoon will prove to be profitable and educational.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. NICKLE (Kingston): I beg leave to present the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Nickle from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the committee's sixth report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 13, An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. 20, An Act respecting St. Michael's College.

Bill No. 30, An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without certain amendments:

Bill No. 9, An Act respecting the Township of Toronto.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 20, An Act respecting St. Michael's College.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. JOHN ROOT (Wellington North): I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Root from the Standing Committee on Agriculture presents the following as the committee's first report:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendments:

Bill No. 59, The Bees Act, 1954.

Bill No. 60, An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act.

Bill No. 61, The Plant Diseases Act, 1954.

Bill No. 62, An Act to amend the Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. W. H. Collings, the hon. member for the electoral district of Toronto Beaches, be appointed Chairman of the Select Committee appointed to consider Bill No. 78, "An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly," in place of the late Mr. MacOdrum.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that, notwithstanding any application which rules 8, 9 and 14 may have to this motion, any Minister of the Crown when presenting his Estimates to the House, may occupy a seat in the front row of the House and may have his Deputy Minister and another member of his staff seated in front or adjacent to him to supply any information required by the Minister.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. A. Kelso Roberts, the hon. member for the electoral district of Toronto, St. Patrick, be appointed Chairman of the Standing Committee appointed to consider Legal Bills, in place of the late Mr. MacOdrum.

I may say, I have taken a little liberty with the wording there.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

HON. MR. M. PHILLIPS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to assist public hospitals

financially, by increasing payments by municipalities for the hospital care and treatment of indigent patients.

If hon. members will look at the financial difficulties of hospitals in the last few years, they will find that in 1948, 119 hospitals operated at a net loss of \$3.5 million. In 1949, it is estimated that the operating costs will exceed those of 1948 by some 10 or 12 per cent; or some \$4 million to \$4.5 million.

In 1953, although the figures are not yet available, it is understood the situation financially has become aggravated since 1950.

This amendment is for another purpose; to provide for a more equitable distribution of the incidence of cost. Municipalities in which hospitals are located, in practice, not only pay statutory rates for the care of indigent residents, but make contributions towards deficits incurred by hospitals in the care and treatment of indigent patients from outside the municipality.

It is interesting to observe that in 1948, municipalities voluntarily contributed \$1,599,000, which is more than the amount the municipalities were required to pay when the municipal rates were increased in 1950.

It is universally agreed that the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar today is substantially less than it was in 1939. Economists suggest that in terms of purchasing power the dollar today is worth about 48 cents, as compared with the 1939 dollar. Today an indigent patient receives what he requires in the way of treatment, regardless of cost. There is no discrimination in the treatment received, in the maintenance supplied, nor in the type of surgery performed, between the rich and the poor. Medical services and hospital facilities are the same for both.

Medical knowledge has improved significantly since 1939. Surgical procedures are performed today which were unheard of 13 or 14 years ago. Rapid strides have also been made in the medical field, especially in what is known as antibiotic therapy, or so-called "wonder drugs."

All this will increase the statutory rates in our various hospital grades. Rates in our "A" hospitals—our university hospitals, of which we have 13 in this province—will be increased from \$4 to \$6 for indigent patients. In our "B" hospitals—those hospitals having 100 beds or more—rates will be raised from \$3.50 to \$5.25; in our "C" hospitals, hospitals of 100 beds and under, rates will be advanced from \$3 to \$4.50. Red Cross hospitals will come into the same category, and the convalescent chronic hospitals, where rates have been \$2.50, will be increased by 50 per cent., making a new rate of \$3.75.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

HON. MR. W. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, two of the principal amendments of this Act are in connection with capital grants on new construction, and payments in connection with maintenance costs.

We have found, over a period of years, that charitable institutions in this province have been doing remarkably good work. Their activities are very efficiently and very effectively administered and our policy is to encourage private organizations, religious groups, and similar bodies, not only to build new institutions, but also to persist in the job they are doing under existing circumstances.

Some time ago we introduced capital grants on new construction to charitable institutions at the rate of \$1,000 per bed. This is in comparison with 50 per cent. which we were paying, in connection with the Homes for the Aged.

We hope that by increasing this grant from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per bed—which we propose to do at this time—we shall provide further encouragement to those charitable organizations which desire to build new accommodation for elderly people, and also for children who need

that type of accommodation in this province. For a number of years the children's institutions in this province have been receiving the sum of 5 cents per day for each child. We propose at this time to bring this payment in line with the per diem payments we are making to charitable institutions which are taking care of elderly people, and in this amendment we are raising our per diem rates to 20 cents per day in respect of all children in institutions in the province.

THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCE ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Mothers' Allowance Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is only one amendment of any significance in this bill. That is to simplify administration in connection with the payment of allowances to mothers whose children have reached 16 years of age, and will be continuing at school.

At the time of the last amendment to the Act, the House agreed to payment of a mothers' allowance to mothers whose children were continuing at school until they reached the age of 18. The practice which we followed was that the mother would receive her June cheque, but the cheques in respect of July and August would be withheld until our authorities had been able to ascertain whether or not the child would return to school.

We now feel, in the light of the experience we have gained in the administration of this allowance, that it would be better for us to ascertain prior to the closing of the school year whether a child proposes to continue at the school, in the following term or not.

If it is learned the child will be returning to school, under this amendment, we shall continue the allowance through July and August, and in September, when we have had verification that the child has returned to school, the allowance will be continued until the child reaches 18 years of age.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Farm Products Marketing Amendment Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated to the members of the Agricultural Committee yesterday when we were discussing the Dairy Industry Act, we are submitting an amendment to the Farm Products Marketing Act to make more specific the percentages required in connection with the taking of a vote on a farm marketing scheme.

Apparently, down through the years, since the Farm Products Marketing Act has been in effect, votes on marketing schemes have been more or less by "rule of thumb." It is felt that this places too much responsibility on the Minister, and though we do not feel at this time it would be advisable to stipulate in the Act just what those percentages should be, we are making provision by this amendment whereby we shall stipulate by regulation what percentage is required in order to carry a marketing scheme vote of the producers of any particular farm commodity.

The only other change of any significance is the introduction of a new section in connection with penalties. We felt that where a group of producers have properly reached an agreement as to minimum prices, any individual producer who may make some private arrangement to sell at less than the minimum price, should be liable to a penalty, and that any penalties which are imposed should be paid either to the commodity group or to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

HON. G. ARTHUR WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the following to the House.

The 53rd annual report of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission for the year ended December the 31st, 1953.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

HON. MR. C. DALEY moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This bill has been the result of very careful consideration of the Labour Relations Act, as it presently exists, and of the results obtained from past administration. It deals to a great extent with the interval which elapses during the course of conciliation. For some considerable time now, there has been criticism of the length of time which has been taken up by conciliation proceedings, and this bill endeavours to reduce the period of time. As a matter of fact, it has accomplished a saving of some 24 days.

It also gives to the Minister some permissive power to appoint, or not to appoint, a Board of Conciliation. That is quite a step in the administration of this Act. It proposes to recognize Trades Councils. We are getting now to a period when a great many unions endeavour to negotiate, as Trades Councils, particularly in the building construction industry. For a long time we have had employers' associations and we are now, by this Act, endeavouring to recognize Trades Councils, which are comprised of a group of unions.

In that connection it will not be necessary for each individual employer, or each individual union to have representation on bargaining committees.

One of the sections of the original Act is clarified to make sure that no trade union or employer can alter working conditions during the period of negotiations. It gives to the board the power to bar unsuccessful applicants, or anyone else, from making new applications for a period of at least 10 months. The purpose of this: supposing an application is made for certification, which is unsuccessful, and somebody else appears for the same group of employees. The result is, that sometimes the employer finds he is concerned with negotiations

with the same employees, to whom certification was not granted.

The bill also liberalizes inclusions in connection with craft unions so that the board may include persons commonly associated in their work. For example, the operating engineers and the coal drivers. At present, operating engineers cannot include in their union, people who actually work normally with them. This measure would permit such inclusions in a bargaining unit. The bill also clarifies the position of guards in bargaining. It has always been a very contentious matter to define what a "guard" in industry actually is. This defines the meaning of the word.

Also, it will be an unfair practice, under this new legislation, for an employer or a union to bargain, or conclude an agreement, on behalf of employees who are already covered by an agreement with another trade union, or where bargaining rights have been established.

There are a great many other sections in this bill, and since I presume this will be covered again on second reading, I will conclude with those remarks.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) send this bill to the Standing Committee on Labour?

HON. MR. DALEY: This bill will be decided in the House.

MR. SALSBERG: Does that mean the hon. Minister will not send it to the Labour Committee?

HON. MR. DALEY: Exactly.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister refuses to send it. Is that the position?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister has said it will not go to the Labour Committee, and I take it that it will not.

MR. SALSBERG: Shame.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

THE PUBLIC PARKS ACT

HON. MR. G. H. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Parks Act."

Motion agreed to: first reading of the bill.

He said: Several municipalities have asked authority to combine the different park boards and playgrounds into one board to look after all the work, if they so desire, in a municipality. We are amending the Act so they can have either 3 or 5 members on the board. If they have 3, it will not be necessary to have any of the council on the board, but if they have 5 or more, they must have 2 representatives from the council.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act."

Motion agreed to: first reading of the bill.

He said: This is quite a lengthy bill, containing a number of amendments. This bill, together with the former one, will be sent to the committee.

MR. SALSBERG: To the Committee on Municipal Law?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister is setting a good example.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act."

Motion agreed to: first reading of the bill.

He said: The same applies here, Mr. Speaker. This bill will be referred to the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, may I say I do not think it has been the sad duty of the leader of

any Party in this House to announce during the session of the Legislature, the passing of three members in so short a period of time as some two and one-half weeks. I can assure you, sir, and the hon. members of this House, that I feel very keenly having to announce as a leader, or chieftain—if I may put it that way—of a Party, of the death of three warriors, two of them young men with all the possibilities of great futures before them, and the other a grand old veteran of his community and of this Chamber with a great record of public service to his credit.

As one who has enjoyed the type of warfare in which we have been engaged, in the House and elsewhere, it is with sadness that I recall—as an old soldier, going back some 40 years—other days when we were engaged, as young warriors in the armed forces of our country; which brings to mind that during that time, many comrades and friends have fallen around me. I do not think we ever become used to this, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary as we become older, we feel more painfully the force of these blows, and perhaps, to a greater extent, the void created by the passing of our friends. The ordeal is not lessened; it becomes greater. This afternoon, with these indelible memories—because they are imprinted on us all—it is with sorrow that I announce to the Legislature, the passing of Joseph Daniel Nault, the member for the constituency of Russell.

Over a period some very considerable time, the late Mr. Nault was plagued with indifferent health and his death occurred early this morning.

Of exemplary character, he has gone to his eternal reward. We find comfort in the thought that while he has left behind the things “temporal,” he is fortified by the everlasting virtues of the things “spiritual.”

It has been said that “the day of one’s death is greater than the day of one’s birth,” and as the member deserved praise in his lifetime so, in the well-merited words which will be spoken by many in these circumstances about the late member, special mention might be

made now of his record of public service.

He was first elected to the Ontario Legislature in 1948, and was the first member of our Party in 24 years to represent the great constituency of Russell in this House. He was chosen by the people of his constituency, among other things, because he was a veteran municipal leader. He served for 11 years as reeve of the council of the Municipality of Eastview, in addition to other years as a councillor, and in that capacity also sat for many years on the Carleton County Council.

Mr. Nault was a worthy representative of that constituency. He was very much at home in the great Party of which I have the honour to be Leader. Representing the fine French-Canadian folk who sent him to this Legislature, their culture and their ideals—he did so in a manner which won for him, and for them, the respect of all members of the House. Their confidence in him was indicated when he was returned to this House as their representative in the general elections of 1951. Truly he was a man of the people!

Employed by the Canadian National Railways, he had a fine record of service with that organization, and was highly esteemed by all those with whom he came in daily contact.

In this House today, we pay tribute to his memory, and the flag in front of the Parliament Buildings again, for the third time during this session, flies at half-mast for one of the hon. members of this House.

Our deep sympathy is extended to his sorrowing widow and her family, for it is by them the loss will be most keenly felt.

We salute our good friend and colleague, as he passes from this mortal scene, leaving behind him a great record of public service.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would join with the hon. Prime Minister in paying tribute to another member of this Legislature. On three occasions within the last few weeks, and while

this House has been in session, our members have been visited by Death, and today we mourn the passing of the late hon. member for Russell.

Mr. Nault was a kindly, unassuming man, a man truly, as the hon. Prime Minister said, of the people, one who understood their problems, who moved amongst them with an ease which perhaps many of us wish we possessed.

Mr. Nault, as we all remember, was not able to take a full part in the deliberations of this House, as he was restrained by failing health and illness, and was not able to participate in the debates, in a way in which he otherwise would have done.

I am sure we all share with the hon. Prime Minister in paying this tribute, and extending our sympathies to the family of the late Mr. Nault.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Leader of the Opposition in expressing our very great sympathy to the family of the late Mr. Nault.

As stated by the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Nault was a representative of the French-Canadian people. Coming, as I do, from a riding almost 60 per cent. French-Canadian, I was interested in Mr. Nault, and spoke to him on every occasion I had the opportunity of meeting him. I found him a quiet, gentlemanly member, and I feel greatly his passing from this House today. I wish to extend to his family, our very great regret at his passing.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, for myself, I wish to extend my sympathies to the family of the late hon. member for Russell, to his many friends, and the Party with whom he was associated, and the government, which has lost a supporter.

It was my privilege during one session, to be a deskmate of the late member, and during that period I learned to admire and respect him for his gentleness and friendliness and his consideration for other people. It was

then I learned of his long years of work in the trade unions amongst the railroad workers, something I had not known when I first met him in the House.

I am sure he would have wanted to have been with us during the last couple of years more frequently than he was. He was interested in all legislation, and sometimes, while it did look odd to me, yet it was true that he had a continuing interest in labour matters, even though he did not share my views, and was a supporter of the government of the day.

I am sure he will be missed by all of us.

MR. SPEAKER: Within the space of less than three weeks the hon. members of this House have been called upon to pay tribute to three of our colleagues who have been called from the cares and duties of this life. Today, we learn of the loss of Joseph Daniel Nault, the hon. member for Russell. Mr. Nault, while perhaps not too well known to many hon. members, was to those who knew him one of the most kindly, gentle and sincere men of our acquaintance. His quiet manner only carried his convictions that much further, and his simple sincerity attracted worth-while attention. Suffering from ill health for some years, he bore his affliction with courage, fortitude and faith. His influence will be greatly missed. To his family we extend our heartfelt understanding and our prayer is that they will find in God their sure refuge and strength. We are grateful for having known him.

May we observe one minute's silence please, in grateful recognition of the life of Joseph Daniel Nault.

One minute's silence; all members standing.

Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of those that depart hence, we most humbly beseech Thee to look in love and mercy upon the soul of Thy child, Joseph Daniel, whom Thou hast called from the cares and duties of this world, into Thine Eternal Presence. Grant that as we believe in the reality of Life Eternal, so too may we, his friends and associates, find comfort in

that same knowledge for him. Graciously look upon those bereaved by their loss, and may they find in Thee—the God of all mankind—a sure refuge and strength in their time of sorrow. For all his weaknesses and shortcomings we beg Thy mercy. For all his good deeds performed in the midst of this world may he be a lasting memory of thanksgiving and may his human understanding add to the betterment of all with whom he came in contact. May he find Eternal Rest in Thine unbounded love. All of which we ask in the name and for the sake of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, who is the Resurrection and the Life. Amen.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to make a statement. I wish to announce that Mr. C. H. Nelson, former Chief Engineer of the Department of Highways, has been suspended for failure to co-operate with the Provincial Auditor and other officials in charge of the investigation. It was felt that Mr. Nelson's co-operation in this matter could have very greatly expedited the investigation, and his suspension is ordered until certain information is made available.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the investigation of certain contracts with the Department of Highways, I have been informed today that warrants were executed by the Provincial Police at 10.30 this morning, at the business premises of the following contractors:

Klimack Construction Limited

Standard Paving Limited

Fort York Construction Limited

and examinations of the books and records seized are being made by Clarkson, Gordon & Company.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Are these in addition to the ones announced the other day, Mr. Speaker?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: That makes 9 or 10?

HON. MR. PORTER: There were 6, I believe. This makes 9.

MR. W. ELMER BRANDON (York West): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House, an article which appeared in the issue of Tuesday, March 16th, of this year, in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. The article purported to be a report, in part, of a meeting of the Education Committee of this Legislature which was dealing with Bill No. 84, "The Schools Administration Act, 1954," and had under consideration at that particular time, section 4, which is the section of the bill dealing with school holidays.

The article in part reads as follows, under the caption: "M.M.P. Says Remembrance Day Only Half-Hearted Holiday."

Although Chairman Elmer Brandon (P.C.) York West, maintained Remembrance Day was a half-hearted holiday, the House Committee on Education yesterday voted to continue it as a school holiday.

Mr. Speaker, the article is correct in part, but it has an ambiguous, or two-fold meaning, which I think should be clarified to the hon. members of this House.

It is quite true that I did say that Remembrance Day appeared to be a half-hearted holiday, but may I be allowed to elaborate as to the details in that connection?

As we all know, over the years, Remembrance Day, as we now know it, was formerly called "Armistice Day," and it commemorated the signing of the Armistice at the end of World War I, at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, of the year 1918. Some 21 years after the signing of the Armistice, we found ourselves involved in World War II, which came to a conclusion in 1945, and subsequently the words, "Remembrance Day," became associated with both World Wars, I and II.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose which I had in mind in making the remarks which I did before the Committee on Education was to draw to the attention of the committee at the time that school holidays were being considered, how Remembrance Day could be better impressed upon the minds of our school children and the citizens of our country. Remembrance Day is one of the greatest of all holidays throughout the entire year. It is a holy day, rather than a holiday. It is a day wherein we commemorate the memory of those who made the supreme sacrifice and of those who have participated by way of sacrifice and effort to uphold those democratic principles which we, in this country, believe in and desire to protect.

The facts which I desired to bring forward at that time and which were expressed, were these: That it is a fact, unfortunately, that inasmuch as many of the people of this country take Remembrance Day as just another holiday and do not take part in municipal services where Remembrance Day services are held, by their attendance and by their participation. It is my belief and my opinion that Remembrance Day should be brought to the attention not only of the people of this province but the people of the Dominion of Canada, and in particular to the new Canadians who are coming into our midst every day.

The fact is that Remembrance Day is an institution of remembrance, as far as the people of Canada are concerned, as far as remembrance is concerned we desire from year to year to commemorate the memory of those who have gone before in battle, and have given the complete sacrifice, or of those who have suffered physical or personal injury as a result of their war services.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that as far as Remembrance Day is concerned it is with regret that I bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House that it is not observed the way I think it should be. I think that something perhaps should be done by way of suggestion to the several Boards of Education throughout the country as

well as other groups by way of preparing a programme whereby the children in our schools might the more readily be enabled to appreciate and be fully informed as to what Remembrance Day is, and in order that they might participate in services of the kind.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

THE TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

HON. MR. PORTER, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, moves third reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

THE OPERATING ENGINEERS ACT, 1953

HON. MR. DALEY moves third reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend The Operating Engineers Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

HON. MR. PORTER, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, moves third reading of Bill No. 56, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS QUIETING ORDERS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, moves third reading of Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend The Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT

HON. MR. PORTER, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, moves third reading of

Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, moves third reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in connection with these third readings may I mention to the hon. members of the House that the passage of the bills on third reading leaves the legislation then in the position that it only requires the assent of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to make it law, unless there are other provisions in the bill itself.

I am not sure I will call upon His Honour to enter this House between now and prorogation to give assent to the legislation which has been already passed, but I might say that it is always possible. I would not want any hon. member of this House to feel the fact that third reading has been given to any bill would mean it would not be assented to until the prorogation of the House. As a matter of fact, we have very often in the past brought in His Honour to give assent to legislation so that immediate effect might be given to it.

I do not see anything at the moment to make it desirable to ask His Honour to do that in connection with any of the present legislation, but, owing to the fact that the point was raised in the House the other day during my absence, I make that plain, that His Honour might, for instance, come here tomorrow and assent to bills which have been passed if it should be in the public interest to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Before putting that motion, may I point out to the hon. members that the passage of this motion under these

circumstances in no way constitutes a vote of confidence. As a matter of fact, if the government were unable to sustain the assaults of the Opposition in connection with the passing of the budget, then, of course, the motions which will be made from now on relative to the Estimates of course would not be effective. However, this is a procedure, I would point out to the House, that we adopted some few years back to facilitate the orderly consideration of the Estimates.

It used to be years ago that the Estimates were never considered until the budget was adopted by the passage of the supply motion, and that resulted in the consideration of the Estimates being left until the last two or three days of the session. I recollect some occasions on which the House sat all day to consider Estimates, all of which were put through within a period of some 12 hours. Sometimes we sat all night to do that. We felt that was completely undesirable and there should be the opportunity for an orderly consideration of the Estimates, and a technical matter should not stand in the way.

Therefore, I point out to the hon. members of this House, and particularly to the hon. members of the Opposition, that the adoption of this motion in no way takes away from their constitutional right to defeat the government if they can raise the necessary force.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Dent in the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supplementary Estimates of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1954. Vote No. 1, 205.

MR. OLIVER: On the First Vote, in 205, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Prime Minister was delivering his Budget Address, he drew the attention of the House to the very great importance of the facilities for teaching dentistry in this province. He said in Canada, there are only 5 dental colleges, the largest of which is in Ontario. However, with Ontario's growth in population alone, extension is necessary,

and with the demands of some other provinces, the need is immensely magnified.

I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me from what I have been able to learn—and there will be those in this House more conversant with the situation that I am—that it is almost a mistake of the government to grant to the present dental college \$1 million for increasing and extending the present facilities.

There are two points which are raised in one's mind when discussing this grant of \$1 million to extend the present facilities. In the first place, it would mean that we are, in a sense, perpetuating what may be at the moment an unsatisfactory condition so far as housing and accommodation of the dental faculty is concerned. It would, in the second place, keep the building there in perpetuity if we are going to try to renovate or improve it. It would mean a stabilization of that institution on that particular site for many years to come.

I would like to know from the government if they are satisfied that this building as it is presently located is adequate and if it is, in their judgment, sound economy and wise spending of the public money to add to this institution; or, rather, does the hon. Prime Minister not think it would be better to start building a new faculty of dentistry away from the present site, into which could be woven all that science has provided during the years, to have it up-to-date, and to have a faculty of which the people of Ontario would be proud, and one which would serve the dentistry profession better than the present building is able to do?

HON. MR. FROST: The question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a very fair one. Here is the problem: we are faced, not only in Ontario, but right across Canada, in some places more acutely than here, with a very critical shortage of dentists. The problem which faces us is this: if you go to a new site now, you have involved in that, the construction which probably would run into a commitment of \$5, \$6, or \$7 million. When you are spending that

amount of money, you have to make sure you are right.

You will readily see that the planning of such an institution as that would probably, with the present pressure on architectural services in Ontario, require a study of the technical men which would involve a year's time before anything was done, as a matter of fact, after that, there would be the construction of the building.

It seemed to us that with the present Royal Dental College, we all admit, there are inadequacies, but how do you make progress in the most rapid way? We felt the method to progress the more rapidly is to make an addition or additions to that building. The building itself does not become useless by any means. It can be used for other purposes; and by that method, you make the most rapid approach, and you are able to get into the production, as it were, of more dentists more quickly than you would if you took the other course, with all the delays which there must necessarily be in a matter of that sort.

MR. NIXON: How adequate are the grounds?

HON. MR. FROST: Of course, the expropriation of certain property will be required, but that has been canvassed, and I do not think it should preclude the planning and building of a completely new building in the course of time, because with the extension of the Toronto University, these buildings can readily be used. That does not, as I say, stand in the way of the future building of a completely new plant.

May I point out to the hon. members the unbelievable difficulties there are when you get into the construction of a place of that sort. The Cancer Institute, which is mentioned later in these Estimates, is a case in point. Part of the problem in connection with the Cancer Institute has come about because of the difference in views of expert people in connection with that problem. You have certain people, doctors and others, who take a certain point of view; others adopt a completely different attitude. A settlement of all that, before

you actually give it over to the architects, involves time to iron out all the difficulties and see what the correct approach is.

The minute you start out into a brand new dental college and building, you are going to be faced with the inevitable differences which should, in all common sense, be settled before you proceed with the building.

We felt that we would proceed more rapidly, at the same time, not lose our money, because the building may be used by the Toronto University which is going to require added accommodation about 1960. It is inevitable that we will be able to use that, and it will provide the opportunity, first to plan, and then to decide the right course to take, with a very large sum of public money.

I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition—and I know he will agree because he has obviously read the budget statement with relation to it—it would give an opportunity to the Federal Government, by providing a place where they could extend their health grants and assistance, because we are helping to bear the burden.

MR. OLIVER: They are not doing too badly.

HON. MR. FROST: That may be, but remember we are bearing the burden for the country in connection with this. I am not one of those who thinks it is an interference with our constitutional rights to accept a grant in connection with the dental college. I would be delighted to accept it, and I leave the door wide open for such an offer.

MR. OLIVER: Can the hon. Prime Minister tell me whether this money is to be used for renovation, or for a new addition, or for what purpose?

HON. MR. FROST: We have discussed this with the Board of Governors of Toronto University and we specify nothing in that regard. We give them \$1 million to assist them to produce more dentists.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the government to help me out.

HON. MR. FROST: I would be delighted.

MR. SALSBERG: I am somewhat bewildered by the supplementary Estimates. Not that I have any objection to the \$1 million we are due to give to the dental college. I think it is a very good idea. But I am wondering what yardstick the government used in deciding to dispose of these enormous surpluses which they obviously did not know how to dispose of otherwise. It does look to me as if the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and his immediate aides were closeted in a room with surpluses continuing to pour in on them while they were nervously seeking ways to hide or get rid of some of this revenue they had not counted on getting.

How did they arrive at this decision to put \$17 million into the Highways Fund and to devote nothing toward a supplemental allowance for old-age pensioners? It is quite obvious that one is certainly as important as the other. To my mind the latter is of greater importance. Thousands of aged citizens are struggling to "get by" on an allowance which keeps them at starvation level, and one might imagine with such a surplus something would be done for them. But, in fact, nothing is done. Yet there is this fairly large sum of \$17 million which is allocated to highways.

To take another item: \$1 million is provided in the supplemental Estimates for the Public Service Superannuation Fund. I have no objection to the government doing that. But having done so, why did it not think of setting aside the necessary amounts to take care of the most deserving section of the retiring teachers who are compelled, because of the whole background of our retirement fund system, literally to starve?

These are the teachers who served our people and helped to raise the generation which is now active, including some of the hon. members of this House. I know that some of my former public school teachers are now existing on a pittance simply because the fund, as established at that time, was inadequate. How does the government explain, rationally and reasonably, the

disposition of such a large surplus, when it fails to include such vital needs as those of the teachers, old-age pensioners and similar groups?

This is the reason for my bewilderment. I would be thankful if the hon. Treasurer would explain the logic of his conclusions, and the yardstick that he used, so that hon. members may have a more intelligent understanding of what is being done.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I despair of being able to rescue the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) from the bewilderment and confusion in which he finds himself. I may say to hon. members that the matter of the introduction of supplementary Estimates here in this House is a development of responsible government. In other words, instead of making the expenditure and then coming to the House and saying the money has been spent, the government has been living within the votes granted by the Legislature last session. That is good parliamentary and constitutional practice. I feel that we are coming here, telling the House what we propose to do, and asking the House for its authority to go ahead.

In connection with the other part of the question by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), these Estimates, which are before the House, are all to provide an investment in the future of our great province. They are designed to do that. As a matter of fact, inasmuch as they are paid for out of ordinary revenue, they are, nevertheless, a continuation and an expansion of our policy of paying as much as we can of capital expenditures from ordinary revenue.

As I pointed out to the House when the budget was brought in, in the last 10 years we have succeeded in paying something over 65 per cent. of our capital commitments from ordinary account. We are living at present in days of great expansion and development—a process which I know hon. members of this House will agree has been contributed to by the action of this government. We have been in the forefront of expanding our province and

of course, with the expansion that has taken place, we have been able to increase our revenues without increasing taxes.

In these days I think it is a matter of wise policy to take these things and invest them in the betterment of the province. What better thing could we do, for instance, than vote \$4½ million, approximately, to our universities, to enable them to meet the stresses and strains which we know are going to come, half-a-dozen years from now? To give to our public general hospitals, that are doing a great job, monies they can apply on debts or the rehabilitation of their buildings?

The same applies, sir, to superannuation. May I point out, it is a matter of strengthening the resources or the funds upon which these matters depend.

In connection with old-age pensions, this government could introduce a supplementary type of pension which the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) knows full well would be the root and genesis of dissatisfaction. We did that some years ago when some of the hon. members now here were not in the House. May I inform them that fully three-quarters of the speeches of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)—and they were not short speeches either—were directed against the iniquities of the supplementary payments. We got away from that around 1950, or thereabouts, and I never want to get into it again, if for no other reason than to avoid having to listen to the interminable speeches of the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) on that particular subject.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): The Honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will hear more now.

HON. MR. FROST: Our position is this. Old-age pensions are a national matter. Pensions to those over 70 are payable without a means test, and this government had a major hand in obtaining that for our people. Pensions for those between 65 and 69 are payable on a partnership basis, fifty-fifty under

federal regulations. Shortly, pensions for disabled persons are going to be payable in the same way, I assume. The hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) can tell us about that.

If the Federal Government raises the level of pensions from \$40 to \$50, or whatever it may be, then we will be pleased to pay our share of the "shot". I can assure you, sir, that this business of going back to where we were a few years ago, with the chaos of misunderstanding which then existed in trying to give one person a supplementary pension of \$2.50 and another person some other amount, is thoroughly unsatisfactory. We have a great deal more satisfaction, justice and equity, the way things are now.

MR. SALSBERG: And a great deal more starvation, too.

HON. MR. FROST: After all, these things develop with our economy. The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) talks about "starvation." I sat in this House, as have other hon. members, when pensions of \$20 a month were given to a very limited number of people. Now we have scores of thousands of people, without regard to any embarrassing tests and examinations, who are getting pensions. I think we have to be honest and recognize that no government can do everything. We, in Canada, have done very well, when one looks at the whole picture. We are a young country; we have to sell our goods on the markets of the world to keep up our standard of living. We have to be sensible. I think, in Canada, federally and provincially, we have done a very reasonable job.

May I say this, that so far as the pensioners are concerned I recognize that pensions contracted for years ago, today in the light of a 40c. dollar, may be quite inadequate. That is one of the reasons why this government insisted at the Federal-Provincial Conference on giving all people over 70 years of age a pension without a means test. That has been stated in this House. As the country and our economy can afford it, with good judgment and good sense, I think the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr.

Goodfellow) will probably say the age limit could be lowered to 65 years. That does not rest with us as our responsibility but lies with another government. It has been openly discussed, and it is known to the people.

In course of time, I should say that such improvements will come about, as the country can afford it, as the taxpayers can afford to produce the money, and as our ability to produce goods so we can compete on the markets of the world, reaches a point where this can be done.

Concerning the \$17½ million for highway reserve fund; this year it brings the amount to \$30 millions, which is the same amount as in the last fiscal year. In setting up that fund, we are placing an amount there voted by the representatives of the people, which can be used in a reasonable, proper way for highway extensions, and, particularly, if employment demands in this country require it. I, by no means, come to this House and say that because the money is there we will spend it. We will not. We will spend it if we can spend it well, and if the plans and specifications and surveys can be properly prepared and if the needs require it. If they do not, then we will carry it forward to another day.

That sir, is the explanation of the supplementary Estimates.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I say a word on the subject which is under discussion, in reference to supplementary allowances? The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will not mind if I inform him that I think he made out a very weak case.

HON. MR. FROST: My cases are always weak with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver).

MR. OLIVER: A very weak case in respect to the government's position in this matter. In other words, we have, as the supplementary Estimates would indicate—and other matters which have been brought before the House—the money to do the job.

We have, correspondingly, a great need for those supplementary Estimates; and, with that, we have the examples of at least 3 other provinces in Canada, which I suppose are less wealthy than we are.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that they all have sales taxes, one of them has a 5 per cent. sales tax. Would he advocate that?

MR. OLIVER: I do not think the hon. Prime Minister adds anything to his argument by saying that. It is a fact that in this province, because of the buoyancy of revenue, we do not need to impose a sales tax in order to do the job which they are doing.

HON. MR. FROST: We might have to next year.

MR. OLIVER: We might have to?

HON. MR. FROST: Certainly we might.

MR. OLIVER: But if I were the hon. Prime Minister, I would take a chance on next year, and pay to these old people a supplementary allowance. The hon. Prime Minister says he is not going to do it because of the difficulties involved in administration. The difficulties, no matter how immense they are—and certainly there are difficulties in administering a supplementary allowance—really fade into insignificance as against the great need there is for such an allowance. And if there is a will toward these things, certainly there is a way, if we have the money to pay for it.

MR. SALSBERG: It should also be pointed out that 65 to 69 years of age pension is entirely based on the means test as it is. There is a periodic check-up of income as well as of need. So all you might be burdened with is the additional group of 70-and-over group who might apply because of need. Actually the basis is all there, and the machinery of the government functions very well, I think, in the 65 to 69 years' group. Sometimes, I feel, too well.

HON. MR. FROST: I can assure hon. members that I have no intention of jeopardizing the fiscal future of this province. Before us today we have great opportunities. If we just use common sense and good judgment, we can provide great employment, or, at least, assist in those things which are going to maintain a high level of employment in the province.

With the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) I entirely disagree. Because we have money this year that can be used for a particular thing, should we pledge ourselves to that in perpetuity? He is like a treasurer who at one time was in this House—many years ago—and who had some money left over. They asked him what he did with it, and he said, "I had the money and I spent it." I am not doing that. I do not think we should. I think we should look at these things sanely.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition says, "Take a chance." Mr. Chairman, what a chance we would be taking! This year, due to a buoyancy of business, which has been, to a large extent, stimulated by this government, we have money we can apply to things which are going to be a great investment in the future of this province and this land of ours. The hon. Leader of the Opposition says, "Turn around and commit yourselves to a policy that is going to make sure that you spend that money next year." If, Mr. Chairman, we do not have this buoyancy, then we probably would be confronted with the predicament of some of the jurisdictions and provinces, which the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, which have sales taxes running as high as 5 per cent. I by no means criticize those places, but I point out that you cannot have your cake and eat it. If you put these things in, you are going to pay for them.

What would be more difficult and harder on our people: the present situation we have here, with the lowest taxes in Canada, and with an economy that is bounding forward, or to do something like this requiring the imposition of a sales tax which in itself falls on all the little people?

MR. OLIVER: If your economy is bounding forward, you still think you would need a sales tax?

HON. MR. FROST: Of course you would run into that situation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition should sit down and read the budget, and he will see how careful the housekeeping and the financing have been to achieve these things.

MR. SALSBERG: And a lot of sweeping under the carpet, a lot of gold-dust underneath it.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, before the vote is carried, may I say the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) last Thursday mentioned that \$300 a bed was given for the retirement of capital debt or rehabilitation. I was wondering, if the Hospital Boards wished to make further extensions of the hospitals some time in the future, would they be allowed to use that money? Because, the hon. Prime Minister definitely stated the money was to be used for capital debt or rehabilitation.

HON. MR. FROST: That is correct.

MR. THOMAS: You would not allow it to be used for the extension of the building in the future, would you?

HON. MR. FROST: I beg your pardon?

MR. THOMAS: Would you allow that amount of money to be expended on some future extension?

HON. MR. FROST: I never like to "prime the pump" too much. We make grants, for instance, of \$1,000 a bed, or whatever the schedule may call for; I think it would be quite unfair, from our standpoint at least, if we were to use this money for the extension of certain plans which would, in addition, involve grants. I mean, that would be "snowballing" things.

No, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the grant is this. I know one very fine hospital in Toronto, at the lower end of Church Street, which has a rather con-

siderable debt, which has been worrisome and difficult for them. They can take their money and apply it to that. Another hospital, say the one in Oshawa or some such place, may be free of debt, but they want to fix their roof or fix the boilers, or something of that sort. If so, they can go ahead and do it. I think this money should be used for such purposes as that.

Vote No. 205 agreed to.

On Vote No. 206.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): On 206, Mr. Chairman, there is a vote of \$1 million, and on the next page there is another \$1 million for the Public Service Superannuation Fund. May I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), does this sum make these funds actuarially sound?

HON. MR. FROST: No.

MR. OLIVER: Then, are we going to keep putting it in, year by year? Is there no way of arriving at a conclusion as to what is required?

HON. MR. FROST: We, of course, in 1954, have the sins of the fathers visited upon us; the sins of other governments.

MR. OLIVER: If that is all the "sins" the hon. Prime Minister had, he would be all right.

HON. MR. FROST: And the sins of other governments. For instance, the government to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition belonged—or series of governments.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Those sins were all washed away long ago.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. members that over the years there has been accumulated an actuarial deficit in the Teachers' Superannuation Account and in the Public Service Superannuation Account. Each year, for some years past now, we have been putting a certain sum of money into these accounts. I think this is about

the picture. The Teachers' Superannuation Account, as I recollect it—and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) can correct me if I am wrong—will at the present rate continue to increase in amount without any additions from us, until about 1970, thereabouts. Even if we added nothing more every year, we would have more in that fund until 1970, but then it would start to decline, and by the time we reached approximately the year 2,000, there would be a deficit of \$90 million or more, according to my recollection. That is what the actuaries tell us, and one has to be guided by what the experts tell us to a certain extent. What we plan to do by the addition of \$1 million this year as we did last year and the year before, is to help extend that 1970 period up to perhaps, by now, 1980, and by gradually going ahead, we can better the situation.

There is, of course, the expedient that one could take of voting, for instance, \$25, or \$30, or \$50 million, which hardly seems a fair thing to do. It hardly seems to be necessary. As a matter of fact, the government underwrites these accounts anyway, and I think if this procedure is followed, as and when we can do it, then we will gradually overtake the deficit that was left to us by other governments which have preceded us.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Prime Minister given any consideration to the situation of those placed on Workmen's Compensation, who are being paid on the basis of 50 and 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of a wage rate, which was much lower than it is today?

HON. MR. FROST: That, of course, does not enter into these Estimates, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member (Mr. Thomas) might ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) when the Workmen's Compensation Bill is brought down. I might point out, however, the same difficulty is inherent here, as in the payments to which the hon. member refers. They are actuarially computed at the time. For instance, a railroader who subscribed to a pension plan contract in 1925, with the feeling that in 1955, he

would be in an adequate position from the standpoint of pension, is faced with this situation. Quite obviously, with a complete change in the economy of the country and the value of the dollar, he is now in quite a different position than he expected to be. However, as I say, that was one of the reasons for the old-age pension being changed.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) could give us an idea as to just how much money would be required at the present time, if we were to put a certain sum into the Teachers' Superannuation Fund as of today, to place that fund on a proper operating basis?

HON. MR. FROST: At the present time, if one follows the actuaries, it might be \$40 million, or something of that sort, and that would take all the money in the supplementary Estimate and a little more. We are meeting that situation in a gradual way.

MR. OLIVER: Does what the hon. Prime Minister has said apply to the Public Service Superannuation?

HON. MR. FROST: I should say the Public Service Fund is very considerably less than that—around about \$20 million. Of course, we must remember there are half the number of people involved. Perhaps relatively, the cost may be the same. In any event, the government underwrites both of them. Our idea is to try to bring them into a proper position, which can be done if the plan is followed in succeeding years.

Votes 206 to 209 agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply reports that it has come to certain resolutions, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, on Monday afternoon, just before the adjournment of the House, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made the statement that on Tuesday, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and myself, would "take the government to task" for expanding its budgetary expenditures. At that time, I had no intention whatever of getting into the Budget Debate. As a matter of fact, the hon. Prime Minister practically "pitch-forked" me into this debate. I did not intend to speak in this debate.

I do not intend in the debate to refer to the hon. Prime Minister's speech. I do not like figures, and I am not going to become involved with them. I am afraid if I tackled some of the figures here, the hon. Prime Minister would immediately "tie me up," and I would not know "where I was at." So, I am going to take advantage of what many hon. members have done in previous years, and that is to wander widely afield in speaking in the Budget Debate.

I am going to speak about some matters pertaining to my own riding. In the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I did not make any reference whatsoever to the riding of Cochrane South, so I am going to take a few moments this afternoon to speak about matters pertaining to that riding.

I should like first to mention highways. I am not going to speak of anything pertaining to the Fort William scandal, or anything of that nature. My remarks will be confined strictly to the highways of my own riding, and I am very pleased indeed to see that the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) has just come into the House, as the majority of my remarks will be addressed to him in his Ministerial capacity, in which he provides funds for the mining access roads.

The first road to which I wish to refer is Highway 101, extending from Timmins to the Quebec boundary, through Matheson. I have spoken on several occasions in this House about this highway, and have addressed my remarks on previous occasions to the

hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), but he has turned a deaf ear to all pleas, so I am going to turn now to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) to see if he will give us a little consideration.

The hon. Minister will recall that 3 or 4 months ago he and I both attended a meeting of the Northeastern Municipal Association, at which time members of the different municipalities very strongly impressed upon us the necessity of completing Highway 101 through to the Quebec boundary.

The majority of Highway 101 was completed in 1947, I believe. The road extends from Timmins through Matheson, and then cuts across to the Quebec boundary. In 1946 or 1947, the Minister of Highways of the Province of Quebec, constructed a road right to the Quebec boundary, in fact I believe it extends a couple of hundred feet into Ontario. This road was constructed in anticipation of the completion of Highway 101.

I do not know why Highway 101 stopped short of the Quebec boundary, but there is a small section of 7.2 miles remaining to be constructed. It is not a very expensive proposition, if it were constructed under the Mines Development Road Plan or mining access roads. I think it could be constructed as a secondary road, and I am sure that it would satisfy the people of both Ontario and Quebec.

At the present time, anyone living in the northwestern portion of Quebec desiring to come to Timmins or any of the other towns in the Porcupine area, have to travel southward to Rouyn, and then across to Kirkland Lake, and then northward on Highway 11, which means a trip of about three times the length of the journey from the border to Timmins if Highway 101 were completed. I am hoping the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) will provide sufficient fund in his Estimates to complete this short section of road.

Another road I want to refer to is the Warren Lake extension. The hon. Minister of Mines has done a great deal of work in connection with the Warren Lake extension, and I congratulate him

on what has been accomplished. This has meant a great deal to the Timmins area, or the Porcupine Camp. If that road can be extended so that it will link up the highways coming up from Sault Ste. Marie it will mean that American tourists can cross the border at Sault Ste. Marie, and travel up to Timmins, and then pass down Highway 11 to North Bay. That is, they can make a loop without having to travel just one way, turn around and go back again. It will mean a great deal to the Porcupine Camp in bringing in the tourist trade, and I am sure the hon. Minister has plans for the extension of this Warren Lake road, and I am hoping the construction will be completed this year.

I want to say a few words to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett)—and I am not going to criticize him at all—in connection with Highway 11. Highway 11 in my riding has every foot of it paved, and I think that is a great accomplishment. Some 10 or 11 years ago, when I first came into the House, very, very little of Highway 11 was paved in Cochrane South. Today it is all paved, and in excellent condition. I can realize the benefit, if I happen to travel over the portion of Highway 11 in the riding of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly), Cochrane North. Much of Highway 11 in Cochrane North still remains to be paved.

Another matter I want to mention in connection with highways has been mentioned here on several occasions. Several hon. members have referred to the very great death toll on our highways. I think it is time that something is done to prevent so much destruction, both of life and to property, on our highways. Several hon. members have suggested remedies which might be taken. Some suggested putting governors on the engines of cars; others suggested increasing the penalties. I do not think either method is effective. The governors can be "monkied with"; they can be taken off or disconnected. Besides that, I have heard it suggested that a governor slows down a car in a "get-away" at lower speeds, that is, at 35 to 40 miles per hour. The mere presence of the governor on the engine will slow it

down. It might be that a little spurt of speed under 50 miles an hour might avert an accident, and if governors were on, a person might be in a dangerous situation, in that he could not prevent such an accident.

Therefore I do not think a governor on an engine is the answer. Nor do I think that increased fines, or increased penalties mean very much to those who offend on our highways.

I think there is only one way, and that is to take away the privileges enjoyed by drivers. If those who operate motor vehicles lost their privileges for some considerable period of time, it would mean that a great many more drivers would hesitate to break the law. That is, for offences where we now impose perhaps a fine or imprisonment for 10 days, why not take away the privileges of driving for 1 year, or 2 years or 3 years, and in that way I think we would do much more than at the present time with our small fines and a very short term of imprisonment.

Many of us have been shocked to see cases in court where someone has lost his life and the driver of a car has been charged with careless driving or dangerous driving, with the result that a fine of perhaps \$25 has been imposed upon him. That is shocking. Some one has lost his life and yet a very small amount is assessed against the person who has done wrong.

I believe it was yesterday we had a meeting of the Fish and Game Committee. In this committee, some of the Game and Hunting Associations suggested a licence of \$50 for a non-resident hunter who killed a moose. Here we have our courts assessing a fine of \$25 upon one who kills another motorist or pedestrian on our highways. This is merely the price of a licence. I think it is time we woke up and did something to curb the very great loss of life on our highways.

I perhaps may be unduly disturbed over this great loss of life, but, Mr. Speaker, as a coroner for 33 years, I have investigated a large number of fatal accidents on our highways, and it is a depressing thing when you go to

the scene of an accident and see some poor youngster, or even a grown-up, crushed and battered in an accident, and you know right well the accident is the result of carelessness on someone's part, or the result of drinking or something of that nature. Every time I visit one of those scenes of an accident, I feel we in Ontario should do something to reduce the number of deaths on our highways.

Some years ago, I made the suggestion that we erect on our highways signs at the site of every fatal accident, such as a skull and cross-bones. I believe it is in effect in some of the states of the United States of America. I still think that is a good suggestion. About 4 or 5 years ago, I made the suggestion that signs be erected on our highways, and our highways would be pretty well cluttered up with signs today if we had started that practice 15 or 20 years ago.

For myself, driving along the highways and in areas where I have acted as coroner, quite often I find I unconsciously lift my foot from the gas pedal of the car whenever I approach a place where I have investigated a death. Unconsciously, I slow up. I think that if we had signs, such as a skull and crossbones, showing that an accident had occurred at a particular point, it would prevent a great many of our accidents. People would slow down. If we went back over the past 20 years, there would be a sign every few miles along the highways of Ontario today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to another matter which was peculiar to my riding during the past year, and that is the great industrial unrest in the Porcupine area. On or about July 11th, strikes broke out in several of the mines in that area. Those strikes continued until a short time ago, and did irreparable harm to the Porcupine Camp.

Such strikes were the result of working men attempting to secure what they considered necessary benefits, which they could not secure in conferences with industry. Industry had completely refused to meet the men, and they were forced, as they considered it, to go out on strike. The strikes continued for a

considerable period of time, and resulted in terrific losses both to the men and to the communities wherever the strikes took place.

I think it is time this government did something to put an end to industrial disputes of that nature. The strikes were called for increases in wages, fringe benefits, and union security. There is no doubt in my mind but that the increase in wages and fringe benefits could have been arranged very peaceably between the unions and the mines employer involved, but on the question of union security, the mines' management stood fast, and refused to give union security in any shape or form, with the result that the strikes were prolonged.

Complicating the situation in the Porcupine area to a great extent is the position of labour in the paper mill centre of Iroquois Falls, which is scarcely 45 miles from The Porcupine.

There, for a great number of years, we have had no difficulty whatsoever between labour and management. In 1917, the check-off was given and in 1926, the union shop was secured by the papermakers in Iroquois Falls. The demands of the unionists in the Porcupine area were in no way comparable to what was secured in 1917, which is 37 years ago, or in 1926, which is 28 years ago. They were in no way the same.

The papermakers secured the irrevocable check-off, but they could not get it.

The whole thing is the difference in attitude of management. I would like to give you an experience which was quite close to me in Iroquois Falls. When my son came out of the air force, he started his course here at the university, and during the summer he went back and secured a job in the paper mill. I have to pay my respects to the Abitibi Power and Paper Company, in that they on each occasion helped out students by giving jobs to young men who were going through university and school. They helped them in every way.

My son went down as soon as he returned home during the summer holidays, and asked for a job. He got it. The employment supervisor, who is,

in effect, a "boss" of the plant, told him, "You have 14 days in which to take out a union card." He said, "Yes." On the date of the first union meeting he happened to have an appointment somewhere and did not appear. The next one came along, and he forgot about going to the meeting and joining the union. He went to his job the next morning and his card was pulled from the rack. He went over to the desk and said, "What is the matter? Why is my card not in the rack?" He wanted to put it through the time clock.

The clerk said, "You had better see the employment supervisor. You are in for it." He did not know what was the matter. He went into the employment supervisor's office and stated his case, the supervisor answering, "Don't you recollect I told you, you had 14 days to join the union?"

Well, he said, "I just forgot about it."

The supervisor said, "I will give you 5 more days." He certainly did not forget again. He had 5 days in which to get his union card.

That is the difference.

It was a "boss," as it were, one of the senior executives of the Abitibi Power and Paper Company, who said to the men, "You are not going to get a job in here unless you join the union," and joining the union meant the compulsory, irrevocable check-offs, as well as all the other obligations of the union.

HON. MR. DALEY: That was according to the agreement, was it not?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, but these agreements were entered into many years ago. Those privileges, as I have pointed out before, were secured in 1917 and 1926, and you could not get the Abitibi Power and Paper Company, or any of the paper-making companies to wash out those agreements or take a different stand. They are all co-operating with their men.

However, it is a different thing when you come to the mining industry. In mining, they do not want to give any concessions whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is this: In paper-making the men who are now at the top, started at one time at the bottom. "Doug" Ambridge is the president of all the Abitibi Companies—I recollect when I went to Iroquois Falls 33 years ago—he was a young engineer at Iroquois Falls, starting at the very bottom. He worked his way up but he never forgot the men he worked with, and never forgot his union.

Therefore, the same thing applies to all of the mill managers. All the big executives of the paper-making industry were men who worked their way up; their sympathies rest with the working men. But in mining, men have taken on the presidency of a mine simply because of financial positions which they were able to command, and they have no sympathy whatsoever for the men working in industry.

During the period the strikes were in progress, the men appealed to this government on several different occasions, but I do not think the government went to any trouble whatsoever to try and overcome the difficulties. The government was in sympathy with the employers, the mine managers, and did nothing whatsoever to assist in solving these difficulties. In fact, mine management had an arrogant attitude towards the government. I recollect that during the summer while one mine was on strike, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) asked management and labour to come to Toronto for a meeting. A mine manager made the statement, "I am not going to talk to that man, Daley, and if Frost calls me up, I will hang up on him."

HON. MR. DALEY: He did not do it, though.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask you, is that any way to refer to two important Ministers of the Crown? Surely, he could have said, "The honourable Mr. Daley," or "the honourable Prime Minister," but instead of that, he adopted a manner which showed the general attitude of management.

HON. MR. DALEY: Would it be asking too much, Mr. Speaker, for the gentleman's name?

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Brown of Broulan Reef. He made that statement and it was published in the Timmins press. Broulan Reef was the one mine where all the difficulty occurred, where the manager armed a group of guards and sent them in, ordering them to shoot down strikers who trespassed on the property.

Now, I think that much more could have been done by this government to solve the difficulties in the Porcupine area. In fact, these difficulties were never solved. The men were driven back to work because they could no longer stand the economic pressure of the situation in which they found themselves. I think this government could do a lot to enhance the position of the working men. When the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) introduced his bill today, I had very great hopes that it would assist the men in regard to union security. I thought that was what the bill was going to cover. But all it does is make some very slight improvement in the Labour Relations Act. It means nothing whatever to the working men of the Porcupine area.

The trouble will occur again. The same trouble will break out, maybe in 1 year, maybe in 2 years. These men are bound to demand their rights. As far as wages go, it is quite clear they have a legitimate case. They knew what was being paid at Iroquois Falls in the paper-making industry. The rate there was \$1.41 an hour. The basic rate in the Porcupine area ranged from 83 cents to \$1.01. That was the highest basic rate in the Porcupine area at the time of the strike. As I say, the men working in the Porcupine area knew what was being paid in the paper mill at Iroquois Falls, and they knew the mining industry could afford to pay them a better wage in the Porcupine, and you cannot blame the men for going on strike at that time for an increase in wages.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government could do a good job by acting at this

time. Do not wait until a strike comes, but get the mine management and labour together, and do a public-relations job, so that the difficulties can be ironed out, and proper concessions granted to the working men of the Porcupine area.

I did not think, Mr. Speaker, I would be able to speak at this length. I have been suffering from laryngitis all week. As a result, I shall have to shorten my remarks. I am appealing again to the government to do something which will prevent further serious strikes, as we had in the Porcupine area last summer. Some 50,000 people live in that area, and 50,000 people knew very great fear and suffered intense hardship. This government owes it to the working men of the Porcupine area to see that this situation never again occurs.

MR. A. R. HERBERT (Temiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I would like at the outset (of my remarks) to tell you how much I have admired the way you have been able to carry on your duties as Speaker of this House so that this session of the Legislature has been running very smoothly, and in a business-like fashion. You are held in respect by all hon. members, because of your unquestioned competence in your demanding position, and also because of your polished approach to the conduct of the affairs of this House.

I would also like to avail myself of this occasion to congratulate our hard working hon. Prime Minister for the good news he has brought to us in his 11th consecutive Budget Address. This is quite a record—an all-time record I understand—and I have no doubt that he will add many more Budget Addresses to the number he has delivered up to this time.

As a representative of a northern constituency to this House, I would like to make a few general remarks on the situation there. The news of the developments which have taken place is a mixture of good and bad. I am sure that all hon. members were saddened by the prolonged stay of operations in the Porcupine Gold Mines. A disastrous strike has done a great deal of harm to

the cities, towns, companies, the gold miners and the families who depend on them, as well as to the business organizations situated in the affected regions. I say it is regrettable that such a strike should have taken place because first of all, the gold mining industry—which has long been a prime developer of our northern regions—has been for some time now in a depressed condition for reasons well known to the hon. members. Kirkland Lake never quite completely recovered from the strike there some years ago, and I am afraid that irreparable damage has been done in Porcupine. Such is the curse which strikes at a single industrial community. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for the Federal Government to start doing something for these single-industry communities in Northern Ontario. There is no reason in the world, in my mind, why some of the Crown Companies could not be established in such areas as around Porcupine, Kirkland Lake, and Cobalt, where power, transportation, communication, housing, educational and public service facilities already exist; and where production, owing to uncontrollable causes, has fallen below the level where all the above-mentioned facilities and services could be used.

As a northern member of this Assembly, I find it difficult to understand why so many industries establishing themselves in the southern regions, should not look to the north as possible sites for their plants. The industrial expansion in areas which are primarily agricultural, because of the rich soil there, is definitely hard to understand. It certainly does not fall in line with the dictates of proper land use. The day is not far off when we will regret this turning over to industrial use of the vast areas of Southern Ontario, which should have been kept under the plow.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that a serious study of this problem should be made. If economic reasons are given as an excuse for not using these facilities and services available in the north, then I hold that the governments of our province

and of our country should get together and figure out the answers.

I know freight rates come in to the picture. I think Ottawa could well look into the matter of subsidizing the transportation of goods coming from newly-organized industries in our moribund gold mining areas—and such a move would be to the good of all.

And while on the subject of Ottawa, where decentralization of federal services seems to be a fashion keynote these days, I would like to suggest to the Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe that the Porcupine area would be indebted to him for quite some time, if he decided to move the gold refinery section of the Royal Canadian Mint from Ottawa to Timmins or Kirkland Lake because most of the gold refined in Ottawa comes from these areas. And if, through such action, Mr. Howe displeases the touchy Mayoress of Canada's capital, on the other hand, I think he would make quite a "hit" with another no less formidable political personage, namely, Mrs. Anne Shippley, of Kirkland Lake.

What I have just said about the precious-metal refinery, should also apply to the Federal Government's metallurgical services. By establishing such services in the depressed gold mining areas, it would serve the dual purpose of helping these communities to survive, and, at the same time, bring the invaluable technical services of the Dominion Government closer to the seat of mining operations. The established mining camps of Ontario are all centrally located and are serviced by unequalled highway, rail and air facilities.

The above suggestions are made because, although the problems of gold mining communities are extremely serious to the communities themselves, they are in fact much less difficult of solution than, for instance, those confronting the Metropolitan government of Toronto, the trans-Canada pipeline, or the St. Lawrence development.

But small as the problem of gold mining communities may appear in the over-all picture, the fact remains that its solution in the long run will be just

as important to the whole of Ontario and Canada, as the happy conclusion of our efforts in any other direction.

Those communities are our far northern bastions. They must not be permitted to deteriorate and become "ghost towns," because, in the foreseeable future, they should play a great role in the development of colonization in our great clay-belt areas.

So much for the gold mining communities.

Now for a look at the brighter side of Northern Ontario.

I learn from the Ontario Department of Mines that an all-time high production figure of nearly \$½ billion has been credited to the mining industry of Ontario for 1953. Besides this, the outlook for the future is such that one can foresee the time when the production figure could be nearly doubled when all the new mining discoveries come into production. Prospectors have been making the front pages of our newspapers by reporting Ontario mineral finds of untold significance to the future of this country. And while most of the big mining news in the past few years originated in Labrador, the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and the Western Provinces, it is a fact that 1953 nearly entirely reserved to Ontario minewise.

The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) has a good story to tell this House, and I will not steal too much of his thunder. But there are certain mining developments within sight of Cobalt, my home town, to which I would like to refer.

The hon. members are all familiar with the name Cobalt, but to many, the fact that Cobalt has made a comeback after many years of somnolence, is not so well-known.

This "best old town of all," as it is known in song, has surprised even the least pessimistic of mining engineers by the extraordinary revival of production which has taken place there in the past few years. The biggest news in a long time, is reserved for the coming week-end, when the refinery of Cobalt Chemicals will be officially opened. This plant,

one of two on the continent, will treat concentrates from the district mines, and its output of strategic metals will go a long way in strengthening the position of the western nations, not to mention what it will mean to the whole of the Cobalt area.

The other day I read in the *Financial Post* that a huge deposit of iron ore had been discovered near Red Lake, in the northwestern part of Ontario. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House that a large ore body of magnetite iron ore is on the verge of development in an area close to Swastika. I hear that this mineral occurrence was discovered in the course of an aeromagnetic survey, and that a highly-responsible mining company owns the rights and, further, that negotiations are under way with the transportation companies with regard to bringing concentrates from these deposits to a lake port. In this particular instance the railway facilities are close at hand, and the cost of running a spur line into the property is believed to be very small.

The projection of mining access roads, a programme instituted by the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell), member for Sudbury, a few years ago, and carried forward with such dynamism by the present hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly), is doing more toward the development of Northern Ontario than possibly any other measure attempted by any past government of this province. The present administration deserves the congratulations of the whole province for having pioneered in this direction. Discoveries have been made as a result of this policy, known mines have been brought into production because such roads made them easy of access, and besides this, such roads have opened to the forest protection services of the province a whole new network of ground communications to help them preserve our timber resources from fire.

Besides this, virgin territories have been made available to the people of this province, as well as tourists from without, to enjoy the beauties and pleasures inherent to our great out-of-doors.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this worthwhile programme of mining roads will be continued for many years to come, and that the amounts set aside each year for mining roads will be commensurate with the needs as they arise.

In closing my remarks about Northern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, I would like here to commend this administration for the deep insight it possesses in matters relating to this vast area of our province. Not only is it "insight," but rather, "positive attitude," which the government has translated into acts such as a mining road programme, the development of new highways, improvement of older roads, direct aid to mining municipalities, the improvement of hydro facilities, expansion of hospitals, increases in school space and an overall amelioration of conditions for new Ontario.

The government's record prior to the last general election gave the Frost administration a near complete representation from Manitoba to Quebec. I feel sure in the next election that position will be improved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that the deep-down qualities of this Administration could not be more admirably described than in the words used by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), in terminating his budget statement on Thursday last. Those words should be an inspiration, not to be reserved to the citizens of this province alone, but they should be broadcast to all parts of this country. They are a profession of faith in Canada such as few of our great men have ever brought forth. The credo of the late Cecil Frost in his native country, will go down in our history as a jewel of patriotic eloquence; an illuminating, resolute yet simple call to Canadian unity for the good of Canada.

When his brother, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) echoed his words with such evident emotion last Thursday afternoon, I felt—as must have most hon. members—that the future of this province was in good hands.

MR. D. McM. KERR (Dovercourt) :
Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in

this debate on the budget, may I be permitted, first of all, to express my personal sympathy to the family of my colleague who passed away last night. Sitting beside the late hon. member, and realizing his loyalty and devotion to his family, and knowing the man, perhaps more than anyone else in the House, it is with deep regret I learned of his passing. May I say to his family, and to the historic riding of Russell, that their loss is great indeed.

I would also like to couple my expression of sympathy, to include the other families who are finding themselves bereaved during and since the last session of this House.

Looking back over my experiences in this, the Twenty-fourth Parliament, since first assembled, I find myself faced with some interesting facts.

I remember the first session when the Opposition tried to find fault with this present government on the question of unemployment, and, from all parts of the Opposition ranks, there came pressure for something to be done for the then unemployed.

If my memory serves me correctly, by the next session, the unemployment situation had increased, but from the Opposition there came not one word about unemployment. Then there came a feeling that there was a possibility of a provincial election, and we find echoes of the old cry that something should be done for the unemployed at the present time.

How some political Parties can sway for the "poor fellow," when they think the "poor fellow" has a vote which they might secure, is beyond my comprehension.

Turning to the third session of this Parliament, the whipping post was hydro, and the Opposition whipped hydro, high, wide and handsome, with regard to state dinners and all the rest of it. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the other hon. members of this House saw what I did in that virulence on their part in regard to hydro? Sitting at that time, as a member of the Opposition, was one who had sat on the Hydro Commission,

the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) who knew hydro backwards. But was he the one who led this spearhead against hydro? No. The hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), who knew nothing at all about the situation in regard to hydro, was the spearhead.

I am reminded of the fact that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, after listening to the various hon. members of the government making their speeches in this House, saying something about, "He was reminded about preaching for a call." I would suggest to the hon. members of the Opposition that the boot is now on the other foot, as between the hon. member for Kenora and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and we are having a great deal of fun listening to both of them "preaching for a call," which I understand will be extended sometime in April, by the Liberal Party.

We are face-to-face today with a budget which is really outstanding, in the fact that in it is a repetition of the statement by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that there will be no increase in taxes. I wish the Federal Government would take a leaf out of the book of the hon. Provincial Treasurer in that regard, for we find constantly, federal grabs of the tax dollars leaving less for the municipalities, and less for this province.

There is one suggestion I might put forward in my somewhat limited time. Being accustomed to preaching for 15 minutes, perhaps I can "put it over" and perhaps I cannot.

I want to commend the Department of Lands and Forests for the excellent job it has done at the entrance to Algonquin Park, and in the establishment of the museum in that park.

It was my privilege to visit this park last summer. I went just as a visitor; no one knew who I was, or why I was there. I discovered that the entrance has been vastly improved through the efforts of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger). I found a very courteous and helpful institution in the museum, and I would advise any hon. members who have not visited this park,

to pay a visit to it. As yesterday was St. Patrick's Day, perhaps it would be appropriate to say there is a stone in the middle of the park which bears the name of an Irishman, who, in his wisdom, had Algonquin Park set aside as a national park.

Mr. Speaker, after last session, and after all the statements which were made with regard to hydro by the Opposition—about one month after the House prorogued, there appeared in the mouthpiece of the Liberal Party, the *Toronto Star*, an editorial entitled, "Another Great Hydro Year."

After listening about all the money which was being foolishly spent, and all that had been said and done with regard to hydro, the *Star* says:

The provincial hydro constitutes a huge financial investment; its assets approached \$1,200 million at the end of 1952. And it is on the way to becoming an even greater enterprise, as the St. Lawrence project, in which Chairman Saunders has been so active, takes form at last.

Then it goes on, and says in regard to Mr. Saunders—after all we heard said about him by the Opposition:

Mr. Saunders has done a great job for the people of Ontario since assuming the chairmanship of the provincial commission.

It goes on to say; after referring to Mr. Saunders as the "liaison" with the public:

This personal touch in which Mr. Saunders has always believed has explained and popularized the hydro to vast numbers of people, and, second only to the hydro's actual achievements, has been the most valuable and effective winner of goodwill at the commission's disposal.

This editorial appeared during the summer, after listening to all that had been said with regard to Mr. Saunders' management of this great public enterprise.

We have heard a great deal during this session concerning various ideas,

coming from individual hon. members. We have heard something this afternoon in regard to the old-age pensions.

Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion to make to the government in regard to old-age pensions, which, I think, deserves earnest consideration.

We find ourselves at this stage of our existence having to make some provision for the men and women who were placed on pensions 10 or 15 years ago. I can recall one friend of mine who was drawing a pension of \$110 then, which was adequate for his needs. He now finds himself barely existing on that pension. My suggestion is the assets which provide that pension might, in some way, best suited to the need—I would suggest about 25 per cent. of those assets—be permitted to be invested in stocks which fluctuate so when there is a “boom” in our land, the value of the stocks would rise, and some of the amount of the investment could be returned to him to compensate him for the cost of living, which, as we all know, has increased as the days go by.

This is only a suggestion, but I think it might be given consideration. Instead of having a fixed sum of \$100 per month, as a pension, if he was sure of \$80 a month pension, and the other \$20 was in a fluctuating stock, which went up as times were good, then he would receive the benefit of the good times, added to his pension. Of course, he would have to take the risk of the stocks going down. But he could take that risk for the simple reason living expenses would be less costly under depressed conditions.

May I be permitted to return to the riding of Dovercourt-Davenport for a moment. In that riding, we have a building built by this government and handed over to the Canadian National Exhibition. I am suggesting to the hon. Minister of Public Works he might spend a dollar or two on that building, bringing it more into line with the present-day needs of that great institution known as the Canadian National Exhibition.

We did spend a great deal of money in erecting that building. I do not think

it is in a dilapidated condition. I say that a little help towards keeping it in repair by this government would be beneficial. When people see it as an Ontario Government building, we are judged by its condition, and the Province of Ontario is being judged by it. I think we could spend a little money on it, and not leave all the repairs up to the Canadian National Exhibition.

May I suggest to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) regarding the packaging of food, we have a great modern invention today known as “cellophane.” Most cooked foods, such as cooked ham, are placed in this cellophane wrapping, and it is placed in refrigeration. When it was placed in this refrigeration nobody knows how old it is. You take it home and open it. As one hon. member says, “The smell would raise to high heaven.” True, we do not go back to that store anymore, but I think if a date were placed on the packaging of food, and made compulsory, we would find it would, at least, be inspected before the purchaser received it.

During the strike up north we, in the City of Toronto, were kept informed of the various statements made by various people. I would like to counteract some of the statements made by some of the union leaders during those strikes.

We found ourselves in the position of listening to people, paid organizers, making statements about the hon. Prime Minister of this province, or the hon. Minister of Labour, statements made by men who could step on a stepladder at the highest point and not even touch the ankles of those they were criticizing.

I personally am in favour of trade unions. I think they have a wonderful place in our economy, but I would like to say to the trade unions that they have a job to do, and it is not within the factory that they have to do it. They have to do it within their own unions.

In the Old Country, we have a bird known as the “cuckoo.” The cuckoo lays its egg in every other bird’s nest, and gradually growing larger, it pushes the others birds out. The unions have a cuckoo in their nest—and it is time they

got it cleaned out—in the paid organizers they employ who are nothing less than parasites living on what the working man has earned for himself. These paid agitators make conditions such as we have at Porcupine and other centres in the north.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a statement which should be withdrawn. Even if it does not refer to hon. members of the House, he called union officials "parasites." I think he is going a bit too far, even if one wants to criticize union leaders, as he may have a right to do.

MR. KERR: If the Speaker so rules, I will withdraw it, but, like the Irishman who was fined for calling his neighbour a bad name, he asked the judge, "Is there any fine for thinking it?" and the judge said, "No," so the Irishman said, "I still think it."

MR. SALSBERG: I hope his thinking will improve, too.

MR. KERR: Mr. Speaker, I shall draw my remarks to a close by saying that in the presentation of this budget, its grant to the superannuation fund of the teachers, its grant to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, its work in setting apart special grants to

hospitals, and all the other welfare grants which have been made, are proof that Ontario is being kept strong because we, the Government of Ontario, are still close to the people and know their needs and grant them.

MR. J. EDWARDS: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: I move the adjournment of the House. We will go ahead with any bill on the Order paper tomorrow.

MR. OLIVER: Will the hon. Prime Minister not designate a little more closely than that? Are there any important bills coming up tomorrow, for instance?

HON. MR. FROST: I think the hon. Attorney-General will deal with the bill relating to gas, and there will be some debate on it. If there are any bills that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) wants held over, we will do that.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, March 19, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, March 19, 1954.

Seventh Report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Stewart	617
First Report, Standing Committee on Health, Mr. Leavine	617
Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	618
Land Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	618
Magistrates Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	618
Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	618
Home of the Friendless and Infants' Home, bill respecting, Mr. Elliott, second reading	619
Royal Botanical Gardens, bill respecting, Mr. Pryde, second reading	619
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Pryde, second reading	619
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, Mr. Pryde, second reading	619
St. Michael's College, bill respecting, Mr. Roberts, second reading	619
Town of Fort Erie, bill respecting, Mr. Jolley, second reading	619
Ontario Fuel Board, bill to establish, Mr. Porter, second reading	620
Child Welfare Act, 1954, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	634
Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	637
Municipal Franchises Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	637
Gas Pipelines Act, 1951, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	637
Persons Who Bore or Drill Wells for Water Act, bill respecting, Mr. Porter, second reading	637
Petty Trespass Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	637
Ontario School Trustees' Council Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, second reading	638
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	638
Provincial Parks Act, 1954, reported	640
Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954, reported	640
Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, held	640
Trees Act, bill to amend, reported	640
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, held	641
Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, bill to amend, reported	641
Crown Timber Act, 1952, bill to amend, reported	641
Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association, bill respecting, reported	641
Township of Scarborough, bill respecting, reported	641
City of Toronto, bill respecting, reported	641
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	642

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1954.

2 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We have, as visitors to our Assembly this afternoon, members of the Service Guild of Christ Church, Port Stanley: the students of the Haliburton High School, Haliburton—the area from which our hon. Prime Minister comes, I understand—and the students of the Queen Mary Public School in St. Catharines.

It is a very great pleasure to welcome these guests to our Assembly, and we hope, with the knowledge you gather here, you will go back as more keen students, and certainly more enthusiastic coming citizens of our great province.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. J. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Seventh Report of the Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Stewart, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the committee's Seventh Report as follows:

Your Standing Committee on Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its Seventh Report:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 19, An Act to incorporate The Hamilton Foundation.

Bill No. 22, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 1).

Bill No. 27, An Act to incorporate The London Foundation.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments as recommended by the Commissioners of Estate Bills:

Bill No. 17, An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital.

Bill No. 23, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 2).

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 17, An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital; Bill No. 19, An Act to incorporate The Hamilton Foundation; and on Bill No. 27, An Act to incorporate The London Foundation.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. S. F. LEAVINE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Health, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Leavine, from the Standing Committee on Health, presents the committee's First Report as follows: Your Standing Committee on Health presents the following as its First Report:

Your committee begs leave to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 92, An Act respecting Mental Health.

Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE REGISTRY ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Registry Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the main amendment contained in this bill is supplementary to an amendment which was introduced yesterday to the Municipal Act, with respect to restrictive by-laws. This amendment provides that such by-laws are not, and never have been, deemed to be required to be registered in order to bind the land.

The Municipal Act provides for a system of recording these by-laws in the office of the municipal clerk, which will be a system designed to enable persons to find out what by-laws might affect the use of their lands.

Persons who may have acquired these rights, under a decision rendered in a case recently in the Supreme Court, are protected by a section of this bill. It does not affect anyone who has actually acquired rights, under the decision of the court, to which I have referred.

There are a few other provisions in this bill. One is with regard to making photographic reproductions of documents in the Registry Office; a provision regarding plans to be registered, and so forth.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to the Legal Bills Committee.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Land Titles Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a companion bill to the amendment to The Registry Act, covering the same main point. There are one or two other minor amendments. This bill also I shall refer to the Committee on Legal Bills.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Magistrates Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment is that where the amount of municipal fines in the magistrates' courts is insufficient to pay the operating expenses of the court, the deficiency is to be made up from provincial funds.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Judicature Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with the powers of a judge—in cases where the onus section in the Highway Traffic Act applies—to direct the jury, in his discretion, to specify the negligent acts or omissions which caused the damages in automobile cases.

This amendment expressly restores the discretion which formerly was exercised by the trial judge. When this onus section was first introduced, many years ago, it was the practice in cases where the judge thought the evidence warranted it, to direct the jury to specify the particular negligent acts, if he saw fit.

A recent decision, however, reversed that practice, and this bill is for the purpose of legalizing a practice which has always been followed under that Act.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Before the Orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Doucett) one or two questions in rela-

tion to his statement yesterday that the chief engineer had been suspended.

I have been informed the chief engineer has recently left the country. Has the government any information in respect of this? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, as a basis for a further question, that if the chief engineer's lack of co-operation was so important as to cause his suspension, why were steps not taken to keep him within the jurisdiction of the province so that he would be available for questioning and the submission of evidence before the Select Committee? I would also like to ask when, and in what way, the chief engineer refused to co-operate?

HON. MR. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): I may say, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), I do not think any of us knew the chief engineer was going away. What was the second question?

MR. OLIVER: The second question was: Why, if his lack of co-operation was so important as to cause his suspension, the government did not take steps to keep the chief engineer within the country?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I do not think we had sufficient information to take that step. We did not know he was going to leave.

MR. OLIVER: I think the hon. Minister should inform the House as to when and in what way the chief engineer refused to co-operate.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I was not present at the examination, but I understand from the Provincial Auditor and the solicitor that the engineer would not answer the questions they were asking of him.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day I would like to table answers to questions number 14, 18, 20, 22, 28, 29, 33, 46, 48, and 49.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

THE HOME OF THE FRIENDLESS AND INFANTS' HOME

MR. ELLIOTT (Hamilton East) moves second reading of Bill No. 7, intituled, "An Act respecting the Home of the Friendless and Infants' Home."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ROYAL BOTANICAL GARDENS

MR. PRYDE, in the absence of Mr. Connell, moves second reading of Bill No. 12, intituled, "An Act respecting Royal Botanical Gardens."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

MR. PRYDE, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, moves second reading of Bill No. 9, intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of Toronto."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

MR. PRYDE, in the absence of Mr. Jolley, moves second reading of Bill No. 13, intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE ACT

MR. ROBERTS (St. Patrick) moves second reading of Bill No. 20, intituled, "An Act respecting St. Michael's College."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF FORT ERIE

MR. JOLLEY (Niagara Falls) moves second reading of Bill No. 30, intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ONTARIO FUEL BOARD

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No. 94, intituled, "An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board."

He said: I explained the main principles of this bill on first reading, but, no doubt, some hon. members will desire to have a debate on this measure. Before the debate proceeds, however, I may say that I propose in the committee stage to introduce an amendment to section 16, which, as it now reads is as follows:

Without restricting the generality of section 15, the board may make orders fixing the rates and meter rentals to be charged to ultimate consumers of natural gas.

I propose to move an amendment of that section to cover rates and charges for the transmission and storage of natural gas.

I also propose that this bill be referred to the natural gas section of the Committee on Mining, which meets, I believe, on Monday at 10 a.m.

If hon. members now wish to discuss this bill I shall be pleased, after such discussion, to deal with any questions they may raise.

MR. OLIVER: I can say at once, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the principle of the bill is concerned, we are favourably impressed. We are going to support the principle of the bill. In committee, of course, as the hon. Minister will probably agree, there will be room on some of the suggestions for some difference of opinion. I was glad to hear the hon. Attorney-General say the bill was going into committee. I think a bill of this character should be sent to committee where the most minute examination may be given it. I think the hon. Attorney-General will himself appreciate, together with most hon. members of this House, that this is one of the most important bills which have come before the Legislature this year.

The bill seeks to deal with a very great problem—a problem which is not immediately upon us, but for which we are preparing by passing this legislation

which, in effect, will be complementary to the federal legislation in connection with the main pipe line from Alberta.

There are two or three things that I wish to say to the hon. Attorney-General in connection with this whole matter. One of them is: Has the government in any way made an agreement on how much gas it will take from Alberta? If so, for what length of time? It seems to me that is a very important point on which we should have a definite answer from the hon. Attorney-General. Is there a commitment on the part of the province in any shape or form to buy any amount of gas for a stated period of time from the Province of Alberta?

If the hon. Attorney-General can tell us in his answer that there is no agreement of any kind on the part of the province then, of course, the problem becomes one of creating or building up a market for this gas when it does finally arrive in Ontario.

It would appear from press reports that 1 or 2 years must elapse before the gas is finally here and available for consumption in this province. In that period of time it would seem that a market must be created to absorb and consume this gas when it is available for distribution within this province.

Has the government made any agreement as to the preparation of this market when the gas finally arrives from Alberta? I think this matter is important. I would like to hear what the hon. Attorney-General has to say on the subject for a moment.

HON. MR. PORTER: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) does not mind, I would prefer to wait until the end of the debate rather than answer questions from each hon. member as he enters into the discussion. This is being discussed on second reading and I think we should deal with it along those lines.

MR. OLIVER: If the hon. Attorney-General prefers to answer later, that is all right. I want, now, to throw this other idea into the arena for discussion so that the hon. Attorney-General can answer that, too, at the same time.

As I understand it, in order to create a market for this gas when it arrives, arrangements are being made, or are in process of being made, for gas to be brought from, I think, the State of Tennessee and to be distributed here in Ontario. It is felt that the availability of this gas would create a market for the Alberta gas when it comes.

I think the hon. Attorney-General should make it clear to the House that when the Alberta gas comes to Ontario there will be reasonable confidence, in the opinion of the government, that at the appropriate time the Tennessee gas will stop coming and the Alberta gas will take its place. This seems to me to be an arrangement of tremendous significance. I want to be assured that the government is sure in its own mind that this reversal of trade can take place—that the gas can come in for 2 years, and then, when all is ready, it will be able to turn the valve to shut off the gas from Tennessee and let in the gas from Alberta. I think this point might well be given some attention.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make about Bill No. 94 and I would be interested in hearing the views of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) when he replies at the conclusion of the debate.

The people who live in the northern part of the province are keenly interested in the development of the pipe line across that part of Ontario, for it will be of great value to industry and to potential industry in the north.

There are, however, many aspects of this picture which need clearing up, both in our minds, and in the minds of many who live in the southern part of the province.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has raised an important question about a market for Alberta gas when it is eventually available for distribution. He also asked about the shutting off of the import of American gas when Alberta gas is available to take its place. There is one other aspect of this question, however, Mr. Speaker, which

I think deserves some consideration. Perhaps it has already been well considered by those who have prepared this legislation. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to raise the question of the future of the Ontario producers when this legislation becomes law and when Alberta gas is ready for the market. In Southwestern Ontario particularly, farmers and other land owners retain, with their deeds, the mineral rights of their property. There is a certain fear abroad that when Ontario gas becomes available in large quantities a situation may develop where local producers will have difficulty in finding the right market at the right price for new sources of gas.

It has been suggested by some responsible geologists and others with knowledge of the oil and gas industry, that the future potential of Southwestern Ontario as a producer of gas has scarcely been explored. The suggestion has been advanced that, as the work of exploration proceeds and more capital becomes available for these activities, further important discoveries will be made.

I am told, again by people with reliable geological experience, that the average deepest point of wells in Southwestern Ontario is now about 2,000 feet. They suggest, once the drills start getting down to 6,000, 7,000, 8,000 and 9,000 feet, the picture is going to change and we are going to find vast resources of oil and gas in this part of the province. I want to be assured, before this bill is given parliamentary approval, that all Ontario producers will be protected, inasmuch as they will be able to market in this area in future any natural gas which may become available.

There is a suggestion in Alberta now that the financial position of that province has reached a point, where, in the foreseeable future, the government may be able to take drastic steps to limit many fields of taxation as the result of royalties being received. Some years ago, a Party leader in that province predicted the day would arrive when the government might be able to give a \$25-a-month bonus to every citizen. I would not want to see that bonus given to the people of Alberta—though I would not deny them

having it—by the farmers and producers of Southwestern Ontario.

I would like to see a complete review undertaken of the whole natural gas situation in this province so that everyone concerned might be assured that our own producers are fully protected both at the present time and, in respect of time, 25 years hence.

There is a further aspect of this question which will bear some examination later on. Perhaps during discussion of the Estimates. But I can only agree with the statement which has been made by many people connected with mining and oil that the activities of the government in survey and exploration work are most inadequate. I notice in the Estimates this year we have set out \$34,000 for this purpose. Last year \$32,220 was allocated for this work. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these sums are wholly inadequate to meet the needs of expansion in this field.

I hope the committee will go into this field and take some time to examine the activities of the National Gas Commissioners office. Not from the point of view of criticism—I do not suggest that at all—I suggest the activities of this office should be examined to determine its extent and how it can be best augmented and improved to develop the industry, which I think has great potentialities.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): The subject matter dealt with in the bill now before us for second reading is unquestionably of historic proportions. I am sorry that the same cannot be said for the legislation. The fact is, we are at a turning point on a matter of historic long-range significance. What we do now will affect the course of events for many years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is from this an approach such as this that I feel very unhappy about the legislation which is before us. Not that I object to what the hon. Attorney-General's proposed—

HON. MR. PORTER: In other words, you will vote for the bill.

MR. SALSBERG: But the bill is hopelessly inadequate, and constitutes, in my opinion, a terrible retreat on the part of the government on a matter of such historic significance.

It is, I think, undeniable that the government has pursued a policy on the question of natural gas which was both hot and cold at the same time. It has offered from time to time, brave words which caused us all to gain confidence, faith and renewed hope, only to realize that the brave words were followed by very timid and ultimately retreating steps.

In short, it is my conviction that the government has failed to give consistent leadership on a fundamental question as was done in years gone by, by another government and under the inspired leadership of Sir Adam Beck.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Sir James Whitney was the Prime Minister.

MR. SALSBERG: Sir James Whitney was the Prime Minister, and it is regretted that this Conservative Government did not seek inspiration and guidance from that government and from Sir Adam Beck on a matter of equal significance.

What is the question? It is one of determining for a long period of time how and under what circumstances, this great province is to gain a natural—and we hope—cheap type of fuel, which is in abundance, so that industry and private consumers can benefit from it.

The government did, on occasion, come out with statements which deserved universal support; for instance, and I think I mentioned this on a previous occasion during this session when the hon. Prime Minister came out with the statement—that the construction of an all-Canadian natural gas pipe line is as important for this country as was the building of the first trans-continental railroad. We struck a note which received warm response, and, I think, general approval across the country, not only in Ontario.

Then there were indications from Queen's Park the government not only

would take a hand in assuring the natural gas pipe line would be an all-Canadian project, rather than a north-south diversion, which was advocated by certain privileged groups, but that the government would go further and seek to establish what amounts to a public ownership administration.

HON. MR. PORTER: When did the government ever make any such statement?

MR. SALSBERG: I will come to it.

HON. MR. PORTER: You never come to it, though.

MR. SALSBERG: If you will only have a bit of patience—

HON. MR. PORTER: We have had patience for 10 years and you have never come to the point yet.

MR. SALSBERG: My friend, the hon. Attorney General is the most impatient man when we are dealing with any question about which he is touchy. He is a touchy man. Particularly, when his position is vulnerable. He becomes very impatient.

As I said, the first statement was that of the hon. Prime Minister. Then, we received word that the government had set up a subcommittee, headed by the hon. Attorney-General, the fuel controller of Ontario and the chairman of the Ontario Hydro to deal with this question. When that committee was set up, I am sure members of all Parties and the public at large approved of it and were hopeful that their efforts would be successful. We were led to believe that the subcommittee would not only work energetically to make sure we would have a Canadian pipe line, but that it would be publicly owned.

HON. MR. PORTER: There never was any such inference or suggestion. If the hon. member had examined closely any statements which did come from the government, he will know that the committee was merely for the purpose of exploring every aspect of the problem, and that no decisions were

made until now. This bill is the first indication of any decision as to government policy in this matter.

MR. SALSBERG: I will supply a portion of the available evidence to substantiate my point, if the hon. Attorney-General will permit me. But I will say, in reply to his remarks, that the government, or, at least, he as head of the subcommittee, was careful not to issue statements which I can now produce, and that all statements bore the explanation, "It comes from an authoritative source."

HON. MR. PORTER: I just wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that these quotations from "authoritative sources," did not come from the government or from anybody authorized by the government to speak. I do not know where they came from. They are just like most of the "stuff" that the hon. member "dishes out" in this House.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General again reveals his fear of coming to grips with this problem in a grown-up manner. He acts in the style to which we are accustomed.

HON. MR. PORTER: So do you.

MR. SALSBERG: He does not like "some of the things I dish up." Well, I "dish up" what I think is necessary, and not what the hon. Attorney-General will like.

For instance, I "dish up" annually the hon. Attorney-General's promise to the people of this province that he will clear the slums in 10 years. I have presented that every year. Now, this is the ninth year of his 10 years. He does not like it, but I will bring it up again during this session. The hon. Attorney-General will excuse me when I "dish up" what I think is necessary in the interests of good government and in the interests of the people.

The committee travelled to New York, Quebec, Alberta, and it was quite obvious these trips were for the purpose of not only clearing up the situation, but that the Ontario Government, quite

properly, was doing what it is expected to do, to make sure that the best interests of the people will be served.

HON. MR. PORTER: And they will be served by this bill.

MR. SALSBERG: That is not true, and the hon. Attorney-General knows it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: He has retreated. I think it would be far better if he were to come here and say, "I am sorry, I will have to retreat."

HON. MR. PORTER: We have never retreated in 10 years.

MR. SALSBERG: Only the hon. Attorney-General does not retreat.

When the chairman of the Ontario Hydro was there, it, of course, lent colour to the belief that it would be a publicly-owned utility.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is ridiculous.

MR. SALSBERG: And the further proof was in the reports that came out. We have, for instance, a review of the situation by a person I consider responsible, the financial editor of the *Toronto Star*. On January 5th, 1954, he said in his column in the financial page of the *Star*:

The Ontario Government has indicated some interest in public ownership and the matter apparently is to be considered further at a Cabinet meeting shortly.

HON. MR. PORTER: "To be considered."

MR. SALSBERG:

What the government has in mind is not clear. But there has been some suggestion that Ontario Hydro might take over distribution of natural gas in much the same way as it now distributes hydro.

HON. MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member consider that a declaration of government policy?

MR. SALSBERG: It indicates the government was seriously considering it.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is what he said.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes. I am sorry if he was wrong. I would be very sorry, indeed, to learn the committee did not even consider it. I gave the members more credit than that.

HON. MR. PORTER: We considered everything.

MR. SALSBERG: Now, the hon. Attorney-General says he considered everything. Therefore, he considered public ownership.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. SALSBERG: We have that much out of him, that the government did consider public ownership as it considered everything else.

HON. MR. PORTER: Of course we did.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to say, to the extent that public impression was created, the government was considering public ownership of the natural gas distribution in this province—to that extent the people by and large were very happy. There were at that time a great many resolutions adopted by the labour movement and others, expressing the hope that the government would establish public ownership of the distribution of natural gas through some commission, either as hydro, or administered by Hydro. There would have been no objection to making it part of Hydro's task. But after that, the newspaper reports began to cast clouds upon the horizon. The news was—and I am reading a headline: "Hint Hydro Leaving Gas to Private Firms."

This heading is over a story in the *Star* of January 20th, 1954, under the by-line of Mr. Roy Greenaway, one of the best informed men in the gallery. The story is as follows:

It seems certain now that the distribution of natural gas in Ontario will be by private companies and not by the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission, it was learned today at Queen's Park in official circles.

"Spokesman," "official circles," "well-informed people." You know how newspaper men are obliged to resort to this method.

Then he continues:

For some time now, the Natural Gas Committee of the Provincial Government has been considering the problem of distribution and will soon make a recommendation. At the start distribution by the Ontario Hydro was considered, but even the Hydro Commission was opposed to such a move and indicated it did not wish to mix sale of electricity and natural gas.

That may be a reasonable view on the part of the Hydro officials, but if it was not to be Hydro, then it should have been another government commission which would operate it as a publicly-owned utility.

From then on, it went from bad to worse until we have complete capitulation as expressed in the legislation now before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I make such a big point of the public ownership of the natural gas distribution, I do so for two reasons: First, because I believe in public ownership. I am opposed to a scheme which will grant to an American-dominated company, a company primarily of Texan financiers, to get a strangle hold on the distribution of natural fuel for generations to come. That is what it will mean if we allow a private company to saddle us with the distribution of natural gas.

It is pretty well known to the government—and the hon. Attorney-General knows more than I do, I am sure, as he has more access to facts than I have—that the two companies which are now being combined into one are dominated by United States' interests. Mr. Speaker, that company will be given the franchise for as long as we, and those

who follow us, live. It will extract the maximum profit it is capable of extracting from the people of this province, and other provinces. I say it is illogical, it is unreasonable, it is wrong to pursue such a policy. Why should the people of Ontario, industry and private consumers, or the people of Quebec or Alberta, have to pay tribute to financiers from Texas, who will invest \$500 million dollars or more in the building of the pipe line?

This country is not in its colonial stage; it is not short of finances, and it has more than enough money to finance this and other big enterprises.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Supposing it operated at a loss?

MR. SALSBERG: They will make a minimum, we are told, of 8 per cent. on the investment.

HON. MR. PORTER: Where did the hon. member hear that?

MR. SALSBERG: I heard that. If the hon. Attorney-General, the chairman of the subcommittee, did not know that, I shall be very glad to enlighten him. There are definite statements from these companies that the Alberta Government is intending, or has already, limited their profits to 8 per cent. At least 2 companies have boasted of this as an indication of the limitations put upon them, and to convince the people that they will not rob them too much.

We do not need that. Furthermore, if we were to develop the gas pipe line service as a publicly-owned utility, we could supply natural gas to industry and private consumers at a greatly reduced rate, thus, helping industry as well as home owners. We could finance the whole enterprise on money at 3 to 4 per cent., not 8 per cent. If there is \$300 million invested in the building of the pipe line, and other hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidiary development, then that money will earn for United States investors 8 per cent. per annum.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is what you say.

MR. SALSBERG: Because it is a monopoly, and nothing will stop them from "upping" the rates, if the dividends should decline by as much as 1 per cent.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): The consumption will control the rates.

MR. SALSBERG: The Consumers' Gas Company, acting under a charter given them by the Legislature away back, limiting their profits to 10 per cent. has been able to establish for itself a position as a gilt-edged security investment, because of it being a monopoly and being able to raise prices.

That is exactly what this monopoly we are about to establish will do. Certainly they will not fall short of what we allow them. They will continue to make up to 8 per cent. We could finance it at 3 per cent. or 4 per cent. and let industry feel the benefits of cheaper fuel, and let the home owners have fuel at a lower rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) in one respect. When introducing the bill, on the first reading, he said, "This is not just an Ontario problem, it is a national problem." I agree with that. But that does not eliminate the need for bold leadership from this government, nor does it prevent us—this Legislature—from acting other than will be the case in other provinces, insofar as this province is concerned.

First, I would say that this government should give leadership. It started a few times to act as if it were going in the right direction, and then it gave us the feeling as if somebody had slapped it over the wrist, and said, "Now boys, do not become too rambunctious," and they began backing up. Then, a few days later, another group made a statement, and somebody else knocked them over the wrist, and again they stepped back.

That is not good enough. I think this government should—and this Legislature would support it—come out boldly and

say during this session—now, the time has come for Ottawa, and the governments of Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec to get together with Ontario in an emergency meeting, and set up a national body, appointed by the governments, and that body will operate a publicly-owned gas distributing agency.

I think, frankly, there are very many members of this government who feel the same as I do. I think that is true. I am sure there are many supporters of the government who feel the same way. I am sorry the pressure from other sources compels this government to back down. They should not.

HON. MR. PORTER: I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg), Mr. Speaker, there has been no pressure.

MR. SALSBERG: Then the government has changed its way, and Bay Street has changed its colours, which I doubt very much, because, like the leopard, Bay Street will never change its spots.

I think there should be leadership toward getting Ottawa and the other provinces to act jointly with us. If that fails, then we should go it alone.

We should have another bill, not Bill 94, but one which would say, as far as we are concerned: "Acting on behalf of the people of this province, we will have a publicly-owned utility to handle this gas distribution in this province, as we are doing with hydro."

We could find the money and do a good job, I am confident.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry we have Bill 94. Do we need control? Of course we do. Do we need some of the things suggested in the bill? Of course we do. But that does not improve the situation. We need an entirely different bill, and to take an entirely different position.

May I say that what we need today is the spirit and courage and the convictions of historic men like Sir Adam Beck.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: And Whitney.

MR. SALSBERG: All right, and Whitney. Let us rise to the occasion. I say to the hon. members of the Legislature that this is not a routine bill. Unfortunately, it can become a routine bill, setting up certain controls and setting up a commission. To do what? To facilitate a Texas-dominated corporation getting its grip upon the distribution of Canadian natural gas for generations to come. That must not be. I think the hon. Prime Minister of this province who has made some very fine promising utterances in connection with this matter, and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), whom I thought shared the views of the hon. Prime Minister, and who has gone to a great deal of trouble travelling up and down the country, would come to this House and say, "We are sorry but we have to fight on this issue, as was done a few generations ago."

If there had not been men like Sir Adam Beck, and Whitney, there never would have been hydro in this province, and the development of this province would not have been as rapid as it has been, if we had no hydro system, owned and operated by the people of Ontario.

I say this despite criticism I have offered in regard to Hydro.

HON. MR. PORTER: I always understood the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) thought Hydro was no good.

MR. SALSBERG: That is beside the point.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member never liked Hydro.

MR. SALSBERG: That is another question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: Hydro is not a matter which has anything to do—

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) never did think very much of it.

MR. SALSBERG: This differs from Hydro, in that Hydro has grown up

through various administrations. I say the progress of this province would not have been as it has, if hydro had not been established.

Let us now seek examples—yes, I will use the word "inspirations"—from what Sir Adam and some of the others may have done: not from what the Government of Alberta may be doing, but from the annals of the past, to which so many of the supporters of this government turn, so that some positive action may be taken. Let us do it at this time, before it is too late. If we pass this bill at this session of the Legislature, then we are missing an historic opportunity; we will be saddling the people of this province with something they will resent, and condemn those who have been responsible for carrying it through.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, the bringing of gas to Ontario will mean a great deal to the northern part of the province. We in the north suffer from one-industry communities, and we feel if gas could be brought to these northern communities, it will mean other industries will establish branches in our northern towns, which will assist to develop the north.

There is one question I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), and which I will ask him to answer when he speaks, and that is this: The distribution of gas will be by feeder or branch lines to the different towns in the north. What would be the attitude of the government toward several municipalities combining resources and running their own distribution line to the main line, and then distributing it to the municipalities, as they pass by? At the present time, municipalities have no power to go beyond their own limits in building lines of this nature. Would the government facilitate a union of several municipalities carrying on a public-utility venture, such as this, getting their gas from the main line, and bringing it to the different municipalities?

Another question, Mr. Speaker, in regard to distribution: It may be that

as it comes across Ontario, the wants of some of the municipalities may exhaust, or partially exhaust, the supply of gas. What provision is there in the bill to see that no one community gets a major share of the gas, to the disadvantage of any other community?

As discussion on this bill proceeds, it becomes more and more apparent that this government does not intend, in any way, to distribute gas as a public utility. That is why I asked my first question of the hon. Attorney-General. Will the government facilitate or permit—I am not asking that it build a line, or hand over the necessary funds—but will it facilitate the opportunity for municipalities to combine in Northern Ontario, to distribute their own gas, that is, bring the gas from the main line to the different municipalities?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the question put by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) in this debate. He asked whether there was any commitment by the province—and I presume he means the provincial government—to take any specific amount of gas, for any specific length of time.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure this House the government has not made any commitment of that kind whatsoever.

As I indicated on first reading of this bill, the trans-Canada pipe line will be privately owned, as opposed to being government-owned.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is a federal matter.

HON. MR. PORTER: I will come to the questions raised by the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) a little later. At the moment, I am dealing with the question asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver).

The main transmission lines will be financed and operated by what may be termed a "private company," which no doubt will have shareholders widely separated, and bonds widely distributed, for all we know at the moment.

This government is not in a position—nor do I think we should—find ourselves in a place where we are going to pledge our own taxing resources to make sure that a specific amount of this gas will be consumed during any particular period of time.

This is a private enterprise, and as such, it will find the gas, will transmit it, and sell it. If they cannot sell it, that is their own loss. It would seem the best guarantee that gas would be consumed in the greatest possible quantity, lies in the fact they will want to sell as much as possible, to assist in paying for the cost of the line, the costs at the Alberta end, for the operation of the line, and, no doubt, to provide some return on their investment. As far as I am concerned, I cannot see anything wrong with that. I believe that private enterprise is what has made this country go. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) spoke about the first trans-continental railway being financed by government funds—

MR. SALSBERG: They took it over from private enterprise.

HON. MR. PORTER: We find the gas in Alberta—

MR. SALSBERG: We will be taking the gas over—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. PORTER: Has the hon. member completed his remarks?

MR. SALSBERG: For the moment.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest he round them out, and then keep quiet.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, I will be back again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. PORTER: Who built the original trans-continental railway? Was it the state? No; it was private enterprise. It was built by men who risked their own money; many of them spent money on the chance of securing

some benefit, and some of them "went broke" doing it.

The hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) suggested the Alberta Government is using some of this gas for the benefit of its people. How do they get it? Does the state create it? No; private enterprise handed it to them on a platter. If the money we distribute by way of grants to municipalities is earned by private enterprise—

MR. SALSBERG: Why do you not sell hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. PORTER: We are not discussing hydro at the present time.

MR. SALSBERG: Of course, we know more about hydro than we do about this gas.

HON. MR. PORTER: At the time the legislation was before the House, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) spoke about it as if it were no good.

MR. SALSBERG: It was only because I liked hydro.

HON. MR. PORTER: No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will say the same thing about the public gas situation, that it will be no good.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Attorney-General runs it, it will be bad.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. PORTER: I wonder what it would be like if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) were to run it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. PORTER: This government, as I say, has not been called upon, nor do I think we should be called upon, to make any financial commitment as a government.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): If it was not called upon to make a financial commitment, was the government called upon and did it furnish, an estimate of what gas might be used?

HON. MR. PORTER: Oh yes. I may say a great deal of work was done in exploring the different markets, and various marketing possibilities. It may be of interest to hon. members if I gave a brief summary indicating some of the problems involved.

There is the domestic market in the municipalities to which gas is distributed for the heating of houses and for domestic use. Gas provided for these purposes is generally the highest priced, principally because the supply varies from month to month in accordance with the quantity consumed, due in great measure, the weather. When gas is sold on that basis a higher price can be obtained.

Then there is gas which can be sold to industry on an interruptable basis. There are industries which are prepared to instal gas equipment, despite the fact that they may use coal or oil in normal circumstances. If they can secure gas at a price that is low enough, they are willing to change over to gas, from time to time, when there is a surplus—during the summer months, for instance, when the domestic consumption is down.

The great objective of any company operating a pipe line of this kind is to provide a market which will consume the total flow of gas in its pipe line 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. That is a very difficult problem, and one which requires great experience and great engineering skill, and ability to find markets, before it can be solved. It requires ability, in other words, to sell the gas. This gas must be sold. If the price is too high, people will buy oil for heating their houses, and industry will make use of an alternative fuel. It will be necessary for the company selling this gas to make sure the prices are low enough to appeal to the various utilities, and to the municipalities, so that the maximum quantity may be sold.

I may interject at this point, that this is one reason why this would be a most undesirable type of activity for a public distributing system. Hon. members will appreciate that it comes into conflict with other fields which compete with gas, such as coal, and oil.

There may be a great deal to be said by various industries which are in the business of distributing oil and coal. There may be certain virtues about their products as against gas.

MR. SALSBERG: You are competing with hydro.

HON. MR. PORTER: It does to some extent. But it should be remembered the main usefulness of hydro is in providing light and power for homes and industry. I do not think gas would be considered an important competitor in that field. The main competition is in respect of water heaters in houses, and I am informed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission that the Hydro has now a great many of these water heaters installed throughout the province — installations which use a great deal of our electricity. They represent a large consumption of power, and as the feeling in this province is that there must be conservation of power, because sooner or later the physical water-power resources of the province will have reached their limit, Hydro would be very glad to get out of that type of installation. This would enable hydro to be used for the purposes for which it is best fitted.

Of course, gas also has certain uses for which it is better fitted than any other type of fuel. It is, perhaps, the ideal fuel for space heating in houses, and although some people might prefer to use electric stoves, a gas stove is also very desirable. Moreover gas can be used to operate refrigerators and a great many other household appliances of that kind.

The problem of this company will be to sell the gas. It is all very well to talk about "cheap gas." In my view it is quite impossible to visualize gas coming in from Alberta to this province and available at a price which might be termed "exceedingly cheap." If they can sell gas at prices which will be the equivalent of, or slightly lower than the prices of coal and oil for domestic and industrial use, and sell the total quantity of it, they may be able to pay for the pipe line.

This is an enormous project which involves calculation as to the future development of markets, and one which has an element of risk in it. Why should the government be involved? In the first place, the government would have to devise some general system of distribution. It would be competing with oil and other products which are being sold on the free competitive market.

MR. SALSBERG: You are doing it now with hydro.

HON. MR. PORTER: Hydro does not compete with any of these other fields.

MR. SALSBERG: Of course it does. In regard to water heaters.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is just a small point.

MR. SALSBERG: It is a very big item.

HON. MR. PORTER: Returning to the main aspect of this picture, the government should not put itself in a position where it is going to compete in the free, competitive market, with other legitimate businesses, which are carrying on and serving the public very well.

Moreover, this is not a project which is for the development of the natural resources of the Province of Ontario. There might be an entirely different argument if it was a question of producing or harnessing some natural resource, such as we do with water power, and turning it over for the use of the people.

This is a project whereby gas will be provided in Alberta and transported down here. We shall have to pay for it in this province at the point where it is delivered in the pipe line, and at the price which is charged, in accordance with the contract, which will be worked out between the Pipe Line company and the utilities.

How can anyone be justified in thinking the government should step in and set up some sort of distributing commission to buy a commodity from a private enterprise, and distribute it for a few miles in a few pipes and sell the gas to municipalities at the other end?

There is no possible justification in the public interest for getting into that sort of "half-baked" type of business. If the Federal Government decides that the main trans-Canada pipe line is to be a publicly-owned pipe line, built and administered by some organization of the Federal Government, our position in dealing with the matter might be altered.

MR. SALSBERG: How about asking them?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not intend to ask them. I have no intention of asking them. It is their decision, and as far as I am personally concerned, I agree with it 100 per cent. I think they are right.

MR. SALSBERG: This is "Toryism 1954."

HON. MR. PORTER: Let it be "Toryism," or anything else: it is right.

MR. SALSBERG: There is not even a small "p" in progressive.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) seems to be following sometimes the tactics of a certain senator in the United States. Only he is going in the opposite direction.

To proceed with the questions asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). The hon. Leader of the Opposition asks whether the problem of building up a market has resulted in our making any commitments. As I have outlined, we have made surveys in conjunction with the federal authorities, and we gave the information to the Pipe Line company and the Federal Government. We have fairly accurate estimates of the market prospects in both Northern and Southern Ontario. The history of the consumption of gas in the United States has been that the great difficulty generally lies in the first 3 or 4 years after the introduction of the pipe line. It takes time to build up the market. The pace of development in the early stages is limited. Somebody has to do some selling, and equipment has to be changed over. But once the companies become established, the mar-

ket expands very rapidly, and once this pipe line has been in operation for 4 or 5 years I would be prepared to say the company will not only sell all the gas which is available, but there will be further demands for its products.

As I indicated the other day, the amount of the average supply expected from this pipe line in relation to the total amount of energy we consume is really not so great as it might be thought. The new supply of gas will only provide part of the additional energy we require over the next 10 or 12 years. It will not be the complete answer to our problem, unless, as time goes by, they can supplement the supply to meet the increasing demand.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to arrangements for gas to be brought into Ontario from the United States to supply the market.

That again is the subject of negotiation at the present time between the Federal Government and the United States authorities. We have laid before the federal authorities all the information we have as to possible sources of gas in Southwestern Ontario and the extent to which those reserves of gas might be drawn upon for a temporary period, while a market is being built up during the next few years. It appears it would be a very risky proposition to rely upon Southwestern Ontario gas to do that job. The reserves would have to be considerable, and I am informed that in the next year or so, some supplemental supply will be desirable.

I do not want to say what may be in the minds of the federal authorities with regard to this matter, but I am sure they are approaching it very much as we have done, and taking a proper share in the exploration of this problem. They are doing their best to see what can be worked out in the interests of everyone. I think it has been stated on a number of occasions by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Thomas) that he would be opposed to allowing gas to come in from the United States, which would compete with gas coming through the Alberta pipe line.

The hon. member for Kenora (Mr.

Wren) raised the question of Ontario production. He said there might be a great increase in the production of gas in future years. That may be so. We do not know. Gas has been produced in Ontario for many years. The extent of production has varied from time to time, but it is being produced now at the rate of about 8,500 million cubic feet a year, which compares with 100 billion cubic feet which will pass through the Alberta pipe line. Ontario gas production is, therefore, a very small percentage of this larger figure. I would point out to hon. members that this proposed production could be stepped up considerably by the use of compression, as well as by what is called "looping." By building additional lines, and by compression, it is possible that the supply of Alberta gas can be almost doubled.

It would, therefore, seem to me that Ontario production at the present time is a comparatively small proportion of the total amount of gas which will probably be available in this province. However, if the supply does increase, it means we shall have more cheaper gas and that will be "all to the good." I think there would be no difficulty in marketing the gas we produce in Southwestern Ontario. It will be cheaper gas because it will not have to be conveyed over such a vast distance. The capital cost of pipelines will be very much less, and this will be reflected in a lower cost to the consumer.

I have dealt with the aspects of public ownership. Much as I try to, I will never convince the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) about anything. On the other hand, I can say he has never convinced me about anything, either.

The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) has asked me about the possibility of distributing gas by branch lines to towns in the north, and whether the government would facilitate the provision of such branch lines.

I am not certain whether this would not require an amendment of some statute—we have 2 or 3 years in which to consider that—but if this problem is raised, and if municipalities think this

would be a convenient and economic way of proceeding, I am sure this government would, as always, do everything possible to facilitate measures of that kind. Although I cannot say what might be done in circumstances which have not yet arisen, it seems to me this is a proposal which might very well be considered. I should not be at all surprised if this were not a very useful way of dealing with certain aspects of this problem.

The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) also mentioned that some municipalities might get a greater share of gas than others, and that as a result there might not be enough to go round.

I think, when the time comes, Mr. Speaker, provision will be made for increasing the capacity of the line. I think that will answer the question.

I do not think we should look at this as a line which will produce 100 billion cubic feet a year for all time, and that will be the end of it. I think it is a great trans-Canada project. It does not go across the whole of Canada, and that may be one of the reasons the Federal Government may have for not attempting to build the line with taxpayers' money, when it only affects 3 or 4 provinces of the entire Dominion of Canada. They might feel it would not be the proper way to spend the money of the taxpayers of Canada. I would think that might be one reason—and a very good reason—for leaving this to a private company which will raise the money, take the risk, and do the business in those portions of Canada which they can conveniently reach.

I would think, so far as the supply of gas is concerned, regarding the demands for gas in future years, if the Alberta fields extend the way they seem to be doing, if the future of those fields is as great as well-informed people seem to think it is, the great problem in the future would not be a shortage of gas, but would be where are they going to sell all the gas they produce? I do not think that is a problem with which we will be faced for some time to come—certainly not in our lifetime.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask if the hon. Attorney-General is doing anything to bring about a condition where the pipe will be manufactured in the only plant in Canada where it can be manufactured, namely in the Page Hersey pipe plant in Welland, where there is a great deal of unemployment at the moment?

HON. MR. PORTER: That matter was raised a few days ago by the hon. member for Welland. He is the one who thought of that, not the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. SALSBERG: It does not matter who thought of it, it should be answered.

HON. MR. PORTER: I answered it at that time. The hon. member should have been here.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General never answered the question then. He was evasive, as always. I have just tried to "pin him down."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Attorney-General one question? Would the legislation, now proposed, give the Fuel Board authority over the prices charged for gas in all parts of the province?

HON. MR. PORTER: It will give authority to fix rates for gas to the ultimate consumer. By an amendment I propose to introduce, where there is transmission between different points, which sometimes is done by separate companies or organizations, authority will be given to fix the costs of transmission and, also, to fix the price of storage. Some of this gas, during off-peak periods, must be stored in storage fields in Southwestern Ontario, and there is some cost involved in moving gas, and the cost of the pipe line itself. Those are things which we cannot control.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Attorney-General is aware, as we all are, that in

Toronto, and some other centres, manufactured gas is being used. Is it true that the equipment now used to burn manufactured gas will not be suitable for natural gas?

HON. MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: Does the consumer, in this case, have to bear all the costs of changing the equipment over from using manufactured gas to using natural gas?

HON. MR. PORTER: I know something of what is proposed in the City of Toronto, where they have a manufactured gas distributing system. As a matter of fact, the manufactured gas distributing systems are not as universal as they were at one time, because of the cost of the gas. They cannot compete with other fuels. I understand, The Consumers Gas Company has arranged with some firm which is still in this sort of business to formulate plans for the conversion of all the equipment in Toronto. Just what the financial arrangements will be, I do not know. I do not know whether they will make a charge for that or not. I do not know whether that has been settled, but I understand it is a very highly-skilled operation, perhaps somewhat similar to the hydro conversion type of operation, but on a different scale, and in a different way.

Natural gas has twice the BTU's of manufactured gas, therefore, every burner will have to be reduced to one-half the volume of flow. They will have to cut down the outlets of every burner by one-half. I understand, there is a device in some burners which provides for that, and the change will be simple. But, in other cases, they will have to replace the burner entirely. I understand that sort of equipment does not involve a very large item of cost, nothing like replacing an electric motor, or something like that. It is a point which has not yet been decided.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

THE CHILD WELFARE ACT, 1954

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 77, "The Child Welfare Act, 1954."

MR. OLIVER: If this is the bill which includes some suggestion that the parents might be "emotionally upset," I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us why he wants to include that.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: In moving second reading of this new Child Welfare Act, I do not want to repeat the explanation I gave on introducing the bill in the House. I would like to say that I do appreciate the apparent favourable reception which it has received from the various organizations across the province, which are interested in child welfare, and also the favourable comments received from hon. members as well.

This was a very large undertaking. A committee was appointed, invited to study the problem, make a survey, and bring in a report to our department in connection with the revision and consolidation of all our Child Welfare Acts, so we would have what would be rated as good as, if not better than, any child-welfare legislation in any jurisdiction.

I want to again pay tribute to those people who comprised that committee, and brought forward recommendations which have been incorporated in this bill, after a great deal of study, not only by them, but also by the officials of the Child Welfare Branch of my department. There has been some comment in the press, and elsewhere, in connection with certain new features and new principles which have been introduced into this bill.

Perhaps on second reading, it might be preferable to answer any questions to any doubts, which may be in the mind of any hon. member of this House, in connection with these new principles.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has raised a point in connection with a new feature respecting

"emotional neglect" of children. This is an entirely new concept of neglect, and is only intended to cover those rare cases where, despite adequate physical care, the child's well-being is endangered by the attitude of the parents.

There are cases which have been brought to the attention of people who are responsible for the care of neglected children in this province, where it was quite definitely felt some steps should be taken to provide legislation, whereby "emotional neglect" could be established as a ground for creating a wardship of the child.

I might give you an example which came to my attention not many months ago, where a family had already 2 boys of their own, and had taken a little girl into their home, to give her foster-home care. They became attached to the little girl, and after a few years, decided they would like to adopt her. The adoption took place, and she became their legal child. As she developed over a period of years, it was found she was not developing mentally as rapidly as she should. These people, realizing the child whom they had adopted was not going to develop into a normal adult, became more or less estranged toward the child, and she was definitely being mentally persecuted in her adopted home. Yet she was their child legally, just as if she had been born to them in wedlock.

This legislation would take care of a case of that kind.

Another case has been brought to my attention, about which I can tell you.

MR. OLIVER: Would the hon. Minister tell me what would happen to the child in such a case?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: The authorities would be able to bring evidence before a judge to secure an order that the child be committed as a ward of the Children's Aid Society.

Another case came to my attention, that of a mother with a child born prior to her husband leaving for overseas in the Second World War. He failed to return because he found someone over there whom he thought he liked better than his wife. She secured a divorce,

married again, and after a few years she and her husband adopted another child. A year elapsed, and they had a child of their own, and for some reason or other, they decided they did not like their adopted child. That child was persecuted in that home through the attitude which the mother had assumed toward the adopted child.

We have had several such instances brought to our attention, and we feel it is perfectly safe to have these cases referred to a judge to decide, on the evidence presented, whether there are sufficient grounds to establish "emotional neglect," and in that way, the child can be made a ward of the Children's Aid Society.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): That does not apply to adopted children only, does it?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: No. We have found cases of that nature, one of which I will bring to your attention.

In one particular home, it has been brought to my attention by an official of my department, that a child was found—one of a large family—who was being emotionally neglected. The father had taken a dislike to this particular child to the point where they had a curtain in the middle of the table, the child sitting on one side of the curtain and the other members of the family on the other side.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to make a few remarks if no other hon. member is going to. I want to say that the government has, I believe, introduced a measure which is generally of an advanced character, and to that extent, deserves a measure of recognition. I say this not with "tongue in cheek." As you know, I am always anxious to give credit to the government, but unfortunately they do not give me that opportunity very often.

In this measure, I am, as I am sure many hon. members are, guided by the opinion of those most interested in the legislation, who have had a great deal of

experience with the problems the legislation is covering. I, like a great many other hon. members—and as the hon. Minister has indicated—have been influenced by the opinions of organizations and bodies which are expert in the field. Having said that, I would like to say a few words, with a degree of hesitation, on the question of "emotional neglect." I know this measure has provided a safeguard in that such decisions will be made by acknowledged, recognized and established experts in the field; nevertheless, it is true it will depend upon the experts, and the law will be interpreted by them.

I am not raising this point by way of objecting to the section as it now is written, but I think I would not be honest with myself if I were not to express, despite opinions of the experts, some measure of hesitation on this one section, and I hope that experience will show whether or not a more definitive form will not have to be resorted to.

There is one point which I am sorry to say has been omitted, and it is very important from the viewpoint of preventing the "trafficking in babies," as it is commonly referred to. It is a case of omission, rather than commission.

I understand that the opinion I am about to express is shared by some people in the profession, and I understand that something to that effect has been stated, but I have not been able to locate it, I confess, and I will speak therefore for myself, giving my reaction to it.

In order to prevent the black marketing of babies, I think we must not only provide rigid and strict controls, and not only increase penalties, but provide conditions which will make it unnecessary for the prospective unmarried mother to turn to people who traffic in babies. I am afraid we have not, as yet, provided such conditions. What I have in mind, Mr. Speaker, is this—and I think it is not an uncommon experience—that an unmarried girl who becomes pregnant will, in most instances, seek a way of escaping from her immediate environment, and the area in which she lives, and will seek to live elsewhere

during the difficult period which lies ahead.

When a girl, in such circumstances, comes, let us say, to the City of Toronto, unless she has private funds to take care of her needs, she is compelled either to turn to private or public agencies for assistance, or to turn to those who seek to profit from the sale of children. The difficulty, as I understand it, at this moment, is that once a girl applies to either a private or public agency—particularly is this true of public agencies—she is of necessity asked to give her place of origin or the last place in which she had established residential rights, so that her community may be charged for the amount of money advanced.

It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that when this is done, the girl will prefer not to seek assistance from such organizations, because she is obviously desirous of keeping her condition from the knowledge of her own community and the people whom she knows. Under such certain circumstances, she may be directed to either a medical practitioner or another person who will provide what funds may be necessary for the pre-natal period—when the girl is incapable of working in any public place—who will take care of her, pay the hospital costs, and perhaps take care of her immediate post-natal needs, and then take the child, and try to profit from the transaction.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we will not stop the trafficking in babies entirely unless and until the province assumes the financial responsibility for caring for prospective unmarried mothers, who are in such circumstances as I have described. I do not think it would amount to a very large sum of money, but I do think it would be money well and wisely spent.

If my presentation of the present situation is correct, then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government seek to amend the bill which is now before us, before it reaches its final stage, so that this dangerous loop-hole may be plugged. As I said a moment ago, at present, the door is wide open for a continuation of

the illicit trafficking in babies, and we are forcing the unmarried mothers into situations of this nature by the rigid demands made upon them when they come for assistance to governmental or other agencies.

I make this earnest appeal to the government to amend the bill before it is discussed in the committee stage, so that it will be much better than it is now, and constitute a piece of legislation in which the government will be able to take great pride.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I think in order to clarify, to some extent, the remarks made by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)—inasmuch that I feel he has been misinformed in connection with the case of unmarried mothers—may I say, in the first instance, that I was in municipal life for a great many years and I cannot remember any charge-backs to any municipality with respect to the care of an unmarried mother who had gone elsewhere to give birth to her child.

It is true that in a great percentage of cases unmarried mothers display a tendency to go to the large centres to have their children. However, we have some very fine organizations in this province which are willing and which are doing a very splendid job of handling such cases. I refer to the Church Homes, the Salvation Army, and other organizations which are furnishing accommodation regardless of whether the mother is able to pay or not.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): The Victor Home?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: The Victor Home is the United Church Home. In addition to that, of course, an effort is made on the part of the organization operating the institution, the home or the hospital, to collect, if possible, from the putative father. If that is not possible, in a great many cases the parents or the unmarried mother herself pay for it or the mother pays for it when she goes back into employment. But in every case, wherever the mother so desires, the child is signed over. Of

course, it immediately loses its identity. I do believe that in practically every case it is a "state secret" in respect to children of unmarried mothers in this province. I do not think it would, in any way, either increase or decrease any "racket" which might be going on, and which I doubt is being carried on to any extent in this province at the present time.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important statement.

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General): This is second reading. In 10 years, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has never learned.

MR. SPEAKER: This is second reading. The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has made his address on second reading.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

HON. MR. D. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 95, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I propose that this bill be referred to The Mining Committee, The Natural Gas Section.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I propose that this also be referred to The Mining Committee, Natural Gas Section.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) would there be any necessity to amend this particular bill, if we were to meet what I thought was the very reasonable request for enabling legislation made by the hon. member for Cochrane South

(Mr. Grummett): If you are going to meet his suggestion, would there be any necessity to amend this bill?

HON. MR. PORTER: Under The Municipal Franchises Act, gas franchises are provided for, all of which have to be approved under that Act by The Municipal Board. This merely transfers the right of approval to the Fuel Board.

MR. OLIVER: That is all right. I see that now.

HON. MR. PORTER: Because we think it is appropriate that the board has complete control over the entire fuel situation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GAS PIPELINES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 97, "An Act to amend the Gas Pipelines Act, 1951."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I propose that this bill also be referred to the Committee on Mining, Natural Gas Section.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PERSONS WHO BORE OR DRILL WELLS FOR WATER ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 98, "An Act respecting Persons who Bore or Drill Wells for Water."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is appropriate to send this to the Mining Committee, but I propose that it be sent there to be dealt with, if necessary, by the Natural Gas Section.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PETTY TRESPASS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 99, "An Act to amend the Petty Trespass Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ONTARIO SCHOOL TRUSTEES' COUNCIL ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend the Ontario School Trustees' Council Act, 1953."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is such a simple matter, dealing with the matter of providing alternate representatives to council, that I think there is no need for it to go to any committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to; House in Committee of the Whole.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman. I beg to inform the House that the Honourable the Lieutenant - Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the consideration of the House.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Concurrence is prayed to the following resolutions:

By HON. MR. DUNLOP:

(a) there shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund annually the sum of \$6,000 to be awarded by the Minister in accordance with the regulations as scholarships to residents in Ontario for the purpose of enabling them to pursue courses of study outside Ontario; and

(b) the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to guarantee payment by the province of any debentures issued by an elementary school board in Ontario or by a municipality in a territorial district for any school purpose for which the board or municipality is authorized to issue debentures; and

(c) the cost of establishment, maintenance and conduct of a provincial

technical or polytechnical institute, school for the deaf, school for the blind, teachers' colleges and summer and winter courses and leadership training camps shall be payable out of such moneys as may be appropriated by the Legislature for these purposes,

as provided by Bill No. 33, "The Department of Education Act, 1954."

Resolution concurred in.

By HON. MR. PORTER:

That, where a chief coroner of a city is also supervising coroner and the corporation of the city has appointed or appoints a secretary for him, the corporation shall be reimbursed quarterly out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the extent of one-third of the salary and the cost-of-living bonus, if any, of such secretary and one-third of the amount, if any, paid by the corporation under the civic pension fund or plan in respect of such secretary,

as provided by Bill No. 36, "An Act to amend The Coroners Act."

Resolution concurred in.

By HON. MR. PORTER:

That, where the judge of the Surrogate Court is not also a judge or junior judge of the County Court, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may fix his salary to be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,

as provided by Bill No. 48, "An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act."

Resolution concurred in.

By HON. MR. GOODFELLOW:

That, the Minister may make annual grants on account of capital expenditures to any society or class of society in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the regulations may prescribe out of such moneys as are appropriated therefor by the Legislature,

as provided by Bill No. 60, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act."

Resolution concurred in.

By HON. MR. PORTER:

That, (a) the salary of every full-time judge and every full-time deputy judge shall be paid out of moneys that are voted therefor by the Legislature and an amount equal to the salary, cost-of-living bonus, if any, superannuation credits, if any, and any other allowance paid in the first instance by the province shall be paid quarterly to the Treasurer of Ontario by the municipality or municipalities that would, but for subsection 3 of section 10 of The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954, be responsible for the payment of such salaries; and

(b) the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may direct the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to any municipality of such portion of the cost to it of a Juvenile and Family Court as he may determine.

as provided by Bill No. 75, "The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954."

Resolution concurred in.

By HON. MR. GOODFELLOW:

That, (a) annual grants shall be paid out of such moneys as are appropriated therefor by the Legislature to each Children's Aid Society in such amounts as may be provided by regulations and an amount equal to 25 per cent. of the amount of funds obtained each year from campaigns conducted to obtain private donations; and

(b) stenographers' fees for taking down and transcribing evidence in proceedings with respect to a child belonging to territory without municipal organization may be paid out of moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature; and

(c) where the municipality is ordered by a judge to pay the average daily cost to a Children's Aid Society of providing for the welfare of a child or ward who is living in an institution or home other than a home of his parent there shall be paid to the municipality out of moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature an

amount equal to 25 per cent. of the amount of the net expenditure of the municipality under such order; and

(d) the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make special grants out of the moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature to any municipality in a territorial district to relieve, in whole or in part, any such municipality that is unduly burdened in any year by reason of its liabilities under Part II of The Child Welfare Act, 1954; and

(e) where a municipality pays for temporary care and shelter of a child furnished by a Children's Aid Society there shall be paid to such municipality out of moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature an amount equal to 25 per cent. of the amount of the net expenditure of such municipality for such care and shelter,

as provided by Bill No. 77, "An Act to consolidate and revise The Children's Protection Act," "The Children of Unmarried Parents Act" and "The Adoption Act."

Resolution concurred in.

By HON. MR. DOUCETT:

That (a) grants in respect of the cost of drainage works may be paid to municipalities out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund where the grant does not exceed \$5,000 by the Minister and in other cases by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; and

(b) grants in respect of the cost of drainage works in a territorial district but not in a municipality may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund where the grant does not exceed \$5,000 by the Minister and in other cases by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

as provided by Bill No. 80, "The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954."

Resolution concurred in.

By HON. MR. FROST:

That (a) the Treasurer may pay for securities purchased by him out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(b) the payment of interest by the Treasurer shall be a charge upon and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(c) money received by the Crown for a special purpose and paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund may be paid out of the Fund for that purpose; and

(d) refunds shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(e) amounts required to be paid under a guarantee for the payment of any debt or obligation may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(f) public moneys may be paid under warrant of the Lieutenant-Governor and on order of the Treasury Board out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(g) the Treasurer may pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund accounts for legislative and departmental supplies delivered to the Queen's Printer; and

(h) moneys raised by way of loan or securities issued are payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(i) payments in respect of lost securities and loan expenses may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(j) where public money has been received by a person to be applied to a purpose and has not so been applied, money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund may be applied to the purpose,

as provided by Bill No. 91, "An Act to provide for the Financial Administration of the Government of Ontario and for the Organization of the Treasury Department."

Resolution concurred in.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the resolution just read is not in the Routine Proceedings?

By HON. MR. PORTER:

That, moneys required for the purposes of the Ontario Fuel Board shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,

as provided by Bill No. 94, "An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board."

Resolution concurred in.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, is it proper to bring on these resolutions when they do not appear in Routine Proceedings? They have been taken out of Votes and Proceedings, instead of taking them out of Routine Proceedings.

THE CHAIRMAN: They were approved by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor today.

PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 79, "The Provincial Parks Act, 1954."

Sections 1 to 32 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 79 reported.

AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 80, "The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954."

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 80 reported.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 81, "An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to hold that bill.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: We shall be glad to hold it, Mr. Chairman.

THE TREES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Trees Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 82 reported.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act."

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, this bill is in the same category. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) hold it also?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, I will hold it, Mr. Chairman, if it is the desire of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver).

WOLF AND BEAR BOUNTY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 88, "An Act to amend the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.
Bill No. 88 reported.

CROWN TIMBER ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 89, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act, 1952."

Section 1 agreed to.
On Section 2.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, is this not the bill in which an error occurred in numbering the sections in committee? I think someone suggested it would be changed. The hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) will have to move an amendment now, to have the numbers changed.

HON. MR. DOUCETT in the absence of Mr. Gemmell, moves that: Section No. 3 be changed to read "section No. 2."

Motion agreed to.

Section 2 formerly section 3, agreed to.

Bill No. 89, as amended, reported.

SUDBURY Y.M.C.A. AND Y.W.C.A.

House in Committee on Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the Sudbury Com-

munity Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.
Preamble agreed to.
Bill No. 3 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

House in Committee on Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.
Preamble agreed to.
Bill No. 21 reported.

CITY OF TORONTO

House in Committee on Bill No. 26, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto."

Section 1 agreed to.
On section 2.

MR. WEAVER moves,

That section 2 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following words:

provided that the full value of such land and buildings, except the land and buildings that are exempt from taxation under section 4 of The Assessment Act, shall be included in the assessment of the city for the purpose of the apportionment of the levies of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto among the area municipalities under The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953.

He said: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has asked for an explanation of this. This addition to the section is proposed, in order to make it perfectly clear that, while exempting certain of the buildings of the Canadian National Exhibition from taxation it is solely for the purpose of avoiding double bookkeeping; in other words, the City of Toronto owns the land and buildings and merely pays taxes to itself on them. We want it to be clear that those lands and buildings are to be calculated in the assessment of the City

of Toronto for the purpose of taxation, or levy for Metropolitan purposes. It was always so intended, but this amendment is proposed in order to make the situation perfectly clear.

Sections 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A to B agreed to.

That Bill No. 26 be reported; agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the committee rise, and report certain bills, with and without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, The Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills, with and without amend-

ment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the adjournment of the House.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Can the hon. Minister indicate Monday's business?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: We shall proceed with what will be on the Order paper, and perhaps with some Estimates.

MR. OLIVER: There will be no debate on the budget?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I think not. I think that will continue on Tuesday.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.39 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, March 22, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, March 22, 1954.

Second Report Standing Committee on Education, Mr. Brandon	645
First Report Standing Committee on Mining, Mr. Mapledoram	645
Security Transfer Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, first reading	646
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, first reading	646
Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	646
Re Establishing Committee to Inquire Into Economics of Gold-Mining Industry, Mr. Frost	647
Motion to Resolve Into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to	649
On Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Doucett, Mr. Challies	649
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	667

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M. on Education presents the Committee's Second Report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act;

And the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 33, The Department of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 63, The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 84, The Schools Administration Act, 1954.

Bill No. 86, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. C. MAPLEDORAM (Fort William): I beg leave to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Mining, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Mapledoram from the Standing Committee on Mining presents the committee's First Report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been asked to make two announcements. For those who may need a little money before the end of the session, I would remind you that Wednesday of this week is the last day for securing any advances you may require.

There seems to be some misunderstanding with regard to the time of the Annual Press Dinner. The tickets, I am informed state "seven-thirty"; however, I am advised that members of the press will be on hand shortly after six o'clock to meet any who would care to arrive at that time.

We are very glad to welcome students of Humewood Public School in the City of Toronto. Day by day, we are privileged to have as our guests those students from our schools who are able to attend, and we sincerely hope they will thoroughly enjoy their visit this afternoon with us.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): I beg leave to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Education, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Brandon from the Standing Committee

THE SECURITY TRANSFER TAX ACT

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Security Transfer Tax Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this matter was mentioned in the budget, and relates to extending the exemption for payment of security tax on bonds which are guaranteed by the Ontario Government, or any Provincial or Federal Government. It would include, for example, the boards of each organization such as Hydro, Canadian National Railways, Ontario Northland Railway, and anything of that sort, and would apply to any of the governments in Canada.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will not go through each section of this bill. They can be considered in committee. It is an Act which clarifies certain matters relating to the sections as set out in the bill. These matters can be discussed in committee, as I have said.

I point out that the bill itself, makes no reference to the bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) relative to the status of adopted children. The provisions contained in that bill are such that it will automatically follow that, in all respects, adopted children will be treated as natural-born children.

THE MUNICIPAL SUBSIDIES ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1953

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the first part of this bill gives the Minister of Municipal Affairs power to adjust the subsidy of unconditional grants to municipalities where they would receive less than they received previously in relation to police and fire department services.

There are 27 such municipalities in the Province of Ontario, most of which are in the northern part of the province. There are many summer places, such as Crystal Beach, Wasaga Beach, and so on, where they require fairly substantial fire and police protection during the summer months, but the per capita grant based on the permanent residents is very small compared to the number of people who are there during the summer months. The same thing would occur in Marathon, Terrace Bay and Kapuskasing. The great percentage of the people in the Kapuskasing area are living outside the town, and that municipality would not be receiving a per capita grant for those outside of the municipality, but they would still have to furnish police and fire services.

Then, we go a little farther and say that:

Notwithstanding the provisions of The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, 1953, where part of a rural municipality is annexed to an urban municipality, the Minister of Municipal Affairs shall adjust the payments under the said Act for the first 5 years immediately following the annexation. . . .

Therefore, the rural municipalities will not lose anything on the grants they would have received for 5 years. For instance, the grant would be \$3 for the City of Hamilton, while Saltfleet, after annexation would still receive its \$1.50 per capita grant. The same would apply to Brantford and London, etc., where annexations of that sort have taken place. The rural community will not lose those grants for 5 years, and the only gain for the larger municipality in each case will be the difference between the lowered grant in the township and the higher grants they would receive.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The Twentieth Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ending December 31st, 1953;

The Report of the Minister of Public Works for Ontario for the 12 months ending March 31st, 1953.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, may I refer to my Budget Address of March 11th, in the course of which I referred to the government's intention of establishing a committee to make inquiry into the economics of the gold mining industry.

The plight of this important industry has been of increasing concern to us, Mr. Speaker. The number of active gold mines in Ontario has declined from 72 in 1941 to 38 last year. More than a dozen promising new mines which began operations in recent years have been obliged to close. The number of wage-earners has been reduced to nearly half the total employed 12 years ago. The value of gold production has dropped from \$122 million in 1940 to less than \$75 million last year. This situation is, of course, not peculiar to Ontario or even to Canada; gold mining is a depressed industry throughout the whole world—in South Africa, the United States and Southern Rhodesia, no less than in this province. Nevertheless in our own province, having regard to the importance of gold mining in the past and the effect which it has had on our economic position, the matter is of great seriousness.

The single major factor which has brought the industry to its present state is this: that while over the past 20 years the price of most other commodities and the cost of labour and materials have doubled, the price of gold has remained fixed at \$35 per oz. in United States currency and in terms of Canadian dollars it has actually declined, leaving out of account the effects of the gold-aid policy of the Federal Government.

No solution would therefore be better tailored to the needs of this industry than a rise in the price of gold. But this is not a matter which lies within the control of the province or, indeed, of the Dominion. It is a matter for the decision of the International Monetary Fund, the member countries of which have agreed not to buy or sell gold above the prevailing price; and in all deliberations concerning the price of gold the voice of the United States, which is by far the largest purchaser of gold, is the determining one.

During the recent disputes between the labour union and the gold mining companies, in the north country, it became apparent that the controversy arose to some extent from a lack of agreement as to the main factors affecting the industry and its future. It is hoped that from the work of the committee which is now being set up will come a better understanding of these factors and that this will promote the industrial harmony which is so essential to the gold mining industry in this difficult period.

May I say, sir, that in the negotiations which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and I conducted—negotiations which involved almost countless hours; I would not say countless days but it seemed to be an interminable time—one of the greatest difficulties we experienced was to arrive at any common understanding as to what were the problems of the industry on one side, I mean representing the mechanics of the gold mining industry and on the other side—the men who were working in the industry. They were very far apart on that point.

The suggestion of appointing a committee to study this whole very involved and complicated problem arose, Mr. Speaker, out of that situation. It was felt that there should be an enquiry to establish what were the basic economic facts relating to this industry. From such a study and report may also come observations which will assist in the shaping of provincial policies for the sound economic development of the mineral resources of the province and the promotion of industry and welfare in these northern areas.

It is not my idea, nor is it the intention of the government, that this committee should be in the form of a Royal Commission. I know this will please the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). The idea is that it will be quite open to the committee to discuss problems with the various persons, parties and interests concerned. In other words this committee will be composed of men who are of great capacity and who have thorough knowledge of this problem, and it seems to me we should not put them in a position in which, as would be the case with a Royal Commission, they would have to sit for days and weeks taking evidence. It would be a matter of obtaining all the information that is available—that is all the information that would be submitted to them, and which they could gather—and then making a report on the situation.

The members of the committee who have agreed to serve are:

Professor F. A. Knox (Chairman),
Head, Department of Political
and Economic Science,
Queen's University,
Kingston.

Professor E. E. Reilly,
Professor of Economics,
University of Western Ontario,
London.

Professor H. R. Rice,
Head, Department of Mining
Engineering,
University of Toronto,
Toronto.

The terms of reference are very broad. They are obviously very able gentlemen, and we are very fortunate indeed in getting them to serve. The reference given to them is to examine and report on:

(a) the conditions affecting the present position of and prospects for the gold mining industry in Ontario;

This is a very big subject, and:

(b) the causes underlying trends in employment, wages, working conditions, profits, dividends, etc., in the industry; and

(c) the effects of these developments on communities in the northern parts of the province.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government why they failed to include on the committee a representative of the miners. I would imagine that would have been the government's first consideration when appointing a committee of this sort. I also wonder why the government did not include a representative of the northern municipalities who are so vitally concerned in the subject matter this committee will be considering.

HON. MR. FROST: In answering the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not want, and I do not think hon. members of this House would want, this committee to be turned into what would amount to a Board of Arbitration. The hon. member will see if that were done, and we were to follow his suggestion, we would select a chairman, then we would appoint a representative of labour and it would, of course, follow, that there would have to be a representative of industry. Then, if this concerned municipal matters, there would have to be a representative of the mining municipalities. After that it would probably be necessary to balance that appointment with a further appointment.

The result of such an arrangement would be to place the committee's deliberations on an arbitration basis of ideas and submissions. I have avoided that, Mr. Speaker. We have chosen men who have no direct connection with any of these interests. They are men who have great ability and intensive training in the field of economics. We have taken 3 of these men, who have knowledge of the general economic situation, and who are trained to look impartially at these problems, and we have reinforced them with an engineer, who is quite detached, one of the staff of the University of Toronto. That appointment brings to the committee a knowledge of the technical matters which might relate to such subjects as gold resources, ore

reserves and the proper use of those assets. From such an impartial committee we will, I think, receive a report which will be of very great value to our province.

MR. SALSBERG: Why could not this committee be enlarged to 5 so that in addition to having the economic experts and the engineer, it would include representatives of the people most concerned with the problem of mining—the men who work in the mines and the heads of the municipalities who have to administer those hard-hit communities. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the mountain is giving birth to a mouse, and that the government is missing the opportunity of establishing a committee consisting of representatives of all interested groups and parties—I am not using the word “parties” in a political sense—in an effort to get to the fundamentals of this question, and make recommendations which would help to solve this very serious issue.

HON. MR. FROST: I have endeavoured over a long period of time to find some point on which I would meet the approval of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) but now, after nearly 11 years, I cannot think of a single occasion when I have been successful.

MR. SALSBERG: There were a few.

HON. MR. FROST: I have come to this conclusion; that if I should ever reach the point where the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) agrees with me, then, Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) a question arising out of an article in today's *Telegram*. The heading of the article was “Hear Nelson Was Silenced ‘On Advice.’” The article read:

It is believed at Queen's Park that C. H. Nelson, suspended Highways Department chief engineer, refused to answer investigations on the advice of counsel.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether that was the reason why Mr. Nelson refused to answer questions—because his lawyer was not present.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): I was not present, but I understand he told those who were present that he would like to have counsel if he was going to have to answer direct questions.

MR. OLIVER: Was that not felt to be a fair thing for Mr. Nelson to ask, to have counsel present?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I think that is quite fair. But he was our employee and we thought it was quite fair that he be asked those questions.

MR. OLIVER: The senior Crown prosecutor was there?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is correct.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply.

ON ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Before proceeding further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words to enlighten hon. members on a few of the things that are being done. I cannot begin to cover the whole ground, but a great deal of work has been done, and I want to mention some of the activities which have taken place in the northern part of the Province of Ontario. The hon. members who were on the Conservation Committee a few years ago, which covered a large part of the northern section of this great province, will know something of the work that is being done.

In 11 of the districts of Northern

Ontario during the past year, 8,573 acres of land were cleared and 8,081 acres were broken up at a cost, in subsidies, of \$149,889.65.

I will not weary the House by reading the figures contained in these tables, but will file them in *Hansard*, for the information of the hon. members, if any are

interested in them. They cover, "Assistance to Farmers and Settlers in Northern Ontario, in Clearing and Breaking Land," "Farm Water Supply," "Live Stock," "Veterinary Services," "Potato Production and Weed Control," "Freight Assistance on Seed Potatoes," "Special Grants," and "Field Men."

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND SETTLERS IN NORTHERN ONTARIO
CLEARING AND BREAKING LAND
1953-1954

District	No. of Settlers Assisted		Cleared	Acres Broken		Subsidy Granted		Total Subsidy Paid
	Total	Clearing		Clearing	Breaking	\$ c.	\$ c.	
Algoma.....	17	17	10	98¾	30½	1,173.00	178.50	1,351.50
Cochrane.....	477	425	401	3,175½	2,993	37,882.92	17,953.48	55,836.40
Kenora.....	50	44	37	218¾	180¾	2,550.93	1,032.02	3,582.95
Manitoulin.....	29	25	29	180½	210½	2,143.61	1,244.68	3,388.29
Muskoka.....	7	6	6	31	29	372.00	174.00	546.00
Nipissing.....	72	67	69	377¼	386¾	4,527.00	2,308.50	6,835.50
Parry Sound....	12	9	10	66	64	738.45	384.00	1,122.45
Rainy River....	102	89	88	633	655	7,498.08	3,934.50	11,432.58
Sudbury.....	74	74	68	441¼	397¼	5,287.84	2,361.26	7,649.10
Temiskaming....	298	284	277	2,315½	2,271½	27,786.00	13,631.23	41,417.26
Thunder Bay....	155	153	131	1,036	863	11,867.02	4,860.60	16,727.62
	<u>1,293</u>	<u>1,193</u>	<u>1,126</u>	<u>8,573</u>	<u>8,081¼</u>	<u>101,826.85</u>	<u>48,062.80</u>	<u>149,889.65</u>

FARM WATER SUPPLY

District	No. of Settlers Assisted	Drilled Wells	Water Supply		Other Sources	Total Cost	Total Subsidies Paid
			Dug Wells			\$ c.	\$ c.
Algoma.....	7	4	..	3	3,977.38	1,255.39	
Cochrane.....	64	48	7	9	43,979.23	13,357.54	
Manitoulin.....	2	1	..	1	740.50	170.25	
Nipissing.....	13	7	1	5	7,933.51	2,536.84	
Parry Sound.....	1	1	640.85	220.42	
Rainy River.....	2	2	828.57	214.28	
Sudbury.....	4	1	1	2	2,160.79	680.39	
Temiskaming.....	33	33	25,093.55	8,706.62	
Thunder Bay.....	16	13	2	1	12,110.80	3,486.84	
	<u>142</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>97,465.18</u>	<u>30,628.57</u>	

LIVE STOCK

<i>District</i>	<i>No. of Cattle Purchased</i>	<i>No. of Farmers Participating</i>	<i>Freight or Truck Charges</i>	<i>Travelling Expenses of Buyers</i>	<i>Total Assistance</i>
			\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.
Cochrane.....	120	41	1,384.71	243.05	1,627.76
Nipissing.....	221	74	2,897.96	1,819.48	4,717.44
Sudbury.....	57	14	584.00	253.48	837.48
Temiskaming.....	38	9	310.00	409.20	719.20
Thunder Bay.....	44	10	618.23	136.00	754.23
	<u>480</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>5,794.90</u>	<u>2,861.21</u>	<u>8,656.11</u>

VETERINARY SERVICES

Name of Committee	Grants Paid	Travelling Expenses of Veterinarian
	\$ c.	\$ c.
Algoma.....	1,600.00
Cochrane South.....	1,600.00
Kenora.....	1,600.00	425.04
Manitoulin.....	1,600.00
Muskoka.....	1,600.00
Parry Sound, No. 1.....	1,600.00
No. 2.....	800.00
Rainy River.....	1,600.00
Temiskaming.....	1,600.00
Thunder Bay.....	1,600.00
West Sudbury.....	1,600.00
Verner.....	1,600.00
	<u>18,400.00</u>	<u>425.04</u>

POTATO PRODUCTION AND WEED CONTROL

District	Purchasing Organisation	Sprayer	Cost of Transportation	Total Cost	Amount of Grants
		\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.
Cochrane	Champlain Co-operative, Timmins.....	356.85	6.95	363.80	181.90
Kenora	Municipality of Township of Van Horne, Dryden.....	400.75	13.17	413.92	206.96
Thunder Bay	Municipality of O'Connor, Cochrane.....	881.60	881.60	350.00
		<u>1,639.20</u>	<u>20.12</u>	<u>1,659.32</u>	<u>738.86</u>

FREIGHT ASSISTANCE ON SEED POTATOES

Name of Organization	From	To	Total Paid
			\$ c.
North Simcoe Seed Potato Grower's Co-operative.....	Cochrane	Barrie	<u>279.22</u>

SPECIAL GRANTS

Paid to	Total
	\$ c. \$ c.
Women's Institutes.....	1,255.10
Agricultural Societies.....	5,051.77
Community Halls, etc.....	3,060.93
	<u>9,367.80</u>

FIELD MEN

Travelling Expenses	Services	Total
\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.
<u>4,977.84</u>	<u>5,601.80</u>	<u>10,579.64</u>

GRAND TOTAL.....\$227,964.89

Contributions were also made, as hon. members will recall, to the finding of water in that section. This is a very difficult proposition in certain areas, as hon. members from Cochrane South and Cochrane North will readily understand, for I find that in Cochrane North assistance was given in 64 places. In the wider area, assistance was given in 142 cases, at a cost of \$30,628.57, which included the drilling of 109 wells, the digging of 11, and other sources, the sum of 22. I might point out that the 22 other sources include assistance to the piping of springs or water sources, which would serve the same purpose as that of a well.

There was also assistance given in Northern Ontario for livestock, that is, for the selection of foundation stock, men to help the farmers purchase, shipping charges or trucking, where trucking is equivalent to freight, and the travelling expenses of buyers, amounting to \$8,566.00.

Then, in the north country there are grants made for veterinary services, in practically the same districts, for which the government pays a grant of \$1 600.00 to each veterinarian, which totals \$18,400.00.

We also assist in the potato production and weed control up there, which costs a further sum of approximately \$1,600.00. Grants were paid to the Women's Institutes in the amount of \$1 255.10, Agricultural Societies \$5 051.77, and the Community Halls and so forth, \$3,060.93, making a total of \$9,367.80, for the special grants.

In regard to the Agricultural Societies; in the Province of Ontario there were 243 field crop competitions last year, with 3,361 competitors. There was a grant of \$50.00 paid to each competition.

Agricultural Societies consist of 265.

Fall Fairs, 251, 7 of Class "A", and 31 of Class "B".

Horticultural Societies; there are 200, with a membership of almost 35,000.

There were 66 senior plowing matches, 21 junior matches, and 7 home plowing competitions.

In regard to community centres; 86 grants paid to March 17th, 1954, for a total of \$164,930.

The types of projects include 8 arenas, 5 arenas and halls, 31 halls alone, 34 athletic fields, 5 outdoor rinks, and 3 swimming pools.

A great deal of work has been done in co-operation with the Marketing Branch, and there were 16 schemes, marketing some 28 crops. These schemes are the legally-constituted means for the sale of farm products coming under their jurisdiction.

In the Province of Ontario, we have 254 cheese factories, 232 creameries, 11 creamery inspectors on the permanent staff, 14 cheese inspectors on the permanent staff, 1 on the temporary staff, 7 on a nine-month temporary, and three-month daily basis.

In regard to farm labour. During the past year, in 1953 the Federal-Provincial Farm Labour Committee supervised the placement of men on farms, which was a considerable increase over the previous year. We find that in 1952 there were 11,619 placed in agricultural fields across the province, which rose last year to 19,364, or an increase of nearly 8,000.

In regard to field crops. The Ontario Department pays 50 per cent. of weed inspectors' wages and expenses in Old Ontario, in connection with weed control. The amount paid from 1953 to date is \$26,609.88. The Ottawa Government pays one-half of the cost, and the Ontario Department pays the other half, and pays the cost of the township weed inspectors up to \$50.00, and the cost of 5 part-time district inspectors in Northern Ontario, which cost \$9,013.12.

We also assisted in agricultural limestone, which is reimbursed by Ottawa to Ontario, to the extent of approximately 60 per cent., leaving the net cost to Ontario of \$19,224.33.

In regard to the Livestock Branch: warble-fly control was carried on in 177 Ontario townships. To date, 197 townships filed by-laws to carry on this work this year.

In regard to brucellosis, the Act concerning which was introduced last year: to date by-laws have been filed by 30 municipalities, and it is our understanding that petitions are being circulated in at least 50 other townships.

In regard to Women's Institute Branch, and the Home Economics Service, last year there were 88 junior institutes, and 1,400 senior institutes. The number remains approximately the same at present; 5 or 6 either way would be the only difference.

On Vote No. 1.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister how the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. F. S. Thomas) is progressing? Is he improving? Do you expect him back in the department?

HON. MR. FROST: I understand he was out for a walk yesterday. He has been very seriously ill; no doubt about that. When he returned last September, my warning and injunction to him was to do as I do, and do no work at all. But apparently he disobeyed that injunction.

MR. PETER MANLEY (Stor-
mont): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) a question in connection with land breakage? Does that apply only to Northern Ontario?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just to Northern Ontario, the districts which I mentioned at the outset.

Vote No. 1 agreed to.

Vote No. 2 agreed to.

On Vote No. 3.

MR. OLIVER: Has there been any change in the basis of grants for community halls?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, there has been no change recently in the basis for community halls.

MR. OLIVER: In connection with the Agricultural Committees; how many of those have you now? You could not have very many for \$2,000. Why not do away with them?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Just one.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell us where it is?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, the remaining one is in Thunder Bay.

Vote No. 3 agreed to.

On Vote No. 4.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote No. 4, Co-operation and Marketing Branch; I would like to say a few words on the very important question of price spreads on farm products. I think this is the item under which it would logically come.

As is well known to hon. members who have been in this House for some time, the former Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) spoke on this question inside the House and out, and on all occasions when he dealt with the question of the prices of farm commodities and the incomes of the farmers, he stressed what is generally known as a fact, that there is a widening spread between what the farmers get, and what the city consumers pay. As far back as 1948, the then Minister of Agriculture spoke about this, and he cited figures to illustrate the seriousness of the problem. He said at that time that out of \$2.18 which the consumer paid for a 75-lb. bag of potatoes, the farmers in Essex or Kent, received 90c. or 41.3 per cent.

Later on, in September, 1950, the then Minister of Agriculture—and I am quoting from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*—is quoted as having said:

Food costs in Toronto are more than in New York and Washington, Agricultural Minister Kennedy said yesterday. The department, he said, had figures to prove it.

Further on, he gives quite a number of details, figures to show that prices were declining on farm produce, while the prices to the consumers were rising.

In February of this year—to be exact, on February 4th, 1954—the Ontario

Agricultural Council, meeting in this building—and I am quoting again from the *Globe and Mail*—

voted to ask for an investigation of the spread between the producer and consumer prices. The spread was widening, and in most consumer circles, the farmers were getting the blame, even though prices to the producers were declining. The representatives of the council decided they wanted an investigation, and, further, that a detailed statement of the findings resulting from the investigation be made public.

Obviously the people from the countryside feel very strongly about the need for a thorough investigation of the price spread between what our farm producers are receiving, and what the city consumers are called upon to pay.

I want to say I had a bit of a shock a few weeks ago, while addressing a meeting in the Niagara Peninsula. A number of farmers who asked questions of me, during the question period showed that they were deeply concerned with the problem of the prices spread. One farmer said that peaches for which they received 35c. for a 6-quart basket—and I hope I am giving the information correctly—sold in North Bay for \$1.80 for 3 baskets. I repeated the figures he gave me, and he insisted they were correct.

He told me the fruit growers of the area had a man go up to North Bay to check the prices, so as to compare them with the prices they were receiving from the truckers who buy from them, and take them to the northern part of the province. That, it seems to me, is a terrific spread.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member please repeat those figures?

MR. SALSBERG: I hope the figures I have written down here are correct. My figures are that they received 35c. for a 6-quart basket—that is, the late peaches—and in North Bay, they were sold at \$1.80 for 3 baskets.

MR. MURDOCH: That would be 60c. apiece.

MR. SALSBERG: That is the way it figures out. Another farmer said they were getting from 20c. to 25c. for prune plums, and the basket cost them 13c. That the same basket sold in North Bay—and this sounded almost fantastic to me, but he repeated the price—at \$1.49. Whether those figures I am giving as I took them down at the meeting are absolutely correct or not, the fact, nevertheless, indisputably remains there is a widening spread between the prices the consumers pay and the prices the farmers receive.

What is worse, there is a definite tendency in that direction. It is not just one year's experience; it is not just a one-season spread, but a continuing process of the widening of the scissors in reference to the prices paid by the consumers and what the farmers receive.

I want at this time to ask the government to come to grips with this question. We all agreed, when the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) spoke on this subject, that there was a need for an investigation, and the hon. member practically promised this House that an investigation would be made, and I would like now to ask the government to make a statement as to its intentions on that score. Is it planned to have an investigation, either by a special committee, a Royal Commission, or any other media to establish the trend that is under-way, and has been for a number of years, and to bring forward some constructive proposals. I would strongly urge the government to do that, and I would appeal to it not to delay the matter any longer. The fact is that farm prices are declining. There is a difference of opinion as to just what the decline has been. I see in one paper the farm income declined by some 12 per cent. in 1953, as compared with 1952. That appears to me a very impressive figure. With all this taking place in the province, I think it would be criminal to further delay an investigation into the price spread on farm commodities in the Province of Ontario.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I might say in reply to the hon. member, that when he was talking about "price spreads," he was speaking of something which is out of our jurisdiction. As I said, this government has given authority for 16 schemes for 28 crops, and they can have authority to bargain with canners or others to whom they sell their produce, but "price spreads" are not within the jurisdiction of this government.

MR. R. ROBSON (Hastings East): Mr. Chairman, on section 5—

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I thought the hon. member was going to speak on item 4.

I would hate to see this question dropped at this time, as much as I dislike pressing this point in the absence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas). I am aware the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is piloting the Estimates through the House, and although he is acquainted with the situation, he is, nevertheless, handling another Minister's department.

I feel the hon. Minister's reply is not satisfactory, in the sense that it is an onus on the department, and the responsibility of the government to order an investigation. I do not think you can leave it to the farmers themselves and their selling organizations, and certainly the former hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) never left any doubt in this House about the right of the government to intercede in this matter.

I am sure there is a record of what the hon. Minister has said, and the older hon. members in the House will probably remember that he as much as promised this House he was going to have an investigation made into price spreads.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I never heard of it.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know of anything which would prevent the department or the government from ordering a public enquiry or investigation of one type or another into this problem, which concerns such a large

portion of our population. I am not a resident in a farming area, and the hon. members of the House who do come from such areas will, I hope, excuse me, if I presume to speak authoritatively, as I assure them I am speaking very earnestly and sincerely, based on my observations, my contacts with a limited number of farmers—but contacts nevertheless—and my reading of farm material, all this convinced me this is a serious question, and I think the farm population of the province would welcome such an investigation.

The extract from the resolution adopted by the Ontario Agricultural Council, which I quoted, would seem to indicate there is a widespread demand, and I submit again there is nothing to prevent the department or the government from ordering an investigation into the spread of prices of farm produce.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the hon. member for St. Andrew should check his figures very closely before he gives them to the House. May I point out to him that peaches originating in Essex County and selling for 35c, if sold in North Bay for 60c, that would seem to be a very reasonable price. The hon. member did not state whether that was the retail price in the stores, but I presume it was. But the truckers' costs have to be paid; they sell them to the wholesaler who, in turn, distributes them to the various stores, and naturally there are charges incurred.

I would like to point out further that it is quite obvious to me—and I am sure it is so to my colleagues on this side of the House—why this spread is rising all the time.

In Windsor, a very few weeks ago, the Dominion Store employees—who handle food products—were threatening to go on strike. The people handling farm products have holidays with pay, and pension schemes and all of these things which enter into the prices of farm products from the time they leave the farm, until they reach the consumers.

A little while ago, again in the City of Windsor, there was a milk strike. It came out during the strike that drivers delivering milk were earning as much as \$70 a week. Let us assume there was a driver who had a son, and they were both working at the dairy. They would earn \$140 a week between them.

I know many dairy farmers in Essex County who are working 7 days a week, no holidays with pay, just taking some whenever they can get them, no pension scheme or anything else, who have thousands and thousands of dollars of capital invested, and yet I know of no father-and-son combination in Essex County in the dairy business who are making \$140 a week, clear money.

The same thing is true in Toronto. It is the same in packing houses, and the hon. member must obviously see that all those things which are granted in one place must be paid for in another.

MR. SALSBERG: I welcome the remarks of the last speaker, the senior Whip of the House, but I must say to him that I am sorry he used that type of argument, because I do not think the interests of the farmers would ever be served by arraying them against the city workers. As I see it, the two very important groups of our population, the industrial worker and the farmer, have a great deal in common and, in most instances, are up against the same combination of big interests, so there is no use counter-poising the interests of a farmer to that of a worker.

It would be no more fair if I were to quote from the last findings of the Gallup Poll, that farm income is superior to the income in the cities. Not only did the city people express that opinion, but I see where the farmers, according to the Gallup Poll, also voted along those lines that farm income is safer and more even than in the cities. At any rate, that is the Gallup Poll, and it seems fair to quote that.

The fact is, farm income has declined by 10 or 12 per cent. over the period of a year. It is enough to know that farm exports are declining. The latest information from Ottawa is there is a

drop of farm exports by about 3 per cent., in other words, a growing seriousness of the farm problem.

What I say is, therefore, we should investigate the cause. The hon. member (Mr. Murdoch) thinks it is due to the wages of the city worker. I do not think that is so. There are other authoritative people—who are far more authoritative on this question than I—who think it is due to altogether too much profiteering in the processing and distributing of farm commodities from the soil to the table on the consumer.

I think we should go into all these facts, study them, unearth them, and I think we, in this House, can be guided on a question of this sort by what amounts to a unanimous opinion of the Ontario Agricultural Council. When that council met here, it decided to ask for a study of the price spread. I think that is a very authoritative opinion, and a very authoritative voice, and I think we should follow it and act accordingly.

Vote 3 agreed to.

On Vote 4.

MR. R. ROBSON (Hastings East): I would like to say, as a farmer, that I do not think I would be very averse to an investigation into the price spreads. I do not think the farmers would be too averse to having such an investigation. In fact, many of the groups of the Federation of Agriculture are asking the central group to ask, in another year possibly, that there be some investigation. We have good reasons for asking that.

During the last 2 or 3 weeks, the growers and processors of canned goods have been trying to get together. They know the prices of the goods are not going down, and the prices of the raw products have not gone up in 3 years, in fact, today they are offering us less. Yet, we know the prices of the canned goods have gone up. We do not know who is making the profit, or taking the extra money, whether it is the processors, the distributors or the fellow who comes in between, or the retailer, but we would like to know why, when the price of the cans go up and they do

not "kick" because of that, if we ask for more money for peas, corn, or tomatoes, they offer us less. Yet when they get them into the cans, and put them on the shelves the next year, we know the prices will be up.

I think an investigation in that regard would be welcomed by most of the farmers, let the chips fall where they may. We might learn something.

Vote No. 4, agreed to.

On No. 5.

MR. ROBSON: I would like to say something about No. 5, the dairies branch.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question. It may be a rather suggestive question, but we are used to them.

In view of the fact that the cheese people had such trouble getting rid of their cheese in the last few years, due to the loss of export markets, and since we know that the consumption of cheese is very small, but perhaps gone up a little bit per capita, and since we know that people seem to want more cheese, and since they cannot get what they want in the package they want, and since the manufacturers of cheese are very small manufacturers—in fact they are doing it themselves, and have to be told by the trade how to package the cheese—and since the trade has not done much towards packaging or telling the cheese factories how they should package it, has the government ever given any thought to the possibility of the Department of Agriculture setting up some sort of Research Committee? It might be done through the Agricultural College at Guelph. They could make a study, first of the kind of packages the people want, and the way it should be marketed and so on, and give some guidance to the cheese factories.

If it does not want to do that, it might give some aid to the Cheese Producers Association, to set up a Research Bureau, and possibly pay a portion of the cost of the research. In my opinion, it is very important.

We were eating $4\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of cheese per person in Canada. That has gone up very slowly in the last 25 years to

almost 6 pounds, but we feel it could easily go up to 10 pounds. We find the people want the cheese.

If you take some one into your home and you have a nice piece of black diamond cheese, he asks where he could get cheese like that. It is unfortunate we do not have a service to tell us how to get it. If we knew how to package it properly, to get people interested, I think we would have the consumption of cheese going up to 10 pounds per person. If that were so, we would not need any export market, we would have a market at home for our cheese. I wonder if it is possible for the government to make a grant towards that.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I might say in answer to the hon. member (Mr. Robson) that last year we suggested merchandising research, toward which we would contribute a certain amount, but the cheese producers at that time—or shortly thereafter—entered into an agreement to sell a certain quantity of cheese to Great Britain, and it did not appear there would be any surplus left, so they did not accept our suggestion. The Ontario Agricultural College has a great deal of research going on, and we have in the main Vote some funds which could be used for that purpose, if it is necessary.

MR. ROBSON: But the cheese they undertook to sell to England sold for $5\frac{1}{2}$ c. or 6c. less than the current price, and the farmers had to take a loss on that. In fact, we have to pay 2c. a pound on all our cheese this year to make up for the loss. If the cheese producers were given encouragement to go into this thing, and if they had help, they might establish something which would be a very great help to the cheese people.

MR. PETER MANLEY (Stormont): In connection with cheese, and cheese marketing, I am certainly in accord with what the hon. member (Mr. Robson) has said. Last year, realizing the difficulties we were in, and the necessity for more advertising of the cheese industry, we in the County of Stormont put on an advertising

campaign of our own. The cheese producers contributed a certain amount of money, the Federation of Agriculture, an equal amount, and a cold storage which we have there, an equal amount, and we also received contributions from public-spirited citizens.

We went out on a campaign to sell cheese, and I am happy to announce this has been very successful. We doubled our sale of cheese in the county. We operated a "cheese school" in the City of Cornwall two days last fall, and on each one of those days we had over 500 of the consumers—that is the wives of the people of the City of Cornwall and surrounding districts—attend those cooking schools.

We had people from the department come down to operate the cooking schools, and advertise various recipes in which cheese could be used. Samples of cheese were also given to those attending the school.

I am happy to say that has been very successful, and when the consumers were asked if they wanted that school repeated this year, there certainly was a great applause, signifying their desire to have it again another year.

We found ourselves in this position, with the limited funds which we have at our disposal, both in the cheese producers and the federation as well, that we cannot go on indefinitely every year putting on a campaign of that kind. I agree that during the war years our cheese was ear-marked for Britain, and we as producers did not take the opportunity, possibly, which was afforded us in doing something about marketing and looking forward to the marketing of cheese in the Province of Ontario, but I think it has been well demonstrated over the past few years that the markets in Ontario and Canada are the best markets we have for dairy products. I think we must turn our sights to some sort of a marketing programme to further the sales of dairy products in this province. I do think the Department of Agriculture should provide the money at this particular time to help establish a fund to market cheese and dairy products.

I think it is a known fact that we have the best cheese there is anywhere in the Province of Ontario. I know that Great Britain or England will vouch for what I am saying, that we have a premium cheese, but, as I say, Ontario and Canada are the best markets we can find for these products, so anything we can do along the lines of advertising and packaging of our Ontario cheddar cheese, I think, will be well worthwhile and will be of great benefit to the cheese producers of this province.

Vote No. 5 agreed to.

On No. 6.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain the work of this branch.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Is this No. 7, Mr. Chairman?

MR. GRUMMETT: No, No. 6.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: They make various cost studies, which are available to all dairy groups, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OLIVER: Just dairy groups?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No, they are available to canneries or, in fact, anybody.

Vote 6 agreed to.

On 7.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I was interested in the remarks of the hon. Minister. He said there were over 8,000 placements last year over the previous year. I would like to ask him if he is expecting a reduction in the service this year, because last year the Estimate for this branch was \$50,000, and this year it is down to \$35,000. I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment on that?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Farm camps were abolished last year, and that is why the reduction was made.

Votes Nos. 7, 8 and 9 agreed to.

On Vote 10.

MR. MANLEY: I see there has been quite an increase this year in the appropriation in this Vote, and I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain that increase?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: The only difference there, Mr. Chairman, is in regard to salaries in the Live Stock Branch, etc.

MR. MANLEY: I am sorry, I did not hear that.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I said, Mr. Chairman, I think the change there would be in regard to salaries. That would account for the increases over the previous year in the Live Stock Branch.

MR. MANLEY: In connection with live stock and agricultural displays at fairs, I have had a number of live-stock breeders in the eastern part of the province, contact me on several occasions asking for some assistance so that they could show their stock at the Royal Winter Fair.

I believe the department will pay a certain amount of freight assistance to the Chicago Fair, and some of the other provinces are doing likewise, but the breeders feel in Eastern Ontario they are so far away from the Royal Winter Fair that they are unable to transport their stock here and compete at this fair.

I was talking to the hon. Minister of Agriculture last year a few days after the Ottawa Fair, and he told me he was very much surprised at the quality and the calibre of the stock shown in Ottawa. He also said, "They certainly should be competing against the cattle being shown at the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto." At that time, I said to him that if the department would grant a bit of assistance, the owners could transport their cattle to Toronto, and we would have many more exhibitors at the Royal Winter Fair.

I think that is something to which the eastern breeders are entitled. I think it would be an aid to them as breeders, and it would be a better way of displaying stock from Eastern Ontario in this

central exhibition here at the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member, we pay a grant which is used as prize money, but the provinces do not pay the freight on their stock. That is paid entirely by them.

Vote No. 10 agreed to.

On Vote 11.

MR. SALSBERG: On No. 11, Mr. Chairman: I believe this will provide perhaps the only opportunity to deal with the matter which aroused the working people of this province during the strike of the milk drivers and dairy employees. We are now providing salaries for the Milk Control Board of Ontario. I am not arguing at this moment that we should not provide the funds for them, but I am seriously questioning whether we are justified in providing funds for this board, if it is to continue to act as a dictator over the working conditions of the dairy employees of this province.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. member that this board is there by Statute, passed by Parliament. How can it be a "dictator"? The hon. member should read the Act.

As a matter of fact, when that Act was passed in the spring of 1950, my recollection is the hon. member voted for it.

MR. SALSBERG: You see, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister remembers exactly how I voted. I do not. But I remember certain legislation he actually piloted through the House, about which he has forgotten. I do not want to bring that up, though I have in mind the Forestry Bill which went through this House. But whether this is authorized by legislation or not, I say the legislation which was passed dealing with the rights and powers of the Milk Control Board was never understood by hon. members of this House, as providing the board should have the power to decide dictatorially how many days

workers should be employed in the industry and how workers must cope with their tasks.

By the action of this board, Mr. Chairman, hundreds of milk distributors in the City of Toronto have been driven into a position in which they are obliged to do 6 days' work in 5. That is what has happened. Collective bargaining was killed. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) shakes his head. I say it was. It was not the normal process of collective bargaining which resulted in the agreement between the dairy employees and the dairy industry. The industry looked on a 5-day delivery with favour. The men have no objection to working a 5-day week, provided they are not saddled with an extra day's work. The process of collective bargaining was "kicked out of the room" when the board took it upon itself to issue a decree that there should be a 5-day delivery of milk in the City of Toronto. And then the men had to fight the government, rather than the industry. That is the position we have before us now.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. member, that this matter was dealt with very, very carefully. As a matter of fact the Milk Board delayed to the very last minute before making any order. The matter was left to labour and to the industry to make their settlement, and everything possible was done to assist them in arriving at a settlement. But they were advised if they did not reach a settlement, the board would exercise its responsibilities in the interests of the community and of all the people in this province. They knew that if they failed to reach agreement, somebody would have to accept responsibility and act. That was the situation and I may say the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), who had to handle this matter, made it very plain to them that if a settlement was not reached, the matter could not, in the public interest, go beyond a certain point. That was the situation, and it was entirely fair.

MR. SALSBERG: The explanation given by the hon. Prime Minister does not in any way alter the accuracy of the facts as I have presented them to him.

That is, that after a certain stage of negotiations had been reached, a government board stepped in and arbitrarily decided the matter.

HON. MR. FROST: Why, of course. That was their job. They were given that job by this Legislature, and that is what they should do.

MR. SALSBERG: They were not given the job of putting on the shoulders of milk drivers an extra day's work, which they find they can hardly carry through.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out that in all these negotiations there was a Conciliation Board report which was unanimous, and which represented everybody. I am not one who says that either labour or industry is bound by a Conciliation Board report, but there is evidence in this of the fairness of that situation. I would also point out to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that in every major area in the United States, certainly—and I imagine, to some extent in Canada—there are, linked with refrigeration, restricted deliveries made possible by improved refrigeration, which result in increased pay. It is true that we all have to make adjustments, because of the times in which we live, and this is just one of them. It is not an arbitrary action. After all, public bodies have to assume their responsibilities.

MR. SALSBERG: I wish further to make it clear to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the position which I am taking here is not entirely due to the fact that he fails to convince me. What I say is not only my opinion, but the unanimous opinion of the entire organized labour movement of this province. I do not wish to add to the difficulties of the government by reminding it at this time that Labour Councils and national conventions of labour have dealt with this matter, and have gone on record as protesting the action of the Milk Board. I have in my hand one item from the *Globe and Mail*, the heading of which is "Labour Council Attacks Ruling by Milk Board." The story reads:

Immediate repeal of the Ontario Government legislation giving the Milk Control Board authority to determine the number of milk deliveries per week and delivery days was called for last night by the Toronto and District Labour Council (AFL-TLC).

In a resolution the delegates, who represent 60,000 Toronto district unionists, said the legislation ignored the interests of labour employed in the industry.

Endorsed by the council, too, was a resolution forwarded from Local 28, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, which called on delegates to protest to the Ontario Government against "the arbitrary action of the Ontario Milk Board in setting conditions of work for milk drivers and dairy workers."

In addition, it protested against the action of the Provincial Cabinet in endorsing such action and placing a statute on the record approving such legislation.

"It is regrettable at this time to be forced to take issue with authorities, directing affairs of the country," said William Jenoves, council president.

It was unfortunate the government saw fit to appoint a Milk Board on which labour was not given a seat, he continued, charging that the board used poor timing in allowing a strike to take place and then ordering the 5-day week and lifting the price ceiling.

I mention this because I feel the attitude of organized labour on this question should find expression in this Legislature, at this time, apart from the fact that I feel the same way about this, too. I am sure that is also the feeling of the whole organized labour trade union movement, and because of that I move that item No. 11 be reduced to \$1.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). What is your pleasure?

MR. SALSBERG: Aye.

CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost almost unanimously.

Item 11 agreed to.

Items 12 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

On item 18:

MR. NIXON: Item 18 is a pretty big item. Can the Minister give us any information as to how we are getting along at Guelph?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Special students for the whole of 1953—one. First year diploma course, 73; First year degree course, 101; second year diploma course, 67; second year degree course, 82; third year, 94; and fourth year, 67.

Item 18 agreed to.

On item 19.

MR. NIXON: With regard to the MacDonald Institute, item 19, some very extensive development was carried out, was it not, in new-building accommodation there?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, there was an extension built there.

MR. NIXON: What is the additional enrollment there now?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Economics, first year, 39; second year, 37; third year, 38; fourth year, 35; diploma course, 36.

MR. NIXON: That is the capacity of the school?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, that is about its capacity.

Items 19 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

On item 22.

HON. MR. CHALLIES (Minister Without Portfolio): May I, Mr. Chairman, present to the committee a short review of rural hydro development this year?

Rural hydro is a continuing operation, to maintain and improve existing systems and to bring power to the rural areas of this province. This operation can be said, now, to be reaching a new

phase, for the programme of betterment to improve power supply is becoming the major part of our work.

In 1954, for example, major and minor betterments will involve an expenditure of some \$8 million while the new extensions will cost about \$7,363,000. In order to maintain a sound agricultural economy in the post-war years, Ontario Hydro, with the backing of the Ontario Government, launched a tremendous programme of expansion in the rural areas. One result of this programme has been to increase the saturation of electrified farms in the province from 47.32 per cent. in 1947 to nearly 90 per cent. in 1953. Today there are said to be some 400 applications for electric power on the farm, and modern electrical living has become an accepted fact in our rural areas.

We have long passed the stage when rural hydro was considered a luxury. It is now considered a necessity. Hydro's approved rural programme for 1954 involves a total expenditure of \$23,933,034, of which \$20,769,878 is capitalized. Grants-in-aid to the extent of \$10,384,939 are, therefore, requested for 1954. The figure of \$23,933,034, which was approved by the Commission on January 20th, 1954, includes the following:

(1) Major betterments for 1954 and approved betterments in 1953 but not completed	\$ 7,260,663
(2) Minor betterments	1,760,850
(3) Temporary installations	68,900
(4) Routine pole replacements (Capital increase only)	387,800
(5) The construction of 1,141 miles of rural lines to extend service to 5,480 new customers and 107 miles of rural line approved but not completed in 1953 to supply service to 492 customers	7,363,460
(6) The addition to existing lines of 23,279 customers	2,911,851
(7) Transformer and meter regional pools	4,179,510
Total	<u>\$23,933,034</u>

Hon. members will find, as I have indicated, that the major part of the programme has been for the betterment of existing installations and appliances. We have provided 1,248 miles of rural power lines to serve 27,251 consumers. When I mention the figure of 90 per cent. of farms as having been served,

this refers to farms that can be mechanically served in the province, in addition to our programme of new extension.

Hon. members may be interested in seeing the following list of equipment now available in the homes and on the farms. It shows the tremendous increase in the use of electricity on farms, and it will be observed that since 1942 some 14 pieces of electrical equipment have been added to those which were formerly available.

LIST OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT IN USE

RESIDENCE

Electric range; toaster; vacuum cleaner; *floor polisher; electric iron; *electric ironer; *television; radio; Mix-master; *oil burner; water system, soft; *water system, hard; *electric grill; *radiant heater—14 pieces (7 pieces added since 1942).

DAIRY BARN

Milking machine, $\frac{3}{4}$ h.p.; milk cooler, $\frac{1}{8}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ h.p.; *ventilating fan; out-roller, 1 h.p.; *feed mixer; *gutter cleaner, 3 h.p.; water-pump, $\frac{1}{2}$ h.p.; water-pump, $\frac{1}{2}$ h.p.; *water pump, $\frac{1}{3}$ h.p.; fanning mill, $\frac{1}{3}$ h.p.; workshop; *grinder, $\frac{1}{3}$ h.p.; *compressor, $\frac{1}{3}$ h.p.; poultry house; *9—poultry water warmers—13 pieces (7 pieces added since 1942).

Of 27 pieces of equipment in use today on the average good farm, some 14 have been added since 1942. This creates a problem because of the increased consumption of electrical energy by farms in the province. Hon. members will understand the significance of this when I say that the increase in rural electrification since 1943 has amounted to 250 per cent., while, during the same time, the average use of electricity in the farms has increased by over 600 per cent.

In addition to our programmes for new extensions, the trend towards mechanization on the farm and the increased use of appliances in the rural homes has made it necessary for Ontario

* Indicates equipment added since 1942.

Hydro to maintain a firm policy in regard to rural betterments. The changing picture of power consumption indicates that rural customers no longer look to hydro merely to supply their lighting load, but regard the supply of power as essential to maintain labour-saving equipment both on the farm and in the home. Average annual farm consumption in 1945, for example, was only 2,199 kilowatt-hours. By 1953, this had increased to 3,886 kilowatt-hours per year. Rural customers who were using an average of 2,026 kilowatt-hours per year in 1945 are, today, using 3,504 kilowatt-hours.

The commission's rural customers, therefore, have a right to expect and, indeed, to demand, an extensive programme of maintenance in order to safeguard the supply of power to their equipment.

The Provincial Government has agreed to pay, as Grant-in-aid, 50 per cent. of the capitalized portion of the betterment programme in addition to 50 per cent. of the capitalized cost of extensions. It should be realized, therefore, that even when 100 per cent. saturation of farm electrification is reached, Ontario Hydro's annual rural programme may still be extensive. If existing systems are not maintained and, at times, replaced, then serious consequences may result—even to the extent of damage claims against the commission. It should also be realized, if comparisons of costs are to be made with early years, the cost of materials and labour have increased tremendously since the war. In 1945, for example, the cost of constructing 1 mile of 3-phase primary, wood-pole line was \$2,342. In 1952, this cost had increased by 89.6 per cent. to \$4,440.

We who live in cities and towns or in rural communities that have for many years been blessed with electricity tend to take its benefits for granted. Think, however, of what electrical service must mean in security and mental relief to—let us say—the thousands of elderly couples on small farms or hamlets somewhere in Ontario. Picture them putting aside their inefficient oil lamps that will

no longer require daily filling and cleaning. Picture them boiling the kettle for a cup of tea without lighting a fire in the woodstove. Think of the fire hazards which electricity eliminates from the farm home and other buildings. Think of the labour-saving appliances and the comforts electricity provides to make the farmer's toil and long working day more acceptable to young and old.

Not only in regard to the extension of rural hydro, but in regard to the extension of equipment can we see not only the problems we have now, but what problems we will be facing in the future. There will have to be a great deal of work done, and a great deal of extensive planning for the future in order to maintain the services we are giving the people in the rural areas, and that is the objective of the commission, to increase the betterments in the service, and at the same time, look after the applications as they come in.

MR. PETER MANLEY (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? The hon. Minister has pointed out what a benefit hydro is to the rural people, especially the older people living on the farms. I was wondering if the commission was considering doing anything in regard to the rural people in the more sparsely-settled districts.

Let us consider, for instance, a family living down a concession road, where the regulations call for so many subscribers per mile. I think every rural home should have the benefit of hydro, and these people, simply because they are living a little beyond the set limit, feel it is a great burden upon them to defray the costs of bringing power into their homes, and I think they are being penalized enough at the present time owing to the power rates, and being long distances off the main travelled roads, and it is a hardship upon them which is not felt by those living in the other parts of the community.

I was wondering if the Hydro was thinking of modifying their rules, to possibly give those people hydro without that extra cost.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Chairman, the matter of added costs or guaranteed contracts is so little, as compared with the service they receive, that there is no reason why everyone in Ontario could not have rural hydro, within economic reason.

One must remember, however, that hydro is sold at cost. One must also remember that even with the 50 per cent. furnished by the government by way of grants, to get the power to the farmers on primary and secondary lines and there are no funds from which the commission can take money to subsidize those living beyond a certain point.

However, the rules and regulations are very flexible. If there is a farmer living a certain distance beyond the limit, he can do one of two things; either pay for the extra line himself—and the commission is always ready to help in any way they can to engineer the line for anyone who wishes to put it in, by private contractor—or, on the other hand, have the guaranteed contract. That means so little when one thinks of the average cost of electricity today, over the province, being a little over 2.2c. per kilowatt hour, and when one thinks of the service received, compared with anything else. I do not know of any method by which we could extend the amount of units per mile, or beyond the economic areas, and still give the service.

MR. NIXON (Brant): Is the hon. Minister not going to tell the House the farmers are getting their hydro for less than they were 10 years ago?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I will be very glad to.

MR. NIXON: I thought the hon. Minister might tell us how many were getting it.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member for Stormont is receiving his hydro for .92c. per k.w.h. cheaper in 1953 than in 1942—1942 cost, 3.45c. k.w.h.; 1953 cost, 2.53c. per k.w.h. The hon. member from Brant for the first quarter in 1953, paid 1.54c. per k.w.h.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the hon. Minister about the conversion from 25 to 60 cycles in the rural areas. What percentage of that is now completed?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I would assume that about the same percentage as over the 25-cycle area. I think over half of the area has been converted.

MR. NIXON: How is that being paid for?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: They pay for it out of the contingent rate, in the rural areas.

MR. OLIVER: All of it?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: It is all being charged back to rural communities?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes.

MR. NIXON: Is there any item in the Estimates for conversion?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: There is no item in the Estimates for conversion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBSON (Hastings East): Mr. Chairman, we know the Department of Agriculture is paying 50 per cent. by way of grant for rural lines, but supposing a rural community decides to set up a public utility, and put their own line in, does the department require them to pay the 50 per cent. back to Hydro?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: When a municipality takes over a rural line, the amount which has been paid in in the form of grants by the government, is included in the amount the newly-formed commission has to pay for that line.

MR. ROBSON: The Hydro really only pays 50 per cent. If the line cost \$400,000, the Hydro would only pay \$200,000 of that. The other \$200,000 is paid by the province?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: With the increasing value of the line, one-half of it would go back to the government.

MR. ROBSON: That means a rural municipality which forms a commission, has to pay back to the Department of Agriculture, that proportion of the grant they put in?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes.

MR. ROBSON: Is that not unduly severe on the people who are trying to help themselves? Are you not handicapping them a bit in that regard? You advocate municipalities owning their own, and now you are making it doubly difficult for the municipalities to do so. We pay back the entire \$400,000, and it only costs the Hydro \$200,000.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: When a municipality takes over, it immediately is taken out of the rural hydro system, and it becomes a municipal system not subsidized by the government.

MR. ROBSON: But they are still rural.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: That is quite true, but their system is set up entirely differently.

Every year there are a number of lines which extend beyond the municipality into the rural area, and after the rural area is taken into the municipality, the municipality pays for this line at the depreciated cost, and that goes back into the funds of Hydro, with the government share credited to the government.

MR. ROBSON: Why should it be that way, if the Department of Agriculture pays for half the line?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Not the Department of Agriculture, but the Provincial Treasurer.

HON. MR. FROST: I never heard of the government being paid back any money in one of these deals.

MR. ROBSON: I have. The question came up the other day.

MR. NIXON: Does the government get it back?

MR. ROBSON: It did not cost the Hydro \$400,000 to build; it only cost \$200,000. Yet if we take it over, we have to pay the \$400,000. What will you do with the other \$200,000?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: If it is taken over by a municipality the municipality provides \$400,000, of which \$200,000 goes to the general hydro fund, and the other \$200,000 goes back to the government.

Incidentally, I think the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) was asking about his hydro account. All I can say is his rate is 1.54c. per k.w.h. for the first quarter of 1953.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, may I try and get a word in edgeways? My heart bleeds for the poor farmers in the east, and the terrific rates they have to pay for hydro.

On my own small farm up north, I have all the benefits of hydro, for which I am very thankful, at a cost of some \$20 per month. We have places in our part of the country—and listen to this, you rural farmers in the east—who are buying power from the Canadian National Railway. I am thinking of Nakina, amongst others. There is a small merchant there, who has electric lights, and an electric refrigerator, and his bill for three months was \$436. We certainly would like to have hydro in places like Nakina and Hornepayne, and we are pleading with Hydro to put it in there, because these people have none of the benefits of the people in the eastern part of the province.

When you are complaining about a few cents extra to obtain the benefits of hydro, I say give it to us, and we will be glad to pay even double what you are paying here.

We hear a great deal about "conversion" in the east; the hon. members should come up to our part of the province, and see what we are up against.

MR. SALSBERG: You want to be converted?

MR. WARDROPE: I ask the hon. Minister to give Nakina and Horne-payne—municipalities with a population of around 2,000 each—hydro, because they are compelled now to buy it from the Canadian National Railway, and at certain times of the day, the housewives cannot use their electric irons and stoves, and they are telephoned, and told they cannot use their washing machines.

It is not a question of paying a few dollars. It is a question of getting this priceless thing we call "hydro." If you want us to pay a few extra cents, we will be glad to do it, if you will put in the hydro. That is all we want.

MR. SALSBERG: The farmers want it.

MR. ROBSON: That is all very fine for the hon. member for Porth Arthur, coming as he does, from Northern Ontario. We are comparing our rates with ones just across the border in the towns and cities, and our rates are exorbitant; we are paying about three times as much. We are going to form the Utilities to try and cut it down a little bit, as the burden is terrific, but the cost for establishing these Utilities is away up. It is nearly double what it would cost the hydro people.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): The hon. Minister, Mr. Challies, is saying how much more it costs him now to build lines than it did 10 or 12 years ago. I wonder to what extent he is checking on the efficiency with which these lines are being built?

I am in the most unhappy position of having one of these lines being built across my own fields, as well as those of my neighbours, for which I am getting the magnificent sum of \$75 a tower, and, Mr. Chairman, that is all I shall ever get. One hundred years from now those towers will be there, the same as they are today. My son and, I hope, my grandsons, will be working around them, but \$75 is the cash settlement for all time.

I would cheerfully have given \$300 a tower if they would have kept them off the place. I would not have them there for any consideration. We have spent 139 years trying to clear the land, so that it can be farmed advantageously, and now those horrible things come upon us.

However, Mr. Chairman, that is not what I was going to talk about. If one happens to be in the road of progress, one simply has to suffer for it, that is all. But we have just come through a very heavy winter, the ground has been frozen hard, and they could have gone in there and delivered the steel on the ground where the tower is going to be built, in a half-hour's time. Instead of doing that, they are going through when there is no frost on the ground, one truck winching through with another one, and I am horrified to think of the condition that land will be in when we have to go on it next year. Why, for heaven's sake, if you want to have some efficiency in your lines, do you cross the fields when the frost is coming out of the ground? If you went on the high-ways when they are in that condition, with an overload, you would end up in the police court.

It certainly seems to me there is poor planning and lack of efficiency in trying to build a line and truck the steel in on the farm when the frost is coming out of the ground.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I appreciate what the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) has said. He is perfectly correct. I know that the trucks should not go on the farms when the frost is coming out of the ground, and it is worse when you cross land with tiling. Instructions have been given to the engineering section not to do that, and all I can say is if they do so, I think I would put in a good bill for damages.

Going back to the subject of the towers—and I always like to get back to those—in 1940 all a farmer got for a steel tower was \$50. We increased that amount in 1947, and paid an occupational rate for the land under the wires, which brought it up to an average of

\$101.20. We thought that was not sufficient, and we increased it again, so the farmer today is getting, on an average, \$151.80 for a steel tower, for which back in 1940 he received only \$50, so we can at least say we are sympathetic to the problem.

In other words, if that is reduced to the equivalent of dollars per acre, in 1940 it was \$13.74; it was then stepped up to \$27.80, and it is now \$41.70. In terms of equivalent dollars for the use of the land the tower is on, as well as the occupation right under the line.

MR. NIXON: Of course, there are acres and acres, Mr. Chairman, as you well know. In the case of my own land, you can put up towers on any wasteland, and leave them there forever, for nothing, but when you pick out the very best part of cultivated farms, with a short rotation, what is fair in the case of permanent pasture, waste land, or scrub land, is not a consideration concerning the damage you do to a farmer who is trying to make a living off that field.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: That is already taken care of, Mr. Chairman, in the question of arable land. The tower is \$75.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): But there is arable land and arable land.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes, which increases the value of the land the tower goes on. It is too bad someone cannot invent a method for the transmission of electrical energy without poles or towers.

As far as going over certain types of land, the practice now is to take an aeroplane picture of the land the power line is to go over, and try to arrange the route so it will skip the centre of the fields and put towers into the corners and onto the worst land. We do the best we can. We have raised the price; I do not say it is high enough, but as long as we have to use towers to transmit energy, I am afraid that problem will remain with us. We will do the best we can to ease the results of it.

Vote 22 agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress.

Report concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed. Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions, and asks leave to sit again.

Report concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go ahead with the Budget Debate, and will have a night session tomorrow night. We will take the Estimates in alphabetical order.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5 of the clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, March 23, 1954

Afternoon Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 23, 1954.

Final Report Standing Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Root	671
Homes for the Aged Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	671
Grand River Conservation Act, 1938, bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, first reading ..	672
Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Edwards	672
Resumption of Debate on the Budget Address, Mr. Child, Mr. Cowling, Mr. Nickle, Mr. Brandon	675
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Fishleigh, agreed to	692
Township of Scarborough, bill respecting, third reading	692
City of Toronto, bill respecting, third reading	692
Provincial Parks Act, 1954, third reading	692
Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, third reading	693
Trees Act, bill to amend, third reading	693
Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, bill to amend, third reading	693
Crown Timber Act, 1952, bill to amend, third reading	693
Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, second reading	693
Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, bill respecting, Mr. Frost, second reading	693
Protection for Persons Working in Trenches Act, Mr. Daley, second reading	695
Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, second reading	695
Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, second reading	697
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, second reading	697
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, second reading	697
Recess, six o'clock	699

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very glad today to welcome students from the Owen Sound Collegiate Institute, the Earls court Public School, the Warden Avenue Public School, and the Rolph Road Public School, all of Toronto. A little earlier, we had students from 10 schools in Nassagaweya Township, who went through the Chamber and received the lecture at that time.

We welcome the students from the City of Toronto and Owen Sound to the Assembly this afternoon. We hope those from out-of-town will enjoy their stay in Toronto, and that they will go back more enthusiastic about the great province in which they live.

I beg leave to announce that the Private Bills Committee will not meet at 5 o'clock this afternoon, but at 7 o'clock tomorrow evening.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. JOHN ROOT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second and final report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Root from the Standing Committee on Agriculture presents the committee's second and final report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 68, An Act respecting the Milk Industry.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. MR. FROST moves the time for receiving reports by Committees on Private Bills be extended to Thursday, April 1st.

MR. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Can we receive reports on the last day?

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition means by "the last day" — perhaps the second last day.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

THE HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments will only apply to homes which have been built or will be built in

districts. They provide for a method of securing an equalized assessment, so that not only the maintenance but capital costs can be apportioned back each year, and in the case of debentures, they will be apportioned back to the various municipalities in the district, each year over the period during which these debentures are being paid off.

THE GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION ACT

HON. MR. WARRENDER moves first reading of bill intituled "An Act to amend the Grand River Conservation Act, 1938."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a very short amendment. When the Grand River Conservation Commission has apportioned the benefit of a scheme among the participating municipalities, it is required under subsection 1 of section 9 to notify the municipalities, and, under subsection 2, any dissatisfied municipality may on 10 days' notice to the commission apply to the Municipal Board for a review of the apportionment. Subsection 2 of section 9 is rewritten to require that the application for review be made within 1 month after the municipality is notified of the apportionment.

HON. MR. WELSH: I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The 34th Annual Report of the Department of Labour of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1953.

HON. L. M. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the day, may I refer to the announcement you made a few moments ago relative to the Private Bills Committee meeting tomorrow night.

I find now that is not satisfactory, and I would like to leave it this way, Mr. Speaker—that the meeting of the Private Bills Committee be postponed pending the fixing of a later time. It may be, sir, that we should have the meeting on Thursday afternoon at 5.30. I am planning a night session on Thursday, but

the House might adjourn at 5.30, and the Private Bills Committee might meet at that time. I will make an announcement about this later.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Throne Speech debate, I would first like to compliment those who have already spoken for their contribution to this Legislature. I would also like to pay tribute to the capable and fair way in which you, sir, perform your duties in this House and your many friendly acts will not soon be forgotten.

I would like to spend a short time on a few points regarding the budget so ably presented by the Prime Minister. In connection with the special grants and payments, I can assure you that every hospital in my riding is very grateful for the \$300 per bed for retirement of capital debt or for rehabilitation purposes. In connection with hospitals, I would like to publicly pay tribute to those who serve on the various boards in all our communities, charged with the operation of our hospitals. The only unhappy feature in a few cases is the rising charges per day for hospital care. This creates a fear in a great many who want to pay their way and cannot afford to have even inexpensive treatment.

One fact we frequently lose sight of in connection with various services is that we have groups of people in our economy—those who are well-to-do and can afford to pay for any necessary medical service; those who cannot pay anything and are helped by our various free clinics, and the vast middle-class, who are caught between the upper and nether millstones. These people struggle to pay their way and often, because of fear of the expense, they put off early treatment of diseases, such as cancer. It would appear to me that our government could and should take the lead with a Contributory Health Insurance Plan. This and free cancer clinic service from one end of our province to the other is, I consider, a must, and would allay the

fears and worries of many who postpone early treatment, because they are afraid of the cost. I have mentioned before that it is my belief that hospitals should be set up on a plan similar to secondary school areas. In this way all municipalities taking advantage of the service would be duty bound to share the capital cost.

Regarding the per capita gift to the municipalities, I would also submit that the sooner the \$4 paid to the large areas is made uniform across the province, the fairer it will be. Our smaller communities still do not have large assessing possibilities, which limits their taxing abilities for improvements. I also maintain that our urban centres and the few separated towns in this province should be freed entirely from the upkeep, in whole or part, of provincial highways. We recognize the fact that amendments submitted several years ago permitting suburban roads commissions to be set up has brought some small relief, but we should go much further. I might point out that St. Marys, a separated town in the riding which I have the honour to represent, has 2½ miles of provincial highways in its municipality. It is admitted by all that they have a real problem with their upkeep in view of the present heavy all-day and every day traffic on No. 7 Highway.

I would also like to mention the decentralization of industry. Our whole province would be much better off if every village, town and small city could be assisted by having one or two light industries locate in their confines. I would urge that both our own government and that at Ottawa should get together on such a plan and try to assist the smaller municipalities. A great many people would enjoy and benefit by the rural way of life, if opportunity of employment was there.

Further, in connection with the decentralization of industry, I would like to speak briefly on transportation and shipping costs. I would urge that some thought and study be given to the elimination of the unfair practices carried on by some trucking firms in

connection with rates charged. Surely now is the time when either the province or the Dominion, or both, should have control and should use it for the equalization of all rates.

Let us consider the traffic on our roads (and possibly a lot of it should be still on our railroads); long-haul traffic, huge tractor-trailers going from our large motor-vehicle plants in Ontario, as far as the western coast. These vehicles create a definite hazard on our highways and in quite a number of our towns through which they pass. This constitutes one of the many problems arising out of this immense trucking movement at the present time. Other trucks come into this province bringing tractor-trailer loads of butter and what do they take back? They take margarine back. The question arises—are we charging enough for licences for these vehicles which contribute largely to the deterioration of our highways and more particularly those which have not been hard-topped?

Then we have our bus services, a network through this whole province. Are they paying sufficient licence fees to compensate for the upkeep necessary on our highways and for the franchise they have?

It was my happy experience this last week-end, along with others, to pay a visit to Cobalt, travelling via the Ontario Northland on fine new equipment supplied by the Canadian National Railways. It would seem to me that if all our railways would provide the same service all over our province, they would reclaim their rightful place in the passenger field, as well as the freight field and in so doing relieve unemployment in Stratford and Palmerston, both railway centres.

I would like also to bring to the attention of this House a few problems in connection with conservation. We have seen the good result of planning in the Fanshawe on the Thames. It has proven its worth in more ways than one, but let us go further with immediate action by the upper Thames River conservation authorities. This flood danger was most imminent a few weeks ago in

the Town of Mitchell. At that time a menace was created and the Thames River swelled to within 4 feet of an all time high—even more dangerous, the water supply of the town is within 10 feet of the Thames and must be safeguarded for the health of the residents. This last Wednesday a 4-man delegation from the Town of Mitchell presented a brief to the Upper Thames Authority at their annual meeting, asking for immediate action to set up a flood control in this area. Mitchell Town Council have approved the sum of \$54,000.00 as their share of the cost.

Another problem hinging on when this project is undertaken is the urgent need for proper sanitation facilities and sewers. This is a job much needed for the protection of local health and for the proper care to prevent pollution, not only for the Thames River, but others, including the Grand River. Let us hope the time is not too far distant when government assistance will be available to permit the carrying out of these projects.

I could mention other municipalities in my riding which have similar and possibly just as large a problem in connection with flood control and sewage. I refer to the Towns of Mitchell and St. Marys.

I would be very remiss if I did not bring to the attention of this House a few points regarding the position of Perth County in connection with agriculture. Earning power has been greatly reduced. There are 4,357 farms in Perth County, with approximately 510,000 acres, 452,000 of which are improved. The total population of the county is approximately 52,500, with nearly 19,000 farm population. This group, you see, accounts for a sizeable proportion of produce for the markets of our country. In 1953, 6,616,696 lbs. of butter and 1,464,141 lbs. of cheese were produced in Perth County. Besides, every day many truck loads of whole milk find their way to the dairies of this city. I would again point out that just because milk is 15c. a glass here the farmer is not making a large profit. If we were to be fair, 10c. a glass should still show the restaurant

operator a good profit. Many people do not know that 38 to 39 quarts of milk comprise 100 lbs. of milk for which the farmer gets maybe \$4.70 per 100 lbs. less transportation.

Too many people think the farmer gets the large end. In fact, with the prices you and I and John Public pay for bacon, milk and other products produced on the farm, the farmer should get half as much again. We must never forget that they do not have a 40-hour, or even a 48-hour week, but work every day of the week, all the year round, particularly those engaged in the dairy branch of agriculture.

I would like to say a few words regarding education in this province. From day to day, we read and hear of presentations of briefs to the government requesting increased aid for education. As a taxpayer I pay my share of the cost and know the need of assistance to our municipalities. \$3.00 per student for text books and \$1.00 for library needs, does not go too far with the costs as they are today. I submit it might be a better plan if the government would supply all the text books for all grades, and beyond that let the pupils buy their notebooks, exercise books, pencils and other supplies wherever they choose. We doubt with all the new courses and text books covering same if the basic truths in connection with arithmetic and grammar are changed. The same goes for correct spelling. Since 1919 I have either worked in or owned a drug-store which supplied local school books and I know that year after year, fewer dealers are left who are willing to handle these books because of the confusion resulting from the number of text books required and the change in courses. I would suggest that fewer texts are required and not so many options. I might mention one case in this connection in the primary schools. Two neighbouring schools, in different township areas use two different texts in connection with the teaching of arithmetic, at the discretion of the teacher. This I maintain is not necessary.

We should have standard text books and the department should supply them. We all recall in our own childhood days

when the primer cost 4c. If I remember correctly they ran, 6, 8, 12 and 15 in the different grades. Going back to those times the government of the day paid the author of the approved text a royalty and then further subsidized the printing of same, resulting in the low prices of text books. Today the author of the approved text is paid a royalty by the publisher, and no doubt this has a great deal to do with the high cost of our text books, along with increased labour costs. I would submit it might be a good policy for the government again to pay the royalty to the author of the approved text, and call for public tenders on a competitive basis for the printing of the books. Today it costs over \$22 for text books to start a student in our secondary schools. I submit we would be doing more for the children of the future and be of greater assistance to the parents of this province if such a course were undertaken.

Regarding child welfare and protection, I would like to bring to the attention of this House the real service being rendered by the Department of Welfare under the capable direction of the hon. Mr. Goodfellow and his Deputy. In the field of child welfare, it has been my privilege over the past few years to become acquainted with the good work being done by the Children's Aid Society of the riding which I represent. Early this year, they suffered a severe loss in the passing of the late Mr. E. M. T. Griffith, past president of the society, who was formerly prominently connected with the work for many years. He was held in high esteem in the whole community and will be greatly missed. The co-operation of the Minister and his Deputy in this field of work has brought many plaudits from the groups interested in children's welfare.

Before closing, I would again like to bring to your attention Canada's Stratford Festival, the greatest achievement on record in its first year, 1953. It was a startling example of the success of the Canadian pioneer spirit on a new and unexplored frontier. Over 68,000 persons attended in a 6 weeks' season last year, grossing \$205,942 in box office receipts. It was a well-planned and

boldly imaginative exploitation of resources which are no less valuable for being intangible. It attracted a large number of visitors from outside Canada and established a standard which assures that its drawing power will ever increase.

A clipping from the *Financial Post* reads: "no event this year (referring to 1953, of course) has so enhanced in non-material ways the name of Canada, but it has done something even more important than spreading the good name of Canada abroad. It has established within Canada a self-confidence in a vital field of expression and thereby enriched the life of our nation."

This year over a longer period, from June 28th to August 21st, Stratford Shakespearean Festival presents three more Shakespearean plays. It is my sincere hope that many of you who did not have the opportunity to visit the County City last year may avail yourselves of the opportunity this coming summer.

MR. ARTHUR CHILD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the Budget Debate, and to congratulate the hon. Minister of Health for his successful efforts to have the 600-bed extension to the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton and the 125-bed nurses' residence included in the 1954-55 budget. This is something I have been fighting for since 1951 and, at times, I thought I was fighting a losing battle as it had been suggested that the 600 beds should be built in the Port Dover area. Had this been done, it would have put a tremendous hardship on the relatives of the patients in the Hamilton district that pay regular visits to their loved ones. Once again, I congratulate the Minister for his wisdom in keeping the present hospital site; as it is so convenient to transportation and encourages visitors to the hospital, so necessary in the patients' treatments. From time to time, I have visited the hospital to get a more accurate picture of present conditions. It has always amazed me that our superintendent at the hospital, Dr. Senn, has been able to do such an outstanding job with regard

to the treatment and service to the patients under such crowded conditions. Actually, the hospital cares for double the number of patients it was originally built for. Also to Dr. Senn's credit, is the record of patients discharged annually, which amounts to, approximately, 450. Last year 66.7 patients were discharged per 100 admitted. A remarkable record. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because, unfortunately, many people today are not cognizant of the work being done in our mental institutions.

I am sure the news of the extension was also greeted with open arms by many of our leading churchmen who have also been concerned with the overcrowding of our elderly patients. Many relatives of patients have already spoken to me saying how pleased they were to know that the much talked of addition was going to become a reality.

I might say, I have also heard of some very complimentary remarks from some of our labour people as the hospital project will mean employment for a large number of our local tradesmen.

We are, at the present time, very concerned in Hamilton with our employment problem, and I would ask the hon. Minister of Health and the hon. Minister of Public Works to expedite this most welcome project so as to help ease the unemployment situation in Hamilton as soon as possible.

And now Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to another problem which is a very difficult one in my riding. It is one concerning housing. We have at the present time, approximately 400 rental war-time houses on the mountain. These were built during the war to take care of the increased number of war workers, and there was an agreement made by the City of Hamilton and the property owners, before they were built, that these temporary homes would be removed within 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

At the present time, there have been two extensions to the original agreement. As it stands now, the expiry date of the last extension, is June 30th, 1955. The problem is Mr. Speaker, there are

some people in the homes that are not in a position to pay a large down payment on a permanent type home, although there are some who could. Due to the temporary type of construction of the houses, the property owners in the adjacent area are demanding the city live up to its agreement to remove the homes and to allow homes to be built that will be in keeping with the rest of the houses in the district.

I believe at the present time, the tenants in the war-time houses can buy the house they are renting, provided they agree to move it to another location outside the city, as they claim they do not comply with the city's building by-laws.

Information I have received, leads me to believe the city will honour their agreement in June, 1955. Although I realize this is an agreement between the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the City of Hamilton and the property owners, and does not directly concern the Provincial Government, it does effect the provincial member for Wentworth, inasmuch as it is, I believe, my responsibility to assist the people in my riding whenever possible, and so I would ask the hon. Minister of Planning and Development to see if he could find some means (under the land assembly scheme that has already been started on the mountain) of setting aside sufficient land for these houses, which could be serviced and cement foundations put in on the federal, provincial and municipal agreement. I believe if such a suggestion can be carried out, it would go a long way to relieve our present housing condition, and I would urge upon the Minister to give this his most serious consideration.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on education. As it is today, educational costs make up a large part of our municipal tax bill. The problem of keeping abreast of the demand for more classrooms is getting bigger each year.

I was fortunate to be present at the official opening of the Charles H. Bray School in Ancaster, and it was announced by the chairman of the school

board on the opening night that the school was already overcrowded.

One of the points that pleased me with the school was that all unnecessary frills had been eliminated. One of the main faults with some of our school boards in the province is that they pass on architects' plans that cost the taxpayers up to \$30,000 per classroom, when actually they can be built for half of this price.

From information I have received, both Burlington and Guelph have built schools for \$15,000 and \$15,500 per classroom, and are finding their needs adequate to teach their pupils.

Last year I recommended to the Department of Education that the department draw up a number of sets of standard plans for schools, specifying the materials to be used for the various types of schools required, and that government grants should only be paid on a school if the school board uses one of the government plans. With several sets of plans of various types, the school boards would be in a position to choose a particular type of design that would be adaptable to their particular location.

All we require to educate our children today is a good dry shelter, well ventilated and heated, with ample light and seating accommodation, and decorated in a harmony of colours that would be pleasing and restful to the children.

I fail to see the advantage of building schools to last 75 to 100 years when they are outdated and outmoded in 25 to 30 years at the outside.

If we are going to start economizing to assist the taxpayers, I believe the leadership or direction should come from the Provincial Government and I suggest, as a means for starting this programme of economizing, we reduce the figure of \$20,000 per classroom, which we will pay a grant on, to \$17,500, and no government grants should be paid on any classroom that costs in excess of \$22,500.

In this way the taxpayers in the municipalities would receive some protection on educational costs from over-

ambitious school boards that have in the past been building monuments to themselves.

I am not sure that my observations will be welcomed by some of the school boards in the province, but I can assure the hon. Minister of Education they will have the blessing of many of our taxpayers, as it was the taxpayers in my riding who brought this to my attention and made some of the suggestions I have recommended today.

I understand if we do not curtail our expenditures on school construction the salaries paid to the teachers may be jeopardized in the future.

This, I am sure, would be a definite mistake. The most important person connected with the school is the teacher and the quality of the teachers we employ will reflect the quality of the citizens we look to to govern our country in the future.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for a very outstanding budget, and, having spoken on the important subject of conservation in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I am pleased to find the hon. Prime Minister saw fit to include \$16½ million for conservation in his budget.

I would like to say another word on an important point, which has to do with our young people. We speak about the conservation of our streams, our rivers, watersheds, trees, and so on, and I sometimes think we should consider the conservation of our young people. The department is doing a great job for the province in this connection, and the young people are taking advantage of it.

Incidentally, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) said in an address here a day or two ago that he thought the young people of today were getting into trouble too much, or words to that effect—I cannot just recall how he put it.

I would like to disagree with him, and say that in my opinion the young folks of today are even better than they formerly were. I speak of Toronto parti-

cularly, Mr. Speaker. Not so many years ago we were having a great deal of trouble in our city with juvenile delinquents, young people getting together in crowds or gangs in our parks and other areas, and making things most uncomfortable for themselves, and for the citizens generally. I think congratulations are due to the police department and the council of the City of Toronto for the great job they have done there.

In my own riding of High Park, we had a group called the "Junction Gang." They were notorious in that district, and it was through the co-operation of the citizens' groups, the police and the government, that we were able to do something about that gang, to eliminate it, and we have not heard of any gangs of any description in the City of Toronto now for several years.

The point I am presenting is that our young people are good people. Our young people are interested politically, they are taking an interest in politics on a civic, provincial and federal level. As a matter of fact, it was my pleasure a week or so ago to attend the regional public speaking contest held by one of our good service clubs in the City of Toronto, and we had 8 teen-agers speaking on any subject they chose, and it was very amazing, and very pleasing, Mr. Speaker, to notice that all through the talks given by these young people, there was a trend toward good government, and what the young people of today could do to help in giving good government.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, they are taking an interest. They are interested in government; they are interested in people; they are interested in whom they elect to represent them, and I sometimes think the suggestion of reducing the voting age from 21 to 18 may have some merit, but at the same time, 2 in particular of the young people who spoke in the contest were very definitely opposed to reducing the voting age, because they did not feel they were qualified, or had enough understanding of the present-day situations to cast an intelligent vote. I just give that for what it is worth, Mr. Speaker.

But I do feel that in our young people's organizations, and in our young political organizations, we have a great opportunity for the future. After all, they are citizens of the days to come; they will take our places in this House, and will continue the good government we have had for so many years. I am pleased to see their interest and I am sure the hon. members of the House take the same interest in them as I do.

Turning for a moment to our senior citizens, our older folk—I do not like to use the expression "old folks"; I would rather call them "senior citizens"—I want to congratulate the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) for making some reference to this class of people, in his address. I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) mention something along the same line in his address a day or two ago, something about the old folks and what could be done for them.

I am not in a position to say whether any supplementary grants can be given to the old-age pensioners now, but I think our hon. Prime Minister covered that pretty well in his reply to a question put by one of the hon. members.

But let us see if something can be done, particularly in co-operation with the government at Ottawa, whereby we can do something to assist the old folks in their later years, and provide them with the wherewithal with which to enjoy life a little more fully.

As a member of the Toronto City Council, I had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the situation at Lambert Lodge. The Lodge residents are enjoying things there. I think there are about 750 of them.

We must be reasonable. We must consider that the old folks of today were the young people of yesterday, and we must stop to realize the great contributions they have made to our Canadian way of life.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any way we can assist in helping them make their declining years happier, I am sure it is the intention of this government to do so.

There is one subject which I bring up annually, and I hope it will pay dividends, and a decision arrived at by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the live stock crossing our thoroughfares at St. Clair Avenue West in High Park riding. A couple of weeks ago, I took the opportunity, with members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, to visit the new food terminal in the Township of Etobicoke. Following that, we had a very nice luncheon at the Canada Packers, and made a tour of the packing houses, and also had a very good look at the Ontario Stock Yards. I am sure the hon. members were much impressed, as I was.

In the annual report of the Ontario Stock Yards, they say that the net profit for 1953 was more than \$48,000, an increase of more than \$20,000 over the previous year, resulting from the handling of a record high of 758,214 live stock, up about 65,000 head over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, most of the live stock crosses St. Clair Avenue during the working day. I ask the hon. members if they can think of any other large city in the Dominion of Canada, where live stock are still permitted to cross a main thoroughfare. I would like to know. Mr. Speaker, I hasten to say to the rural members, that I am not condemning the live stock. After all, we need the steaks, and I am not saying a word about the fact that it may be a good place to have them, but the point I am making is; we do not want them to cross the city streets during rush hours.

As a member of the Toronto City Council in 1950, with some of my colleagues, I was able to have a by-law passed which prohibited the use of city streets for live stock between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., so it just remains for the hon. Minister to "o.k." that, and we will have the live stock off the streets.

If you will remember, the *Globe and Mail* had a series entitled, "This is Toronto," depicting some of the not too pleasant aspects of our great Metropolitan City. I took the liberty of

cutting this one out, Mr. Speaker, which is a very good photograph showing a number of good fat cows crossing St. Clair Avenue, and the trucks and cars lined up away back on the road.

In addition to the fact that they tie up traffic, Mr. Speaker, on one of the busiest Metropolitan roads, they are dangerous. We have had loose cows and steers in our parks adjacent to these crossings, and I understand from some of my farmer friends that when a bull or steer becomes unruly on the farm, the best thing to do is to ship it to the stock yards for beef.

Can you imagine some of these unruly bulls getting loose on a main thoroughfare, getting down to the parks where the children are using swings and into the area where they play? It just is not right, and I think the time has come for some action.

MR. SALSBERG: How about a tunnel?

MR. COWLING: Every time I attend our St. Clair-Maybank Ratepayers Association by the Stock Yards—and it is an outstanding ratepayers group—they raise this question of the live stock. Following a meeting the other day, they put me right "on the spot," by asking, "What are you going to do about it?" I say there are several solutions. We could dig an underground passage and have the live stock go down below; we could put a bridge across the top, such as they have in Montreal; or else, we could say they must use big transport trucks.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that all the local packers, with the exception of the two big packing houses and I am not condemning them, they are doing a great job and I would like to say that the packing house business is the largest single industry in this great Metropolitan Area of Toronto; they are providing a great deal of work and that part is fine—but I say this, that if the local small packing houses can send a transport to the Ontario Stock Yards and take their live stock away, then the same thing should apply to the two

packing houses adjacent to the Ontario Stock Yards.

For years and years, they have been able to use the city streets at no charge. I think it is high time we took some action in this regard. As far as the people of High Park are concerned, and the people in the other areas, they are behind this thing 100 per cent. The live stock are sometimes dangerous; they hold up traffic; they create a very nauseating odour during the summer months, by constantly crossing the highway, and they are a danger to the children and citizens in that area.

I would like the hon. Minister to give very serious consideration to some way of eliminating this danger.

Incidentally, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I understand the packers are transporting hogs in trucks. If they can transport hogs, they can transport cattle. So let us get the live stock off the streets; let us become a big town, because that is actually what we are. We have a million and a quarter people in this area. Let us not have the other large centres across the country ridiculing us because we still permit cows on the streets.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I have a few observations I would like to make at this time with relation to the budget.

One of the matters which has given me some concern in the last several weeks is the report I read in the newspapers that Mr. Blair Fraser, who writes for *Maclean's* magazine and other newspapers, as a result of a libel action was ordered by the court to disclose the source of his information. In my judgment if that is good law—and I do not question it at the moment—then I say the time has come for those of us who believe in the freedom of the press to amend the law, so there may be freedom of the press without fear on the part of those who express themselves fearlessly and frankly of having to disclose the sources of their information.

As a matter of law, any action of libel according to the Judicature Act must be

tried by a jury, unless counsel representing the plaintiff and the defendant in the action, consent to have the action tried by a judge without the intervention of the jury.

Then the Libel and Slander Act as enacted in the Statutes of Ontario, states that:

In any action for libel contained in a newspaper, may at any time after the delivery of the statement of claim or the expiry of the time within which it should have been delivered, apply to the court for security for costs, upon notice and an affidavit by the defendant, or his agent, showing the nature of the action, of the defence, that the plaintiff is not possessed of property sufficient to answer the costs of the action in case judgment is given in favour of the defendant, that the defendant has a good defence upon the merits, and that the statements complained of were published in good faith, or that the grounds for action are trivial or frivolous, the court may make an order for the plaintiff to give security for costs which shall be given in accordance with the practice in cases where a plaintiff resides out of Ontario, and the order shall be a stay of proceedings until the security is given.

As a matter of law, anybody who has had any experience in the courts must know, and indeed does know, if you are going to institute an action against a newspaper, you serve a newspaper, and if you know the name of the reporter who wrote the article, his name may be added to it. Then as a mark of prudence, you not only sue the newspaper, but the reporter who wrote the article.

At the same time, if an aggrieved person wants to get damages as a result of a libelous article which appeared in a newspaper, all he need do, per se, is to prove his damages, and his damages may not be substantial if the alleged libel was published in good faith, on the grounds that it was believed that the publication was for the public benefit and did not involve a criminal charge.

It seems to me that the time has now come when the hon. Attorney-General of this province and those who advise him, should carefully consider The Evidence Act, particularly section 7, which states:

(1) A witness shall not be excused from answering any questions upon the grounds that the answer might tend to criminate him or may tend to establish his liability to a civil proceedings at the instance of the Crown or of any person or to a prosecution under any act of the Legislature.

(2) If with respect to any question a witness objects to answering upon any grounds mentioned in subsection 1 and if, but for this section or any act of the Parliament of Canada, he would, therefore, have been excused from answering such question, then, although the witness is, by reason of this section or by reason of any Act of the Parliament of Canada, compelled to answer, the answer so given shall not be used or receivable in evidence against him in any civil proceeding or any proceeding under any Act of the Legislature.

If we are going to have, as I have indicated a moment ago, outstanding and fearless press reports, then I say the individual who writes the article, and the gentlemen or companies which publish the newspapers, should be protected to the extent that the source of information which the writer of the article had at the time of the publication should not be divulged in any court of law.

It is my submission that section 7 of The Evidence Act should be amended, and amended indeed at this session of the Legislature by the following words:

No newspaper and/or the reporter for any newspaper on an examination for discovery and/or by reason of a demand made by a solicitor acting for a plaintiff should be forced to disclose the source of the information on which the action for libel is based.

I think that will lead to freedom of the press as we understand it. Any other programme, as I see it at the

moment, is not conducive to the freedom men have fought for in two wars.

I would like to take this opportunity of indicating to my leader the satisfaction his budget gave to the people of Kingston, and I think I can best express this view from an editorial which appeared in the Kingston *Whig-Standard* on Friday, March 12th. I would like to read in part what this newspaper had to say:

The budget tabled by Prime Minister Leslie Frost in the Ontario Legislature yesterday was typical of all the budgets he has presented to the Legislature, in that it reported a surplus, forecast a surplus, and showed the province's finances to be in excellent condition.

Since the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) assumed office in the Drew Government he has announced 11 consecutive budget surpluses, and the current budget is also the sixth in succession in which no new taxes have been announced.

The special and maintenance grants to universities, including increases, and the increased grants to hospitals, are also important features of the new budget. These will be generally approved, in our opinion. The people of this community, with its concentration of hospitals and Queen's University, are perhaps more aware than the citizens of many other communities of the difficulties encountered by such institutions because of mounting costs.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his advisers are to be congratulated and commended on the new budget. It is documentary evidence of another year of most capable management of the financial affairs of the province, and it holds the promise of a year of similar management to be added to the record. It will be, we predict, highly satisfactory to most citizens of Ontario.

I would like to say a word concerning Queen's University, and make reference to a statement made quite a number of years ago, in fact in April, 1903, by Daniel Miner Gordon, then principal of

Queen's University, whose daughter showed me a love and affection that otherwise I would probably never have had in my life, due to the fact that my own mother died when I was a little boy, and she in every sense of the word, after she married my father, was everything to me that a mother could be. Principal Gordon said:

Queen's has its friends, benefactors and graduates throughout the country, a constituency distinctively its own, whose members are united by their loyal attachment to the university and by their interest in its progress and prosperity. One after another passes away from her council board and from her list of benefactors, but Queen's remains a living, growing organism, not dependent upon even the wisest of her counsellors, or the most bountiful of her benefactors, because drawing to herself, by the very power of her vitality, the elements requisite for her support. The life so strenuously maintained in the past, so vigorous and helpful today, is the best pledge of what awaits her in the years to come; and our hope is that with increasing equipment, by wisely directed effort, through the earnest co-operation of all who seek her good, Queen's may share and may assist the expanding life of our country, and may from year to year become more capable of rendering the loftiest kind of service to the nation.

As the result of the capital and maintenance grants made by the Province of Ontario to Queen's University, it has rendered, is rendering and will continue to render the loftiest kind of service to the Province of Ontario and to the Dominion of Canada.

As I understand it, the budget carries out the policy of the administration, and the government must play a vital role in maintaining economic growth and stability. It is my opinion that the great development of this province in the last 20 years has been, to a great extent, as a result of the solid financial policy of the Progressive Conservative Party.

The sound financial position of the Province of Ontario has gone forward

with leaps and bounds as the result of Canadian genius for creative initiative, which has had the effect of multiplying our production.

One of the grants in the recent budget was to the Canadian Cancer Foundation, and at this time I would like to say that some few days ago it was my very unique pleasure and privilege to be the guest speaker at the Annual Dinner of the Ontario Division of the Canadian Cancer Society. We in Kingston are very proud of the leadership that Mrs. Frank Archer has given in connection with the work on cancer, its treatment and cure. At this time I would like to pay my respects to the early outstanding leadership given to the Canadian Cancer Society by Mrs. Egmont Frankel, who, when this society needed encouragement, gave to this splendid organization the inspiration that was needed. To this fine woman the Province of Ontario is indebted, and no words of mine can adequately express the appreciation that is due her.

One of the problems in relation to cancer, is to try to find out what makes cancer grow, and it seems to me that it is fair to say that without research, the expectation of survival from cancer is greatly reduced. The cancer cell in the body is much more violent in growth, as I understand it, than any other cell. It is highly self-reproductive and, as nothing can grow without nourishment, then the nourishment to cancer comes from the other cells in the body.

The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer announced in his budget speech that, in reference to the Canadian Cancer Institute and the Cobalt bomb, there had been spent a total of \$9,500,000, and of this amount \$1 million had been contributed by the Federal Government. Treatment with the Cobalt bomb means that the ray of radio-activity can be focussed very accurately to cancer in any part of the body, and one of the great problems that still leaves the medical profession in the dark is the diagnosis of cancer of the stomach, and its treatment in this area, in that the treatment sometimes has an adverse effect on the healthy cells of the body between the

outer surface in the region of the stomach.

There are two callous murderers in the world today—war and cancer. Freedom from war depends on the nations of the world. Freedom from cancer lies within our own grasp. And as we know so little about what makes cancer grow, there is still so much to be done by research to cure this dread disease. I am not unmindful that Pasteur made surgery possible, Crawford Long made operations painless, Dr. Curie placed treatment by radium within our hands, Fleming discovered penicillin, and Dr. Best was one of the co-discoverers of insulin. Whose name will be blazed forth in the medical records of tomorrow for finding out what makes cancer grow is yet to be determined, but may I express the hope that with the great brains possessed by the medical profession, and the research programme instituted by my leader, the day is not far distant when we will have a drug and/or treatment that will arrest the growth of cancer.

I go along with the observations of the Prime Minister in a recent statement made by him in which he said that it is the desire of the province to establish for the people of Ontario a research and treatment organization which would develop the latest in medical knowledge for cancer patients.

Another matter to which I would like to refer is the grant made to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. Last fall, the cornerstone was laid at a building in Kingston which will extend its programme of useful service to more than 420 blind people in the Counties of Leeds, Grenville, Hastings, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, and Prince Edward. This organization is known as the Quinte-St. Lawrence District. The Province of Ontario made a grant to this institution in the amount of \$30,000. The total cost of this building has been estimated at \$255,000. A grant of \$30,000 has been received from the Ontario Division of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. Cities, towns and villages in the above counties have made grants.

The Quinte-St. Lawrence District is still short about \$25,000 to complete their project. At this time I want to pay tribute to Dr. Stewart M. Polson, of Kingston, a retired eye specialist, who has fired this organization with enthusiasm and was one of the main men to blaze a trail to make possible this new institution in Kingston. To him and his colleagues, men and women of the 6 counties, goes a vote of thanks from our sightless friends.

The grants that are made to the Agricultural Fairs of this Province are money well spent. A century ago, robust yeomen from the Old Land, sometimes driven by poverty but often lured by the opportunity to share in the wealth of the New World, the United Empire Loyalists who sought the right to live under the Union Jack, left the gentler civilization that then existed south of the line and brought to the Kingston district the traditional county fair, at which was shown the products of their toil and the handicraft work, as well as the pickled vegetables, preserved fruits, relish of all kinds and the home-made cooking of their women folk. Vying with one another in friendly competition, they very often seriously talked Party politics, discussing the solution of their common problems and expressing their opinions of how the Ontario Government should be run.

Measured by the conditions that exist today, the county fair of a century ago was an insignificant occurrence, but it is not to be overlooked that great oaks from little acorns grow.

As we all think of the fair today, we must be impressed by the superb advances that have been made in the production of live stock, the improvement of cereals and vegetables, and the lessening of manual labour by the ingenious advances in modernizing processes that have driven almost into forgetfulness the scythe and flail. The ingenuity of man has controlled and conquered the forces of nature to assist those who make their living in the first 6 inches of the top-soil. Those who attend a county fair today go to compare, and analyze, perhaps to criticize, to see

what is displayed, even the proverbial horse races, without which traditionally the county fair would not be complete. In a word, I commend to the Prime Minister favourable consideration in the future of grants to the county fair. It is money well spent.

Last September Sam Carr was discharged from the Kingston Penitentiary. He was one of the big figures in the Soviet espionage ring uncovered in Ottawa in 1946, at one time the national organizer of the Labour-Progressive Party. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation sought Carr for 3 years, following the 1946 spy trial. He was finally arrested in New York.

He was convicted of uttering and forging an application for a passport for a known Russian spy who was a member of the Labour-Progressive Party in this country. Carr, on his release from Kingston Penitentiary, stated that he was still a Communist, and I suggest to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) that this man should be still watched by the police of this province if he is within our boundaries.

I want to direct a word to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) who frequently goes to Ottawa for top-level conferences, and I am going to ask him to discuss with the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St. Laurent) the question of giving a Silver Cross to the mothers of men who have been killed in the last war and/or Korea or to the eldest sister if the mother is dead. Many a sister would be honoured to wear such an award, and I can see no good reason, when there is no mother, why the sister should not be recognized in this regard.

When I went on the Parliamentary trip to Northern Ontario in 1952, I was impressed by the number of engineers that I met who had passed through the halls of the Faculty of Science at Queen's University, and I would like the Province of Ontario to know that recently the Dean of Engineering of this University, Dr. Douglas S. Ellis, was recently awarded the Julian C. Smith medal which is presented each year by the Engineering Institute of Canada to the

one who renders the greatest service in the development of Canada. My view is that the sound policy in the Faculty of Science at Queen's, headed by Dean Ellis, has meant much to the development in recent years of Northern Ontario.

I would like to make an observation in relation to an editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on January 2nd, 1954, which was headed "Slaughter On Our Highways." There have been certain amendments to the Highway Traffic Act this year, but there is still a section which must be amended or there are going to be more killings, serious injuries, and great damage to motor cars.

That section is section 41, subsection 3A, which states:

The operator or driver of every vehicle or car shall, before entering or crossing a through highway, bring the vehicle or car to a full stop immediately before entering the nearest crosswalk.

The driver or operator of any vehicle who has come to a full stop as required above, upon entering the through highway, shall be subject to the usual right-of-way rule, which is to the effect that the car on the right has the right-of-way. I have said before in this House, and let me repeat, that this section should be amended to read that the operator or driver of every vehicle, before entering a through highway, shall bring his car to a full stop and shall only proceed on his way *with caution*. If this section is not amended as I suggest, the day will come when it is known as the manslaughter section, and let me be frank to say that in my opinion this section is bad law, having regard to the great traffic on our provincial highways.

Section 41, subsection (1) states:

When two persons in charge of vehicles approach a crossroads or intersection at the same time, the person to the right shall have the right-of-way.

Then, according to subsection G (ii), it states that:

Where an amber light illuminated by rapid intermittent flashes is shown at the intersection, the driver of the vehicle shall approach the intersection and may only proceed through the intersection with caution.

This section should be amended to read, by adding the following words:

"That the man on the right entering the intersection shall not have the right-of-way."

After 12 o'clock, or sometimes later, a motorist driving through cities often finds four amber lights flashing at each corner, and it has been argued by good lawyers that the vehicle to the driver's right as he enters into the intersection has the right of way.

My statement is that where there are four amber lights blinking on four corners of an intersection it seems to me, generally speaking, that the car on the right should not have the right of way, but that the common law rule should apply. The first into the intersection should have the right of way, and where these amber lights are working each vehicle must enter with caution.

Old man Ontario is satisfied with the sound financial policy of this government and the Watch Dog of our Exchequer, the hon. Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), who has made it very clear in the immediate past that he will stand for no dishonesty, fraud, carelessness or negligence in reference to the spending of the taxpayers' dollar.

With all humility and reverence, let me say that it is my earnest prayer that my leader may be blessed with the best of good health to carry out the policy of his late brother, Mr. Cecil G. Frost, that there may be in this Province of Ontario, equality, justice and toleration.

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this afternoon to participate in the budget debate, and to review some matters which have been discussed heretofore, and to introduce some new matters for further consideration.

As has been mentioned by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) this

is the eleventh year in which the province has enjoyed a surplus on a financial basis, and it is the sixth year in which there has been no increase in taxation, and no new taxes have been introduced.

For a province—or for any institution, for that matter—to carry on with the increased financial expenditures from year to year without increasing the sources of revenue on a per capita basis, is really an accomplishment. I know in these modern times the matter of heavy expenditures is something which is increasing from year to year. I know, for example, at the municipal level, we expect to have higher tax bills in 1954 than we had in 1953, and so on, from year to year, simply because of the fact that the cost of the administration of government, and of matters of personal import, increase as times go by. So I suggest the hon. Prime Minister is to be complimented in being able to introduce a budget in this House in 1954, without any increases in taxation, nor the introduction of any new taxes.

One of the matters I presume which the average individual who does not reside in an urban centre appreciates more than perhaps any other is the introduction of hydro during the past few years into the rural sections of the Province of Ontario. Within the last day or two, we have had the opportunity of listening to some of the observations which have been made by hon. members of this House relative to the cost of hydro in their respective communities. We have heard, for example, of excessive costs in one community where hydro-electric power has been developed by, and purchased from, the Canadian National Railway. We have heard, on the other hand, of the cheapness of power which has been developed through the natural waterpower of this great Province of Ontario.

A few years ago, during World War II, many of us in the City of Toronto experienced a most inconvenient practice of having to almost crawl up the stairs of office buildings in the downtown area, when the hydro-electric power was cut off for one hour in the mornings and one hour in the afternoons, in order that it

might be conserved for the general benefit of the citizens at large. It was a happy day indeed when it was announced that Hydro was able to alleviate that particular inconvenience through the installation of a steam-plant operation as a supplementary power development to that of natural power.

Now, this year, in the budget, mention is made that for rural power development, by way of hydro-electric power in our rural areas, more than \$9 million is in prospect for the benefit of those who live in our non-urban areas. That is something which is undoubtedly going to react to the benefit of the people of this province. I suppose that many of us, prior to the introduction of hydro-electric power, in our summer cottage areas, for example, experienced the use of the old type of lighting by coal-oil lamps, gasoline lamps, and other old-time services, which we were glad to have, but we are also glad they have undoubtedly been supplanted with great benefit, by hydro-electric power.

We are, accordingly, glad to know as well, that there is a great prospect of improved development of the St. Lawrence, in order to provide additional energy by way of hydro-electric power for the people of this province.

Last week-end, with other hon. members of this House, it was my privilege to visit the Town of Cobalt, and to inspect the plant of the Cobalt Smelting Company, a plant which is modern in every sense of the word, and one which will undoubtedly bring great benefit to the development of the municipalities in Northern Ontario, which have suffered for a lack of the development of mineral wealth which lies in such vast quantities in that particular area.

I was very much interested to learn that this particular smelter will be the second smelter in the Province of Ontario. Heretofore, it apparently has been necessary to have the materials forwarded to a smelter in Southern Ontario, in order that the mineral wealth might come to proper refinement. With the development of this plant in Northern Ontario, not only will we have facilities closer at hand, which will

permit a great deal faster development and the re-opening of many of the mining properties in that part of the country, but it also will increase the possibilities of employment in that area, and will afford the possibility of development of that part of the country at a rate which has hertofore been unknown.

I am sure that each hon. member of this House is quite delighted with the prospect of the introduction of this particular industry in the Cobalt area.

Now, coming to the matter of highways, and we all needs must think of highways; it is the common denominator of transportation, not only in this province, but in this country. We know there is a proposed Estimate of \$127 million allocated for the development of our highways system.

A few weeks ago I had the privilege of participating in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and among the things which I mentioned in that particular speech, was a reference to the Central Registry system of motorcar ownerships, and also the registration of titles, and of liens, and chattel mortgages, pertinent to motor vehicles as being a very desirable thing.

I said it then—and I still feel—that the day is not too far distant when a common registry system for the ownership of motor vehicle permits and of chattel mortgages and lien registrations is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary.

Within the past month, there has been a judgment in the Court of Appeal in a case wherein a person purchased a motor truck in a community not too far distant from the City of Toronto, from a motor car dealer, and on the bill of sale was printed a memorandum in very small type, which I suppose not one person in a thousand ever reads, which contained reference to the effect that no statement or understanding not set forth in writing in the contract would be valid, unless it appeared in writing on that particular contract.

What happened in this particular case was that the farmer purchased the truck for \$1,200. He had the privilege of driving it for approximately 2 weeks,

and at the beginning of the third week, a bailiff visited his premises and seized the truck on behalf of the prior lienholder.

The farmer brought an action against the vendor of the truck, the motor car dealer. His action was dismissed, and that judgment was re-affirmed in the Court of Appeal. So the farmer not only lost his \$1,200, but he also lost the truck. In other words, the innocent purchaser of a vehicle under the laws of this province was not helped at all; but he could have been helped had there been a common registry of title and of chattel mortgages and liens and encumbrances for such vehicles.

In some States to the south of us, not only do they have a common registry office system for such matters, but they also have a tabulation of title in the form of a document which the owner retains, and which he produces when necessary to those persons who may be purchasing or otherwise interested in the establishment of title, or a lien or encumbrances to any such chattel.

Such a system has many advantages and it is something which, I submit, should be given serious consideration by the hon. Minister of Highways.

In this Province of Ontario, we have some 62,000 miles of hard-surfaced or paved highways, which is more than double that of any other province in this great Dominion, and which indicates to us the magnitude of development of the highway system in the Province of Ontario. I am sure it is something of which we, as citizens of this great province, can be and rightfully are proud. When we stop to think that the gasoline tax we pay in this province, although it is 11 cents a gallon, is some 4 to 5 cents a gallon less than that paid in some four or five other provinces of this great Dominion, and that the motor car licence fees in this province are the lowest of any province in the whole of the Dominion of Canada, it is a great thing. When we realize full well the fact that we have such an extensive highway development in our province, and operating at the minimum cost to those persons who contribute directly to their upkeep, we should be justly proud.

In the riding of York West, which I have the honour to represent, we have one or two problems. One of them I mentioned a week or two ago in my speech in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am going to speak about it again, today, because something important has happened in that area since I made my last speech concerning it. That is, the "death-trap intersection," as I will call it today, at Royal York Road and Dundas Street in the Township of Etobicoke. I do not think there is another intersection of highways and railways which could be worse than this in the immediate vicinity of suburban Toronto. There have been deaths occur at that intersection on many occasions—not just one, but several. I want to emphasize the necessity of having something done with regard to that intersection.

Royal York Road is the through highway from No. 2 Lakeshore Highway, New Toronto and Mimico on the south, northward to the town of Weston. It is a very well travelled highway and should be. It is a good road; it is a service artery, and as one might say speaking in metropolitan terms, it is an "arterial highway" for the Metropolitan Area. But, what do we have at this intersection of Royal York Road and Dundas Street? We have a level crossing despite very heavy morning and night, east and west-bound traffic on Dundas Street, and north and south-bound traffic on Royal York Road. To cap it all, within a matter of 100 feet of that intersection on Dundas Street there is a level railway crossing, and within another 100 feet on Royal York Road there is another level railway crossing. At these railway crossings, which are on a curve, more than 72 trains a day travel on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and some of them do not travel 5 miles an hour, but they travel at very high rates of speed.

That is the particular reason why I am bringing this matter to the attention of the hon. members of this House today. We all read in the press about a week ago of a very serious accident which occurred on this same railway line, a few miles to the west of this

intersection, when a large cement-mixer truck and a railway freight train and a diesel passenger train came into collision as a result of a level railway crossing accident.

So I say to the hon. members of this House, that while that accident happened at the Dixie sideroad: it could just as well have happened at the corner of Dundas Street and Royal York Road in the Township of Etobicoke, either on Dundas Street or on Royal York Road. Double railway tracks, trains passing in both directions heavily-trafficked highways, and yet, it would appear that it almost has to come to the point where many people will have to be killed before we can get something really necessary done at some of these intersections.

I know the matter of Royal York Road and Dundas Street has been up for discussion many, many times. It has been discussed in Metropolitan Toronto Council; it has been discussed in the Township Council of the Township of Etobicoke; it has been discussed in the Council of the Township of York. There is not a council of any municipality in and around that particular area that is not fully aware of the matter, and that has not brought this matter to the attention not only of members of the council, but also to their own individual residents in the area, and to the Department of Highways. I would certainly suggest that definitely something should be done in regard to that particular intersection, not a year from now but in the immediate future, if we are going to avoid future accidents at that and other similar railway crossings.

The other point I want to bring forward relative to the Department of Highways is the old "chestnut" Brown's Line, that is No. 27 Highway which runs from No. 2 Highway at Long Branch, across the Queen Elizabeth and Dundas Highways, towards Malton and up to Barrie. From the Queen Elizabeth Way down to No. 2 Highway, which is a comparatively short distance—about a mile or a mile and a half; maybe less—that highway, although it is very heavily travelled, is still a 22-foot pavement in width, with a shoulder on either side.

Something has to be done to widen that into a four-lane highway in order to take care of traffic which has been using that highway for many, many years, but now in addition, we are going to pour a great deal more traffic onto that particular highway because of the completion of the Toronto by-pass which joins No. 27 Highway just north of the Queen Elizabeth and Dundas Highways. Coupled with that, of course, is the renewal of a railway bridge on No. 27 Highway just north of No. 2 highway.

In order to accomplish that, I fully realize that the Canadian National Railway and the Metropolitan Toronto Council have to be consulted. The Department of Highways is interested, and also the Council of the Township of Etobicoke. There are many people who have an interest in that highway, from a municipal standpoint, but at the same time we should take into consideration the fact that it is a highway which has a tremendous amount of traffic upon it, and one which should be relieved at the earliest possible moment.

Turning now to the Department of Education, I know that in the budget we have set aside \$61 million, plus certain grants to universities, and the College of Art, which bring the total grants up to some \$81.9 million. That is a great deal of money, but every dollar of that is being used, and will be used, for the benefit of the people of this province. There is not a thing one can give to anybody better than something which has the possibilities and the great potential of education. With an education they can help themselves; without it they are dependent on a lot of people and a lot of contingencies. And so, insofar as the budget for education is concerned, I wish to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) in the amount of the budget and the potential in educational work which will be accomplished during the year 1954-55.

There are some interesting facts in regard to the matter of education. In this province we have some 915,000 students attending our public and

secondary schools and in addition those attending our universities. We have some 30,000 teachers who are employed in teaching those students and providing them with the wherewithal that they may be enabled to look after themselves in times ahead. More recently we have had come into our midst many New Canadians, people who have not had the privilege of learning the English language even abroad; they have had to take time and trouble and sustain themselves, earn a living, and acquire unto themselves an education in our culture and in our educational system and habits. They are doing a great work for themselves; they are anxious to get ahead; they want to be able to make a contribution to this country, and I am sure that each and every one of us welcomes the New Canadians to our midst. We are a country of some 15 millions of people with the vast areas undeveloped which we have in this great country of ours. There is room not only for ourselves but for all these New Canadians who are coming, and what is more, together we can all go ahead shoulder to shoulder, and develop the national wealth of this great country of ours, and in particular this great province.

Turning now for a moment to the matter of municipalities, I have a great yearning in my heart for municipalities. I had the privilege of being associated with municipal work for a great number of years, and I know some of the headaches and some of the heartaches that members of municipal councils have experienced over the years in trying to meet budgets, finance the municipalities, and provide the essential services which they are called upon to provide by the citizens of their respective municipalities. I can well recall the day when municipal councils used to receive grants from this province, which were earmarked grants; they were designated for certain specific purposes. We received a grant for the police department; we received a grant for the fire department, but before one became entitled to those grants, one had to qualify, and if one did not qualify, they did not get the grant. There have been some municipali-

ties in past years which, through not qualifying, did not receive any grant for certain services.

However, last year we came to realize this, and introduced a system of unconditional grants to municipalities in this province. This is something which has proven its worth over and over again in the last 12-month period, because municipalities today have a freer hand of operation as individuals, and also in providing services to the citizens of their respective municipalities. And after all, that is what a municipal council desires to do, to provide adequate, fair and reasonable services to its citizens. Today, as I say, municipalities are enabled the better to do that by reason of the system of unconditional grants which presently is in vogue.

In the case of municipalities, the budget this year provides \$125 million, which is an increase over last year, and there is a possibility that it may even go as high as \$134 million this year. That, too, is a great deal of money. In certain quarters, we sometimes hear individuals associated with municipal effort, either by way of municipal council or school board, or even a ratepayers' association, who will criticize the government by saying that the percentage of grants that the province is paying this year is not as large as it was last year.

They like to give the impression that the province is lessening its interest in municipal welfare. That certainly is not the case. The fact of the matter is this. Never before have there been the dollars poured into the municipal treasuries of this province by way of grant than there will be during the year 1954-55. Never before have there been the demands made upon municipal councils by the citizens of those communities that will be made during the year 1954-55. The people of this country are progressive; they are desirous of accomplishing things, and the way you accomplish things is by doing, by being active.

The province, as I have indicated, is pouring more money into municipal treasuries this year, but, as I mentioned in opening, there are not any new taxes levied; there are not any new sources

of revenue being sought provincially, but simply by the natural increase of taxation on an existing basis do we find that the province is able, not only to increase its grants to municipalities, but in all avenues of services increased grants are being made.

We realize, of course, that every dollar which comes into the Provincial Treasury comes from the individual resident, or from industry or from a natural resource in the province. It is all home-produced, so to speak, and produced for the benefit of the people of this province. A few weeks ago we read in the press of a neighbour province where it was hoped that sometime in the not too far distant future a dividend might be declared by that province to the individual residents, and it was suggested in one newspaper article that I read, that there might be an emigration into that particular province in order that they might be enabled, as individuals, to acquire a certain per capita grant. All that is happening in that particular province is a development of natural resources, something which has heretofore laid dormant, today is being developed, and I hope that there will be more people go to that province to develop those particular natural resources.

In the case of the Department of Health, there is a matter which has a local tinge here which I want to refer to; something that I think can be alleviated from recurring in the future. It all had to do with a development during the past 12-month period, but it does indicate to a degree the disinterest some people can take in their neighbours. It has to do with the erection of a sewage disposal plant on the Etobicoke Creek, which is the boundary between Toronto Township in Peel County, and Etobicoke Township in York County. Apparently what happened was this. Naturally, Peel County, and Toronto Township, in particular, desired to extend their residential areas. They went ahead. They contacted the Provincial Department of Health, and received a blessing from that department for the installation of sewers, in the development of an area, and the

installation of a sewage disposal plant. Ultimately, the people in Etobicoke found themselves in a completely built-up residential area, staring out their kitchen windows one morning, at steam-shovels and bulldozers, in action preparatory to the erection of a sewage disposal plant, in one case within 81 feet of the backyard of a neighbour whose property abutted it on the rear. Never at any time had there been any communication between those municipal councils as to what the project was.

Now a little bit of co-operation, and a little bit of appreciation of the other fellow's viewpoint would have saved many headaches and heartaches, and I sincerely trust, not only in the case of those two municipalities but in the case of municipalities at large, in a metropolitan area such as we have here in Toronto where we have growing pains and growing problems, that no matter how those problems may be sought to be remedied, they may be remedied on a co-operative basis between the respective councils of the adjacent municipalities, to the benefit of all concerned, and not, on the other hand, by trying to disregard the viewpoint of the other people in the area.

Now I turn my remarks to the Department of Agriculture. I have a complaint in regard to that particular department, or a phase of its operation. Very recently, acting in a professional capacity, I had occasion to appear before the Transportation Committee of the Milk Control Board, acting on behalf of a client who is in the milk transportation business. The situation has developed, in regard to this particular problem, along these lines. This individual had purchased a milk transportation business some 19 or 20 years ago, and had been servicing a number of farms by picking up their milk and delivering it to certain dairies in the City of Toronto, for which he had obtained the usual and necessary licence from the Milk Control Board. Two or two-and-a-half years ago, a competitor started picking up milk on the same route without a licence. The matter was brought to the attention of the Transportation Committee of the Milk Control Board, and

I believe ultimately to the attention of the Milk Control Board itself, but, believe you this, gentlemen, for the past two-and-a-half years that condition has been existing, and there has not been a thing done to correct it.

If our licencing system under the Milk Control Board, and in particular the Transportation Committee of that Board, is going to mean anything at all, that licencing system should be on a proper basis. The issuing of a licence should mean something. If, on the other hand, anyone who wants to, can simply start a milk transportation business and infringe on anyone's route after he has paid for it, the fact of the matter is that the licencing system does not mean a thing. I feel that in that particular matter something should be done directly to remedy the situation, and to set up the licencing system of the Milk Control Board on a proper basis, so that there will not be a half-a-dozen trucks running up and down the same township road, picking up from one farm and another. All of that adds to the cost of milk production, which is something that we, in the city here, are asked to pay additional costs for in order to meet those transportation costs, and we all know that from the consumer end, at least, we are paying plenty for milk in Toronto today.

There have been some observations made in the last day or two, by hon. members of this House, in connection with the cost of agricultural products as paid to the farmer, and as paid for by the consumer, and as to whether that differential is too broad. I have not had the opportunity to investigate personally phases of costs of farm products from beginning to end, but I do know that, as was mentioned yesterday, in the case of the cost of a bag of potatoes costing a matter of cents less than a dollar at the farms, and the consumer in some of our organized centres paying not one but two and three times the cost of the article as paid for to the farmer, it seems to me that the spread is too great, and the farmer should either be getting more for his product or we, in the city, should be paying less; and I think that

either one of those two things should be investigated, and an answer found to it.

Dealing now with the matter of one of the appointed boards of government, there is one observation I want to make, and then I am through. I want to say a word, if I may, concerning the Ontario Municipal Board. The Ontario Municipal Board is a board which has functioned in this province for a great number of years, and which has served a very useful purpose over those years, but at the same time there have been, during that time, a number of matters which have gradually found their way onto the platter of that board for decision and determination, until now we find ourselves in this position, that the Ontario Municipal Board has accumulated unto itself, through the provisions of various statutes, a tremendous amount of work, with the end result that in many cases the board is unable to deal with matters quickly and efficiently.

We find, for example, a situation where a hearing was held by the board in July, 1953, and a decision has yet to be given. A matter such as the great Metropolitan problem, with which the board was faced, undoubtedly required a great deal of study and a great deal of research and individual effort. That particular problem took more than one year to solve, and ultimately, as we know, it found its way into our Statute Books, in The Metropolitan Toronto Act of last year. But when citizens of this province are required to go to a board, whether it is the Municipal Board, or the Milk Control Board, or the Liquor Licence Board, or whatever board it may be, I do not think it is fair to the citizens of this province to ask them to wait a matter of months before a decision is given. If an individual goes into court and has a trial, in 9 cases out of 10 judgment is rendered immediately, or within a matter of days, and then he is on his way to the Court of Appeal, but as I say, in the case of a board where a person is obliged to take his matter to the board, to have to await the pleasure of the board for

months, before a decision is rendered, I do not think is fair.

What is the answer to it?

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is the thing; give us the answer.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): If the hon. member (Mr. Brandon), gives the answer, we do not need a Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRANDON: The answer I am going to suggest is that the problem resolves itself, as I see it, into the fact that the Municipal Board presently is overworked. They have too much work on their platter. There are some things with which the board deals, such as the approval of debenture issues, with regard to which I see no reason why they could not be stamped "approved," and investigated by a member of the Department of Municipal Affairs, a person who has full knowledge of the affairs of the individual municipalities. Why should a municipality have to be required, in order to issue debentures, to send a programming of those debentures to the Municipal Board; wait a matter of a week or maybe two weeks before they get approval, and then, when they get it, they are on their way, simply because it takes a little time to put the rubber stamp of approval on those debentures?

In my opinion, the Municipal Board should deal only with matters which require a judicial function; in other words, separate the administrative function of the board from the judicial function of the board, and let it deal with the judicial function of statutory matters which have been placed before it, and matters which can be dealt with by individuals or by officials of a department, whether it is the Department of Municipal Affairs or any other department, let those matters be taken care of by officials in departments. That, to my way of thinking, would relieve, to a very great extent, in particular the burden which presently finds itself resting upon the platter of the Municipal Board. The board consists of men who are well

experienced in matters of municipal affairs; engineers, lawyers, and persons who have been versed in matters of municipal affairs. It is not a case that they have not got the experience, but it poses a problem like this; this morning, the Private Bills Committee had an agenda of some four bills, and they dealt in part with one, and there are still more that are put over to another day; in other words, the agenda was too great for the committee to deal with today. Similarly, I think if something could be done to spread the work of the Municipal Board, to give them the function of a judicial character which is laid upon their shoulders, as I say, by statute, and let officialdom take care of those matters which do not require that particular type of care and treatment. This problem then would resolve itself.

With these remarks, I am through, Mr. Speaker, but ere I sit down, may I say that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and his Cabinet, are to be congratulated on the budget which they have brought down this year, because there is not a single department of public service but into which more money is being poured for the benefit of the people of this province.

The Province of Ontario today is a better place to live in than it was in 1953, and with a budget coming down in 1954 and the prospect of good government that we have in the year 1954-55, there is no doubt that Ontario will be a better place to live in, in 1955, 1956 and for years to come, as the result of good government by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and his colleagues.

MR. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

The following bills were read the third time and were passed as intitled in the motions:

Bill No. 21, An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough.

Bill No. 26, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Bill No. 79, The Provincial Parks Act, 1954.

Bill No. 18, The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act.

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend the Trees Act.

Bill No. 88, The Wolf and Bear Bounty Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act, 1952.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

HON. MR. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 100, intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister) moves second reading of Bill No. 78 intituled, "An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I had overlooked the fact that this bill has to receive its second reading before it goes to the committee which has been constituted to deal with it.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill. I tried to comment on this procedure when the motion was before the House, but I was a little slow in getting to my feet.

I am opposed to the entire principle of the bill for the handling of the redistribution procedure. I am opposed to it because it displays a total lack of principle and consistency on the part of the Party which is in power, and because the bill, and the motion which accompanies it, makes possible the carrying through of an undemocratic, improper revision.

Let me explain what I have in mind by this statement. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that one would expect the Progressive-Conservatives, whether with a big "P" or a small "p" to show some

consistency in the matter of redistribution. But this bill reveals a complete lack of consistency. In the House of Commons the Conservative opposition—both big "P" and small "p"—voted against a measure to set up a House Committee to deal with redistribution, and suggested instead an impartial committee, or a Royal Commission which could be fully relied upon to approach the question objectively and disinterestedly.

That was the position which the national leadership of the Conservative Party took at Ottawa. They made a lot of capital out of it. Mr. Drew, Mr. Diefenbaker and all the other "bigwigs" of the Party spoke on it, and they rode onto the rostrums of the House of Commons like knights into battle, for a democratic redistribution policy as against the "grabbing" method in which the Liberal Party in power was going to engage. In fact there was a real outcry against the St. Laurent government which, however, overruled the official opposition and carried through the old and tried method of setting up a committee which included a majority of the Party in power, and handling redistribution in the manner that might best suit their purposes and interests.

As a result we had, of course, instances like the Diefenbaker case. The committee set up by the government at Ottawa gerrymandered the Diefenbaker riding and trimmed others.

I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not concerned about the danger to my own riding. If this government wants to gerrymander it, they will do so regardless of what I say. In fact I have already been given a detailed description of the plan for St. Andrew; it has been fully prepared and worked out. I understand that some of the "smart boys in the back room" have it all figured out. Some want to cut it into a triangle and others want to make a rectangle out of it. Then again, others want to snuff it out entirely and say "Finish." I do not know why they picked on St. Andrew, rather than on St. Patrick or some other ridings. I assure hon. members that this advice and

intelligence was brought to me. I did not go seeking it. If this government and this Party still want to pull a "Diefenbaker arrangement" on me, good luck to them.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: Did you get the information from Mrs. Smith in Hamilton—the fictitious Mrs. Smith who was mentioned in the House in connection with real estate?

MR. SALSBERG: I will give the hon. Minister of Planning the names of the real people who have been cheated in connection with the case of this lady as he says is fictitious, if he desires. But to go back to my subject. The information which has been given to me about the intentions of the "smart boys" in the Party is not the reason why I speak as I do on this bill. I speak on grounds of principle, and I say to this government that if the Party to which it belongs, voted with a pretense of concern for the democratic process in Ottawa, then at least they should have done something here and practiced what they preached. But they did not do that. And not only in Ontario but in the Province of Manitoba, the question of redistribution arose, and what happened? The Conservative minority objected to the method of appointing a committee, even a Select Committee. They asked for a Royal Commission so there might be a fair, impartial redistribution on the basis of population and not on the basis of Party interests.

But the Liberals in power there laughed at the Conservative minority and continued the old, partisan traditional method. They chose a Select Committee to do the work. Hon. members might imagine that after the stand the Conservatives took at Ottawa and in Winnipeg that here in Ontario, the only province in which they are in power, they would have set an example.

MR. ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Why not get up to date?

MR. SALSBERG: New Brunswick, I understand. Nevertheless one would expect the Conservative Party, being in

power in this province, would set an example and say: "We are not like the Liberals. We are going to have a democratic redistribution. We are going to have an impartial committee, almost as impartial, at least, as the committee set up to investigate the mining question."

HON. MR. PORTER: You did not like that committee. What sort of committee do you want?

MR. SALSBERG: I want an impartial committee, a non-partisan committee, a democratic committee that will approach this question objectively. The government would like to set up a committee which would ride roughshod, if they so desire, a committee which will be able to manipulate things, if they so desire, a committee which will gerrymander if this will fit into the plan of their Party interest. Does this not belie the position of the national Leader of the Conservative Party, and make a mockery of the attitude of the hon. Minister's colleagues in Manitoba? Hon. Ministers who stand up in this House are just like the rest of them. The only defence they have to offer is that this is the traditional way of doing things. Those in power gerrymander. Those who have a majority redistribute to suit themselves, and all the talk which hon. Ministers' Party colleagues put up elsewhere about the undemocratic character of this procedure is evidently just a lot of talk.

I, for one, will not go along with such a practice, and I am opposed to this bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must say the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) never "goes along" with anything that is suggested over here, at any time. Yesterday he opposed the motion proposing that three very distinguished Canadians should serve on the committee in relation to mining. Today he admits that the committee should be an impartial committee.

MR. SALSBERG: I said "even as impartial a committee as—"

HON. MR. FROST: I see. As I said before, I think that redistribution which does not have regard to the community interests of people, or which upsets people, by destroying the old traditional areas and settings, in which people are used to voting, and working is undesirable. I must admit that I do not know of any group with a better understanding of this situation than the people's representatives. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) talks about "gerrymandering." That means altering things in order that some particular Party or interest may have an advantage. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think there is any hon. member in this House who wants anything of the sort.

MR. SALSBERG: St. Laurent said that too.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, sometimes he is right.

May I point out to hon. members opposite that I am sure this committee, and those who sit on it, chosen from this House, proceed from the standpoint of trying to carry out the objectives which we all have in mind—not to break people away from their old traditional historic moorings, but, at the same time, to have regard to population increases in this province.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Is it the hon. Prime Minister's intention to add another member to the committee?

HON. MR. FROST: I had not thought to do that. I thought we should leave the committee as it is. I am quite satisfied.

MR. NIXON: There is a vacancy on the committee caused by the death of the late hon. member, Mr. MacOdrum.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. I am perfectly prepared to nominate another hon. member if the House desires, but I had in mind that the committee would remain as it is now, with the vacancy left by the passing of the late Mr. MacOdrum.

THE PROTECTION FOR PERSONS WORKING IN TRENCHES ACT

HON. MR. DALEY moves second reading of Bill No. 102, "An Act to provide for the Protection of Persons Working in Trenches."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Minister care to have this bill go to the Standing Committee on Labour?

HON. MR. DALEY: I think I have already made myself clear on that question.

MR. SALSBERG: Has the hon. Minister not learned anything? Does he not change his mind? Does he not think it should go to the Committee on Labour?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The motion has been carried.

THE ELEVATORS AND LIFTS ACT, 1953

HON. MR. DALEY moves second reading of Bill No. 103, "An Act to amend The Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953."

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member can repeat his question here.

MR. SALSBERG: I will. On this bill, I suggest that it is necessary to have some such legislation for the protection of people in this type of employment, but I suggest it is impossible to provide the necessary legislation unless the workers affected and directly involved have an opportunity to make presentations, and to appear before a committee of the House where such legislation is considered.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what I say is properly within the discussion on the principle of the bill. In other words, it is my suggestion that no labour legislation affecting the working conditions, safety and health of working men and women can be properly considered unless they know all the proposals, and

unless they have an opportunity of appearing.

Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with dumb animals, live stock, poultry and farm items of all sorts, those who handle animals who cannot speak for themselves are invited to come and express their opinions on the legislation affecting those animals. That is what happens every time legislation is introduced dealing with agricultural problems, with live stock, and other elements of agricultural life; but, when it comes to the protection of the health, life and limbs of workers, we do not give them the opportunity of appearing before the committee of the House which is provided by the rules of the House, and where they could speak and make presentations on legislation affecting their lives, health and well-being.

I suggest we cannot feel we are doing justice to the groups of workers affected by each of these pieces of legislation, whether it deals with large or minor matters, unless and until we give the affected groups of workers notice of what we are introducing, and give them an opportunity to appear before us.

Here is a bill dealing with elevators and lifts. It is a very serious piece of legislation. I do not think we are adopting good legislation unless those interested are given the opportunity of appearing. That applies also to the previous bill. I am not going to get tired, and I am not going to cease. I am not threatening, but I am advising the government, Mr. Speaker, that I will on every possible occasion so long as I am in this House rise to my feet and fight for the establishment of a procedure which exists in this House, and in other Houses, about all other matters except labour. I say we will have to break down the inhibitions of the hon. Minister of Labour toward the committee.

HON. MR. DALEY: The hon. member is talking so much nonsense.

MR. SALSBERG: Why is the hon. Minister afraid to call the committee together?

HON. MR. DALEY: The hon. member has a good enough sounding board right here. All he wants is to get a sounding board.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as it affects this bill, that the hon. Minister of Labour, unfortunately, has suffered a severe shock he experienced when he first became Minister, and the CCF was the Official Opposition. I remember those nights. There were some hon. members who really "went to town" on him and on his department. But he has learned many things since then, and he is now an experienced Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: Look where it landed the Opposition, carrying on that way.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not saying for one moment that what the members of the Opposition did to the hon. Minister was wrong, or that they should never have done it. Let that be clear. I do say, as a new man, he received a number of shocks and since then he shies away from the Labour Committee like—I am sorry I do not want to make the comparison, but I am thinking of "riding the buggies" in the early days of the railroad.

There is no need of shying away from it. He has held the portfolio for a good many years and I think he should be prepared to appear before the Standing Committee on Labour. He should give all the unions affected an opportunity of expressing their points of view as they relate to this and other pieces of legislation.

HON. MR. DALEY: This Elevators and Lifts Act was thoroughly discussed with all the people mentioned by the hon. member, over a long period of time last year. The elevator people came in, the manufacturers, the union workers for the elevator construction and erection, the insurance companies which insured these elevators, all these people were in conference with us a great many times in developing the Act. In the Act

which we have here today, there are a few little things to which the legal fraternity seems to feel should be altered as there might be a wrong interpretation put upon some of the clauses.

That is all there is in this, Mr. Speaker, and all that the hon. member is requesting now was done completely and thoroughly, and the Act was developed with the approval of all these people I have mentioned, the unions, the elevator builders, the erectors and the insurance companies and everybody concerned.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to say again, I was—

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I have allowed the hon. member to be completely out of order, but I have known for some weeks he had this speech ready to be delivered. I think it has been well worth-while having a speech on the Labour Committee delivered, in order that we may go right ahead with any labour legislation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

HON. MR. WARRENDER moves second reading of Bill No. 104, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PLANNING ACT

HON. MR. WARRENDER moves second reading of Bill No. 105, "An Act to amend The Planning Act."

He said: At this time, may I say I will have an amendment to section 10 of this Act, which I shall present to the Committee of the Whole House and, at that time, will discuss the features of it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves second reading of Bill No. 106, "An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): If no one else wishes to speak, I would like to say a few words. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) to tell the House on what basis he arrives at the figure for payments to hospitals for indigent patients. This is a very grievous thing for municipalities. The hospitals complain continuously, despite the increased grants—that their losses are mainly due to the indigent patients for whom they are obliged to provide hospital accommodation. Invariably they come back to the municipalities and ask them for a lump sum at the end of the year to cover such deficit, and when questioned, they tell the municipality it is because of the indigent patients.

The government introduced a bill which obviously provides for some increase, but I believe the time has come, in view of the prosperity of the province for a number of years, and the fact that the government is being congratulated by all its supporters for having surpluses year after year, that the province should arrange with the hospitals to relieve the municipalities entirely by a contribution for the maintenance of indigent patients, and take that matter over entirely. At least, that would relieve the municipalities of one of the very heavy burdens which the home owners and the taxpayers have to bear. I think it would be a far better way of handling the matter than is done in this bill.

Let the hon. Minister of Health meet with the Hospital Association and find out exactly what the minimum costs of caring for indigent patients are, and let the Province of Ontario, as prosperous as it is, and with the surpluses it has, undertake to repay the hospitals for the full cost of caring for such people.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that it is only a matter of perhaps 6 years—not more than 7, in any event—since we introduced the provision for assistance by way of contributions toward public-ward beds in the hospitals. The problem at that time was one of indigency. We considered the matter very fully, and it has been explained in the House a number of times. We felt instead of placing the government's contribution directly on the sole matter of indigency, it would be far better to leave room for municipal participation, and indeed hospital participation. The hon. member will see why. I think if the government was to assume the total cost of indigency, a great deal of trouble would be caused by the difficulty in determining who was indigent, and perhaps the incentive might be to pass persons as indigents. As a matter of fact, that was considered at the time and we felt it was far better to permit hospital and municipal participation in regard to that problem. But in lieu of that, we gave a grant based upon the number of public-ward beds. That grant in most hospitals exceeds the costs in regard to indigents.

One of the difficulties, of course, is that in some hospitals, they segregate indigents, and disregard the public-ward grants across the board, and only apply the public-ward grants to indigent cases, and of course, that creates a deficit. But if the government's contribution were applied to indigents, in most cases, it would completely take care of the costs.

I discussed the matter with the Hospital Association, and I said, "Ladies and gentlemen, you do not expect us to pay twice. If you want this grant applied to indigents, we will do that. As a matter of fact, probably our contribution would not then amount to as much as it does now." Unanimously, the Hospital Association said, "That is good business; it is far better the way it is." So that is the way in which it has been left.

The Mayors and Reeves Associations, and many cities, particularly localities where hospitals are located, have asked

for this particular increase. It does not approximate the total costs, but I think it does even the matter up a little. Instead of leaving the municipalities to pay the deficits, it spreads it across the board. That is the situation, and that is the answer to the question raised by the hon. member for St. Andrew.

I admit that in the whole question of hospitalization, there are many things to be learned. I have not found any province or any country which has the answer to this problem.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh yes; health insurance.

HON. MR. FROST: Where?

MR. SALSBERG: If you have health insurance, that would cover hospitalization.

HON. MR. PORTER: Where would the hon. member find it?

MR. SALSBERG: It has been promised. Doctor Vivian promised it, when he was Minister of Health. Housing was promised, and also health coverage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. FROST: There has not been any sound hospitalization insurance plan in Canada, or in the world, so far as I know. It has been impossible, as determined by the experience of the States and other jurisdictions, to have it applied on an actuarial basis. It has been attempted, and has been completely unsatisfactory.

In the United Kingdom, they have tried it, and have run into enormous difficulties, but, as the hon. members will know, the United Kingdom plan is administered under a central government, while we are a provincial government, and our financial powers are very strictly limited. There, they have had to subsidize the fund very heavily out of the consolidated funds.

Mr. Speaker, in one of the provinces, just recently they abandoned the direct-contribution plan, after some years of

trial, as I understand it. In place of that, they substituted a five-per cent. sales tax. I think one of the other provinces which had a plan of that sort, also has a sales tax. The incidence of that on the "little people" is extremely heavy.

I realize this is a very grave problem, and one in which we are looking for methods of improvement in connection with all the problems relating to illness. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be on the side of reason and common sense to

study the experiences of others, and go slowly and soundly in connection with something for which nobody seems as yet to have the answer. That, I think, is the position.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the Chair.

—It being six of the clock, the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, March 23, 1954

Evening Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 23, 1954.

Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Doucett	703
Estimates, Department of Attorney-General, Mr. Porter	703
Estimates, Department of Insurance, Mr. Porter	725
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Dunlop	730
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	743

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1954

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT moves that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to; House in Committee of Supply.

ESTIMATES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I am taken aback at the applause at the untoward enthusiasm of the affairs of the most unpopular department.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Oh no.

MR. PORTER: This department is one whose main object over the years has been—in the minds of some people—to put people into the jails. What they do when they get into jail has been examined by the committee appointed to investigate reform institutions, which is something about which I am not prepared to speak, so there is really very little for me to comment upon which involves any new departures in the Department of the Attorney-General.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): \$12 million worth.

HON. MR. PORTER: Is it that much?

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Minister should know.

HON. MR. PORTER: You astonish me. I had not added it up. Oh, that is the total. I thought the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) suggested it was a \$12 million increase, and I wondered what Santa Claus had done.

Most of the items which appear in the Estimates of this department follow the same headings, and very much the same course, as they have in previous years. There is, however, one matter upon which I would like to comment before the items are discussed, and that has to do with the probation services of the Department of the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that so much interest has been aroused in the last few months, in matters relating to probation, not only in reform institutions but the probation services, which are designed primarily to keep people out of those institutions, may I say that probation services have been carried on for many years by the Department of the Attorney-General. In view of certain changes which have been made, and some expansive policies which have been adopted, I would like to make some comment upon that subject.

The item concerned with probation is 29(S).

The amount provided there for salaries is \$177,000, which is an increase over last year of \$42,000. That is to provide for additional staff, and to provide for the one-step increase, and to incorporate part of the cost-of-living bonus, but to a large extent it is for the salaries of additional probation officers, who have been taken on during the course of the last year, and provision for further probation officers in the year ahead.

In 1952, the post of Director of Probation Services was created. This was done after a thorough survey had been made of the existing situation, both in the Juvenile and Family Courts, and in the Criminal Courts. This survey was made just prior to 1952, and a plan to expand probation services, especially in the Criminal Courts, was initiated at that time. At the beginning of 1953 there were 17 probation officers serving in the Criminal Courts. These officers are appointed by the province, under The Ontario Probation Act, and are paid by the province. They are provincial employees. There have been probation officers for a number of years in the courts in the larger centres. At that time, that is, in 1953, these officers were stationed in Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa and London, which were the only places where probation services were provided. By December, 1953, 24 additional officers had been appointed to the Criminal Courts, making a total of 41 officers covering Criminal Courts in 20 areas of the province, so that not only was the total number of probation officers increased, but they were spread out to various other sections of the province, which had never had any probation service of this kind before.

Since January of this year—that is, just in the last 2 or 3 months—9 more officers have been appointed to supplement the services in existing probation areas in the Criminal Courts, and to cover 5 new areas. That makes a present total of 50 officers in 25 areas of the province. The appointment of at least another 20 officers is contemplated during the year 1954, so the total will then be 70 officers, and this number should give probation coverage to the Criminal Courts in most areas of the province.

The work of a probation officer requires training and skill. It is not just a matter of picking up anybody who wishes to do that sort of work, and putting him in as a probation officer. The problem is to explore every application that may be received, and to seek some people who may have these qualifications.

There are two standards of qualifications for work of this kind. One, of course, is educational. Many probation officers have had university education, having taken special training in the university for this sort of work. On the other hand, a great many of them have not. In every case, an attempt is made to have, not a person who merely has some academic qualification, but someone who, in addition, has had a number of years of practical experience in some type of welfare work, or human-relations work, of a kind which would better equip him for the work of a probation officer. Although a university course is of great value, and should equip a man for this sort of work better than if he did not have it, nevertheless—as happens in many cases—a man who has not had a university course at all, very often, if he is a person who has the right approach, the right understanding of the problems, and experience along these lines, is equally good at that sort of work, as one who has had such university training. So there is no absolute standard which can be imposed.

The problem is to pick men who, as far as we can see, are best equipped for this sort of work. The Director of Probation Services, Mr. Coughlan, has devoted his attention to this problem, and from all reports I have received, he has been extremely successful in attracting a very high type of person to this work.

As I believe I explained, when introducing the Estimates of my department a year ago, the work of a probation officer is to examine into cases which come before the magistrates in the Criminal Courts, in order to ascertain something of the backgrounds of the accused persons who come before that court: the accused man's family relationship, his general history, the sort of work he does, and the sort of place he has made for himself in the community.

The probation officer is then in a position, if he is reasonably skilled at this sort of work, to make a recommendation to the court as to whether this is the type of offender who might be better off if he were not placed in an institution but allowed to remain on probation for a time, to return to his

family and to his job without interruption, in the hope that he will not get into difficulties again.

I think it is quite apparent there are many cases where men or women get into difficulties for the first time, and find themselves in an institution, and rather than it having a salutary effect upon them, the stigma attached to incarceration in an institution, the economic difficulties they suffer due to the interruption of work, and the disruption of their family life, and everything that goes with it, tends to make that person a repeater, rather than a reformed individual. So the main purpose of the pre-trial probation—the matter with which the Attorney-General's Department is concerned—is to determine whether an accused is a proper person to be granted probation, and whether justice will be served by placing him—or her—on probation.

We are concerned with either putting people into jail, if we can prove a case, or dealing with them in the best interests of justice and society. There are many cases where proper probation can be granted in the interest of society, and for the benefit of the Provincial Treasury, in that the province does not have to keep them in an institution, the family does not find itself a charge upon the community, and the offender himself is more liable to learn his lesson and "go straight" in the future.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Attorney-General permit a question?

HON. MR. PORTER: I always permit a question. If I did not, I would never hear the end of it. Go ahead.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General will hear the end of this one tonight. I would like to know whether the hon. Attorney-General does not think perhaps this type of probation work would more appropriately belong to the Department of Reform Institutions rather than his department, since his main task, as he outlined a moment ago, is to convict people if he can prove a case against them.

HON. MR. PORTER: I did not say that was my main task at all. I said my main task was to deal with people who had committed offences, and either see that justice is done by putting them in an institution or by keeping them out of an institution, whichever is in the best interests of themselves and society.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Attorney-General thinks he can handle it both ways—

HON. MR. PORTER: The Attorney-General's Department has never taken the position that it is our business to get convictions at all costs.

MR. SALSBERG: He left that impression a few minutes ago.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is the impression the hon. member would take out of it.

MR. SALSBERG: Does the hon. Attorney-General think probation work should be under his department, or under the Department of Reform Institutions?

HON. MR. PORTER: I really do not know. I have no choice in the matter. The fact is, it has always been in the Attorney-General's Department and when I came into this department, I thought it was a good thing. I had a survey made as to the results of probation as we have it, as a matter of fact, into the entire workings of the Juvenile and Family Courts as well, to find out what improvements might be made in the system in the administration of justice.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Attorney-General not allow it to go to the Department of Reform Institutions?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know. Some time that might be decided, but it has not as yet. At the present time, it is in my department, and as long as it is, I am going to do a good job. I do not care what department it is under, as long as it is well done. All I know is, that is the way it is right now.

MR. SALSBERG: I will have to ask the Department of Reform Institutions what they think of it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Anybody can have it if they want it. If they can do a good job, that is all right.

HON. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): No, thank you.

HON. MR. PORTER: I was handing it to the hon. Minister on a platter. May I proceed?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes.

HON. MR. PORTER: Thank you. In 10 of the 25 areas which I mentioned as now covered by probation, the existing Juvenile and Family Court probation officers are paid by the municipality. That is the difference. The Family Court and the Juvenile Court probation officers are paid by the municipality, whereas, under the Statutes, our probation officers are paid by the province.

There are some places, however—10 of them at the present time—where the work of the probation officer in the Magistrates Courts, the adult Criminal Courts and the Juvenile and Family Courts, is not sufficient to warrant two probation officers, so the one probation officer is appointed to take charge of both. In those cases the province pays the salary. Therefore, some of them have been reappointed under the Probation Act, thus making them available to serve all courts in the area. He is paid by the province, in keeping with the over-all long-term plan, which will eventually be a unified plan over all the courts in the province.

That is something toward which we intend to work, so the whole service will be one service, Juvenile Courts, Family Courts, etc.

I do not think there is much more I can add to these general comments about probation. I cannot say it is a new departure, but we have attempted in the last 2 or 3 years to extend and improve it and set it up on a basis where the entire province will be served, rather than just a few areas. I think I can

take some satisfaction in the way the Director of Probation has performed his functions in the last few years.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Before the hon. Attorney-General leaves the question of probation, it is apparent, I am sure, to all the hon. members of the House, that the interest of the hon. Attorney-General's Department in the appointment of a probation officer, and in probation, generally, has increased very much in the last 15 or 16 months. The hon. Attorney-General has stated in 1953 there were 17 probation officers, and now there are 50. That is an indication, I would say, that the hon. Attorney-General and his department are "sold" on the merits of the probation system.

I was wondering if the hon. Attorney-General would indicate to the House with the experience already gained, just what has been the saving both in the reclamation of offenders to the "straight and narrow path" again, and in dollars and cents, because I am sure that there are savings in both directions.

The other question I wanted to ask the hon. Minister was: How many are now on probation? It would be interesting, I am sure, to compare the increased numbers of probation officers with the increased numbers on probation.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know. I do not think I have those figures available here, but I will be very glad to get them. I believe I gave some information along that line before the Committee on Reform Institutions. On that occasion, I took as an example, the activities of the probation officer, I think it was in St. Catharines, or some place about that size, over a short period. He was only there 2 or 3 months, but his work had resulted in a very great difference in the number of people placed in institutions, as the result of trials, and those who were not. The number who were committed to institutions was cut down very materially.

But, in a general way, I would hesitate to come to any conclusion yet as to the

real effect of this expansion of the probation service. I do not think it has been in existence long enough. One or two years is barely enough to prove much. However, I should be glad to get the figures as to the actual number of people on probation. I suppose we have those figures, and perhaps we can also get some figures showing the savings.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): It might be of interest also if we had the number who failed under probation, and where it had become necessary to incarcerate them as repeaters.

HON. MR. PORTER: Two years would hardly give sufficient time, but I suppose if we had the figures in prior years without probation, it would indicate something.

MR. OLIVER: I think the hon. Attorney-General will agree that Hamilton is a very good example. That would indicate how many failed on probation.

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): I was going to suggest St. Catharines would not be a very good place to take as an example, as there is such a small amount of law breaking there.

HON. MR. PORTER: I was astonished at the small number. It was just a handful. I do not know why they wanted a probation officer at all. The only reason they wanted one, I suppose, was because they knew we would pay his salary.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 23, item 4, "Crown Counsel Prosecutions": I presume that covers cases where a special counsel is sent to prosecute at the Assizes and so forth.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. That is to cover the Crown Attorney's fees and expenses when prosecuting in the Assizes.

MR. GRUMMETT: Not the Crown Attorney's, the special counsel's.

HON. MR. PORTER: The Crown Attorney's. We have not used any special prosecutors. They all get special fees for prosecuting in the Assizes.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): On item No. 3, special item 11, "Grants to County Law Libraries." Would the hon. Attorney-General tell us on what basis the grants are made?

HON. MR. PORTER: \$150 per library, and there are 42 libraries which are all certified by the Law Society of Upper Canada. I might say that was increased a year ago, and has been trebled within the last 5 years.

MR. GRUMMETT: On Vote 23, item 13, I was just wondering what that covered. I believe the one matter is the case of a magistrate or Juvenile Court judge who was shot and killed, but I do not know the other case.

HON. MR. PORTER: There have been certain officials in the Registry Offices—registrars—who were appointed years ago, and were not under the civil-service regulations as they are now. They could really stay on until they died if they wished, and could not be forced to retire at 65.

MR. GRUMMETT: I do not think that is the right Vote.

HON. MR. PORTER: First of all, it deals with Judge McKittrick. The hon. member is familiar with that.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes.

HON. MR. PORTER: And Constable Nathan, who was shot and killed on duty in Port Arthur. There was a pension allowance paid to his widow.

MR. NIXON: But he would be entitled to superannuation, would he not?

HON. MR. PORTER: Apparently he was not. He was appointed at an earlier time, or for some other reason, was not entitled to superannuation.

This allowance is only because these people were not entitled to superannuation. There are a few persons in this

category, such as registrars in the Registry Office—two cases that I know of. Their health was not good enough to enable them to carry on, but they were, strictly speaking, entitled to hold the position. An arrangement, therefore, was made under which a rather limited allowance was granted and it was found acceptable. They were retired and replaced. We have been able to do that in some cases. As time goes by, I suppose such cases will cease to exist.

MR. OLIVER: On item 8, how do we stand in respect of the cost-of-living bonus now? I understand that a proportion of it has been written into salaries. Can the hon. Minister tell the committee what the proportion is? And what is the reason why it was not all incorporated into salaries?

HON. MR. PORTER: The decision as to what should be done with the cost-of-living bonus is something which does not come within the scope of this department. We simply follow the policy. The cost-of-living bonus was \$420 a year and it was decided, within the last year, to incorporate \$300 of that into salary. I think that was done throughout the whole service. There still remains \$120 as cost-of-living bonus.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, with reference to item 13, the last item. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has just explained the two items listed in the Estimates, and I am sure the entire House agrees with the procedure which was followed. I wish to proceed further to an extension of the principle employed in those two cases, and I refer to citizens who are wrongfully imprisoned and deprived of their freedom—citizens who are incarcerated and who later are released without the benefit of compensation. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that such citizens are entitled to compensation, and the principle applied in the two cases before us on this occasion should be extended and applied also to the type of case I refer to.

This is not a whim of my own, but it is something that every citizen—I wish to refresh the minds of hon. members

of this House about the position taken by *Saturday Night* a year ago in the case of Mr. Ronald Power. *Saturday Night*, in a front page editorial, took very serious issue with the Attorney-General.

HON. MR. PORTER: All I can say is I disagree with *Saturday Night* in the position it took.

MR. SALSBERG: That may be the opinion of the hon. Attorney-General. I very often disagree with *Saturday Night*—

HON. MR. PORTER: So long as *Saturday Night* disagrees with the Attorney-General, you agree with *Saturday Night*.

MR. SALSBERG: I have no desire to make the task of the Attorney-General, an important member of the government, more difficult than it is, but as hon. members know, I am in a position where I fill all Cabinet posts.

HON. MR. PORTER: A "Shadow Cabinet."

MR. SALSBERG: At this moment I take the place of a member of the "Shadow Cabinet" who takes his place opposite the hon. Attorney-General. I have no special reason to engage in controversy with the hon. Attorney-General.

Saturday Night in my opinion was quite right. It went out of its way to disassociate itself from the position taken by the hon. Attorney-General and the government. In fact the paper went so far as to apologize to Mr. Power for the failure of the government to acknowledge its responsibility to him, after he had served 7 months' imprisonment for a crime he did not commit. After his release, the hon. Attorney-General, according to *Saturday Night* let him go with a bland "So sorry."

This matter came up again a few days ago when the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) raised a case—

HON. MR. PORTER: This is out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not out of order in any way.

HON. MR. PORTER: It has nothing to do with this item.

MR. SALSBERG: It has everything to do with the hon. Attorney-General's Estimates contained in Vote 23.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am not going to argue with you.

MR. SALSBERG: If you decide that you have nothing to say on this matter, that is your right, but I am trying to elicit information. The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) raised the question a week or so ago of a young man who was incarcerated, though he was innocent. The question arose as to why he should not be compensated. The hon. Attorney-General said there was no provision for compensation, and no one had ever heard of compensation being given in such a case.

A visitor in the gallery, totally unknown to me, sent me a note—

AN HON. MEMBER: Not Mrs. Smith?

MR. SALSBERG: Do not worry. The hon. Attorney-General will be embarrassed by that "Mrs. Smith" case. Judging by the handwriting this note was sent by a male. It said:

I see by the newspapers that the Attorney-General stated in the House that the principle of compensating persons who have been wrongfully imprisoned is unknown in any British country. In this he is mistaken. In England, about 20 or 25 years ago a certain party by the name of Oscar Slater was liberated after several years in jail because the authorities found he had been wrongly imprisoned.

THE CHAIRMAN: I had better ask the hon. member to stick to the Estimate.

MR. SALSBERG: I am, or I would not be speaking.

As compensation, the British Government awarded him the sum of 10,000 pounds Sterling. This case is very well-known.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that on this occasion the government should consider this problem, and agree to find the necessary funds to compensate people such as Mr. Ronald Power, whose case was mentioned in *Saturday Night*—and the case of the young man mentioned by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay).

I do not agree at all with the attitude of the hon. Attorney-General nor of the government—for this is a Cabinet responsibility—when he says "we will offer no compensation, we will have no more to do with a person after we release him."

When a person has been deprived of his freedom for a long period of time, I believe compensation should be given, and I raise the matter because I think, just as the hon. Attorney-General and the government agree to offer compensation in cases of the sort dealt with in this item, they could find the funds to carry out the suggestion I have advanced. And I think they should, as a matter of principle, deal fairly with persons who have been unfairly dealt with previously, and who have been deprived of their freedom.

HON. MR. PORTER: What the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has said has nothing to do with the subject. Nevertheless, he talked. We are quite accustomed to that. This is the third time since the hon. member has been in the House this matter has been raised. He has heard my explanations on previous occasions, but nevertheless, since he either has no recollection of what I said, cannot remember, or cannot understand, if he wishes me to answer the question a third time I am willing to do so.

MR. SALSBERG: If you can make it any clearer, please go ahead. On the last two occasions you did very poorly.

HON. MR. PORTER: What the hon. member suggests—although in a very vague way—is that any accused

person who is acquitted in the court after he has had to await his trial in custody, or if he was convicted and had to await the hearing of his appeal in custody, should be compensated. That is the substance, I think, about which the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is talking.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh no. You are putting not only words but thoughts into my mind which were never there. The hon. Attorney-General would be a very poor counsel. I did not suggest any recompense for a person in those circumstances. All I am suggesting is if a person is wrongfully convicted and later proven to have been so, the government should take some responsibility.

HON. MR. PORTER: Thus, if a man were convicted at a trial and appealed, and his conviction was quashed on appeal, would the hon. member say he had been wrongfully convicted?

MR. SALSBERG: To make the case very simple I will limit it to the case of Mr. Ronald Power who served 7 months and then was released.

HON. MR. PORTER: He was released after a new trial by the Court of Appeal. He was given a new trial and was acquitted. The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) suggested he should be compensated. He was entitled to bail, but, in fact, he either could not or would not raise it. He was not held in jail wrongfully for one day. He could have had bail at any time.

MR. SALSBERG: Could he? The poor often cannot get bail.

HON. MR. PORTER: Are you suggesting we should do away with the whole system of bail, because a man is poor?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is complicating a very simple matter. He is a master of complication.

HON. MR. PORTER: Let me tell the hon. member this: This man, Ronald

Power was associated with some people who held up with guns reputable and innocent citizens on the streets.

Those were his associates. One night, a couple of these people held up a man in a motor car, and the driver saw their faces, and he thought he remembered the faces of these two men. Sometime later, Ronald Power and the other man were brought into the police station, and the man who was driving the car and who laid the complaint, recognized one of those who he thought was Ronald Power, and Ronald Power was convicted on that evidence, which the jury believed.

Certain things developed, and Ronald Power appealed, and eventually was given a new trial because there was some new evidence, I think, which came out, which indicated he was not actually present at the time, but the whole course of his difficulty arose because he gave a wrong statement of the facts to the police which involved him with these criminals, who eventually were convicted—and quite rightly so—and went to jail.

The man who claimed to recognize Ronald Power as one of the persons who was involved in the holdup, swore again in the new trial that he thought it was Ronald Power, but the jury gave Power the benefit of the doubt. He was not found guilty on his second trial, but was acquitted.

If every case where a man is accused goes to trial and is acquitted, were to be compensated, we would probably be compensating a great many people who were actually guilty, but against whom the offence could not be proven. If a person is involved with the police, and gets before the courts, and becomes involved with some gang, which commits a crime which would be very dangerous to the innocent people on the streets—and, after all, you must think of the innocent people once in a while—but if they get into difficulty, and are too poor to raise the bail, or have no friends who can raise the moderate bail which is usually asked for, they must remain in custody. Perhaps they choose to stay in custody. From reports I have heard of the reform institutions, I think many

men would be delighted to stay in one of those institutions, under the capable guidance of the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote, V.C.).

MR. SALSBERG: That man certainly put up a battle to get out of there. It is all very unfair.

On Vote 24.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Attorney-General tell us how many employees' salaries are covered by this item, and if they are determined on a commencing minimum basis, and being increased annually until the maximum is reached?

HON. MR. PORTER: There are 8 on the staff, Mr. Chairman. There are 2 legislative counsel, Mr. MacTavish, and Mr. Treadgold. Then there is the secretarial staff, and one other solicitor, Mr. Alcombrack.

MR. CHARTRAND: How is the minimum salary determined?

HON. MR. PORTER: Do you want their salaries?

MR. CHARTRAND: No, but I would like to find out if they start at a minimum when they enter the service, and go up to the maximum?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. CHARTRAND: What is it?

HON. MR. PORTER: There are categories for those. I can get the exact figures. In most categories in the Civil Service, there is now fixed a certain minimum and certain maximum, and they can work up from the minimum to the maximum. I am informed that regarding the legislative counsel, the maximum has not yet been fixed.

MR. CHARTRAND: What is the minimum?

HON. MR. PORTER: There are some parts of the service which have not completed that as yet.

MR. CHARTRAND: No minimum and no maximum?

HON. MR. PORTER: The minimum is \$5,000, plus the cost-of-living bonus of \$120.

Vote No. 24 agreed to.

On Vote No. 25.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): In connection with Vote 25, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister how many full-time employees in the Registrar of Regulations Branch?

HON. MR. PORTER: A staff of 5, Mr. Chairman. Mr. D. W. Rose, is the Registrar. Mr. Wherry was the first Registrar, but he retired this year, having reached the age of retirement, and Mr. Rose, who was his assistant, is now the Registrar.

MR. NIXON: How can you keep 5 people busy registering regulations?

HON. MR. PORTER: I find they are always flooded with work.

MR. NIXON: I do not see how they could be. If the Lieutenant-Governor was sitting day and night, how could they get enough registrations to keep 5 people busy?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) that they are busy. I do not know where they come from. We are turning out these regulations, all the time. We are the only department which does, I think.

MR. SALSBERG: Do they come under the Factory Act?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mass production.

Votes 25 to 28 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote No. 29.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I know that 29 is a statutory provision, the Administration of Justice Expenses Act, special expenses. It is not a very large item, but I would like to know what it covers, and to what it refers.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is an item which has been unchanged over the years. They are special expenses. I will ascertain exactly what was spent last year to show the nature of the expenditures under this Estimate.

I am informed that last year about \$250 only was spent under that item. That is a statutory item.

Section 11 of the Administration of Justice Expenses Act is the authority for it. It says:

Where services are rendered by any person in connection with any prosecution, and such services are rendered by the direction of or with the approval of the Attorney-General, the person who has so rendered the service is entitled to such sum as the Attorney-General may direct, the sum to be charged upon and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Last year, there were a few dollars paid under that item. That is, other than Assize work.

MR. GRUMMETT: Other than cases in the Supreme Court?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): On item 10, Mr. Chairman; I notice the maintenance for this year is \$15,000. Last year, it was \$35,000. Would the hon. Attorney-General care to comment on that?

HON. MR. PORTER: A year ago, there was some expensive equipment purchased, which accounted for the size of the amount allowed. This is decreased by \$20,000 this year, because we do not need that equipment again. It was a spectograph. I have seen spectographs some years ago. They have something to do with picking out and analyzing colours. It is very important in the detection of crime. As a matter of fact, I saw some of these spectographs in the office of the FBI in Washington. Perhaps the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) will accompany me on my next visit.

MR. SALSBERG: I have no reason to accompany the hon. Attorney-General anywhere.

HON. MR. PORTER: They use it in cases involving automobile accidents, or hit-and-run drivers. That is where they find great use for these spectographs.

They have information there about the paint which is used on every model of car turned out in the United States; every group of cars which is turned out on the assembly line, goes through the paint room, and perhaps a number of them are painted with the same mixture of paint. When the next line of cars goes through, they have prepared a new mixture of paint. To the human eye, it might appear to be all of the same colour, but there are very fine differences in each mixture of paint, and by the use of the spectograph, they can identify a car by the paint which has been used on it. Sometimes they get a piece of chipped paint from a motor car, which might be clinging to the body of a person who was hit, or to his clothing, or they might find it lying on the roadside, and from it they can tell exactly what group of cars, the make, the model where it came from, within perhaps a few hundred cars. They get it down to that narrow point, and they try to find out where these cars are in the United States.

MR. SALSBERG: Did you have to go to the FBI to learn that?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. Their spectographs are much more expensive than ours. I do not say we can do that much with our modest spectograph.

On item No. 6.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): In regard to the general administration of justice, including "fuel, water, light, rent, maintenance" and— and here is what I am interested in, Mr. Chairman — "clothing of prisoners." Why is that referred to only in the question of expenses for districts? Why not in other institutions?

HON. MR. PORTER: In the districts, we pay everything.

MR. GRUMMETT: Even to the clothing?

HON. MR. PORTER: Sure, sure. You do not realize how well off you are in the north country. It almost pays to be a prisoner.

On item No. 12.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): On item 12, of Vote 29, Mr. Chairman, "Salaries of Magistrates."

We have what we consider quite a problem in Ottawa. As the hon. Attorney-General well knows, there is a senior and a junior magistrate for the City of Ottawa, and also a magistrate for the County of Carleton. Since annexation has taken place, and the suburban parts of both the Townships of Gloucester and Nepean have been incorporated into the city, there is very little with which the magistrate for Carleton County has to concern himself, and very often the magistrate for the County of Carleton has been called upon to sit in the City of Ottawa—which we approve.

The point is this, that with 3 magistrates, there is only one Magistrates' Court sitting every day.

Of course, for the last few years it would have been difficult to have two magistrates sitting due to the fact the courtroom was being renovated. Now that this has been accomplished, I think there would be no difficulty in having two Magistrates' Courts sitting every day, but the difficulty, I am told, is that they cannot obtain an official reporter. They are using a reporter from the House of Commons, but they are available only in the mornings.

The situation which stems from that is that the court house is crowded with witnesses, and members of the bar must spend hours waiting for their cases to be called. We think there is accommodation for holding one Magistrates' Court at the Police Court, and another Magistrates' Court in the County Court every morning.

HON. MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Mr. Chartrand) think the Mayoress would allow us to use the County Court building?

MR. CHARTRAND: I think so. I believe this matter was brought up before, but I think it was delayed, due to the fact that there was no space available until the County Court could be fully renovated. Now this has been accomplished.

HON. MR. PORTER: I understand that one of the magistrates has been using the court house.

MR. CHARTRAND: The County Court Magistrate has been using that—for the county, not for the city.

HON. MR. PORTER: We will look into that.

MR. CHARTRAND: I am told the only thing that is preventing it now—the magistrates would be quite willing to sit—is they cannot get an official reporter. Could that not be arranged?

HON. MR. PORTER: I believe the difficulty may be to obtain one.

MR. CHARTRAND: That may be, but cannot the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) work that out?

HON. MR. PORTER: We will look into the matter. As a matter of fact, official reporters are very difficult to obtain today. They are becoming very scarce. There is so much talk going on in the world today, that reporters are at a premium.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): It is because you do not pay them enough.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): In connection with the same Vote, No. 29, "Probation Officers": I was wondering why all the salaries, travelling expenses and maintenance, were shown here, in the sum of \$205,000, as a statutory expenditure. How does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) decide what sums are put under a statutory

expenditure and which are carried in ordinary? Looking at some of the other items, such as "Magistrates' Salaries," "Judges' Salaries," "Public Trustees' Salaries," and so on, I see those are in ordinary expenditures. How does the hon. Minister decide just what items go into the statutory column of the Estimates?

HON. MR. PORTER: There is a provision in the Statute that it be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That is a definite provision in the Statute. Then, of course, we have to estimate how much will be necessary, and it is an estimate, just as it is if it appears in the other side of the column. However, that is an accountancy matter, and I am not at home in accountancy of any kind, or with anything having to do with figures. I am like the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) in that respect.

MR. GRUMMETT: I was wondering just how you determine what items should be covered by the Statute and what should not.

HON. MR. PORTER: Where it is specifically authorized by Statute.

MR. GRUMMETT: I know that. But how do you, when you are setting up the expenditure in the first instance, decide; "This item will be covered by Statute, or it will not."

HON. MR. PORTER: Compare this, for instance, with item No. 12, "Salaries of Magistrates."

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, that is what I was doing.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is not statutory in the same sense.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is right.

HON. MR. PORTER: So that it goes in the column, "To be Voted."

MR. GRUMMETT: But the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) does not get my point. Why could you not have said, when you set up the Magis-

trates' Salaries, that they would be covered by Statute, and have them go in the statutory column as well?

HON. MR. PORTER: It just happens that the Statute does not cover it in the same way. I must confess to the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) that I do not see very much rhyme or reason to this, but this is the way the accounts are set up, and I do not know that it makes any difference in the long run, because the net result is the same. I think what the hon. member might have in mind is this—and perhaps he will correct me if I have it incorrectly—that a statutory amount should be some amount which is authorized.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, some definite amount.

HON. MR. PORTER: So that we have to provide \$177,000 for that, and we have no choice. That is perhaps what the hon. member has in mind?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, and you may not use all of it, or you may.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, you must have that provided for.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes.

HON. MR. PORTER: Well, apparently it is a little more flexible than that. It also includes any expenditure which, under the Statute, must be met out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. In so many words, apparently that is what it means.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes. Well my difficulty—

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know why it should be, and I am not prepared to justify it.

MR. GRUMMETT: Neither am I, and I thought maybe I might be able to find out. I was just wondering how the decision was arrived at, placing it in the "Statutory" column.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is because it was in the wording of the Statute.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is right.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, in that particular item there is an increase of \$58,000 this year. Would the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) care to comment on that?

HON. MR. PORTER: I explained that in my opening remarks. I commented about the increase of probation officers, and this increase is to take care of the 20 additional officers whom we hope to appoint during the next year, as well as the number who were appointed last year. That is the explanation.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, the Vote we are on now. No. 29, items 7 and 8 deal with costs of Juvenile and Family Courts in the provisional judicial districts. I want at this stage to bring to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) a very serious problem which, in my opinion, contributes greatly to the difficulties of family life, the difficulties parents encounter with their youngsters, which causes a great deal of delinquency, and, therefore, problems for our Juvenile and Family Courts. I have reference to the crime comics and the horror comics which are being distributed throughout the length and breadth of the province, as they are in other provinces.

I am aware of the fact that there is a very small minority of people who seem to think these types of comics are not harmful, but that opinion is not shared by the overwhelming majority of educators, religious leaders, and parents who are active in Home and School Clubs. They are certainly considered a very harmful and very dangerous problem in Great Britain and elsewhere. The opposition to the wholesale distribution of crime and horror comics ranges from the Pope down to the neighbourhood Home and School Club, and indeed to our own Committee on Reform Institutions.

HON. MR. PORTER: Once again, I wish to point out to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that this has nothing

whatsoever to do with this Estimate. He is talking about something dealt with by the Criminal Code. If the hon. member were to be elected in some constituency, which would send him to Ottawa, he would be then quite in order to make a speech on the Estimates there.

MR. SALSBERG: I disagree, Mr. Chairman, and I challenge the opinion of the hon. Attorney-General, and I will soon tell him why, in spite of the interruption.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am just registering my objection.

MR. SALSBERG: Because the enforcement of criminal law is the responsibility of the Attorney-General of this province. That is true?

HON. MR. PORTER: Let us get down to the enforcement, then.

MR. SALSBERG: What is the difference if I raise it in this item or an item down below?

HON. MR. PORTER: Go ahead.

MR. SALSBERG: But a moment ago, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), in order to prevent the discussion of this, said blandly, that this does not belong to this Legislature.

HON. MR. PORTER: Get down to the enforcement, then.

MR. SALSBERG: And now he wants to get down to it.

HON. MR. PORTER: What is the problem? What is the question?

MR. SALSBERG: You just sit and listen, because in my humble opinion you are failing in your duty. That is that. Is that straight? And I will tell you why.

HON. MR. PORTER: Very concise. Why not stop there, why spoil it? Stop at a good point.

MR. SALSBERG: Don't try to get away from the issue by pretending the problem does not belong here, but to

another jurisdiction, maybe the House of Commons. It belongs here, first, and if it belongs here, then this is the time and place to discuss it, because when this matter is taken up at Ottawa by parents' associations, teachers and ministers and so on, they are always told that the enforcement of the law rests with the provinces.

MR. A. K. ROBERTS (St. Patrick) : Why do you not initiate a prosecution?

MR. SALSBERG: And that the amendment they put in the Act—which I on a previous occasion have read in this House, I think it is an amendment to section 207 of The Criminal Code—should be enforced by the Attorney-General. However, I must say the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has a very cynical attitude to this whole problem. When I spoke in this House about the dangers and harmful effect of comics a couple of years ago, I presented to the hon. Attorney-General a number of comic books which were purchased in his riding, and at that time he said—

MR. J. W. HANNA (Huron-Bruce) : We do not want the story of your life.

MR. SALSBERG: He said he would read those comic books, and look into them, and see what could be done. Mr. Chairman, do you know what happened? A week later I had occasion to be in the Attorney-General's office, and in the outer office where the clerks and telephone operators are, I found a young lad sitting at one of the desks, and, lo and behold, he was reading the comics I sent to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) as material evidence of the crime that is being committed against the youth of this province.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) confine himself to the Estimates?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but I am speaking to the Estimates, the enforcement of law as it affects the Criminal Code, and the

section that deals with crime and horror comics. Now, you see, the Attorney-General was just cynical about it; he took those horrible books, and allowed juveniles in his department to read them. I suggest that is nothing to laugh at. Our own committee—and this is what I was about to say when the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) interrupted me before—our Committee on Reform Institutions in its report gave some prominence to the problem of comics, and its report to the Legislature urged that "comic books should be closely scrutinized by the proper authorities with a view to an increased number of prosecutions for flagrant violation of the present laws governing their sale and publication," and I want to bow to the chairman, and all members of that committee, for having made that recommendation. I think it is good. I think it is correct.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick) : Do not spoil it.

MR. SALSBERG: But the only one who can enforce it is the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) if he would have the will to do so, but if he takes these horrible things—and I am going to send across some of them—

HON. MR. PORTER: Send them over.

MR. SALSBERG: Only with the understanding that he will not distribute them to the minors in his own office.

HON. MR. PORTER: We have no minors.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, they are minors.

HON. MR. PORTER: They all look young, but they are not all as young as they look.

MR. SALSBERG: Such books are really horrifying. Look at this, *Terror Tales in the Night*, and *Astonishing Comics*.

HON. MR. PORTER: Send it over.

MR. SALSBERG: With the most horrifying scenes depicted on the front page.

MR. ROBERTS: Have you one for me?

MR. SALSBERG: Another one here. This is called, *Young Men*, and the story at the top is—"A Human Torch," with a human torch murdering or massacring other people. To the hon. Attorney-General.

Now then, here is another one which the hon. Attorney-General allows to be sold and refuses to take any action against, though the Criminal Code has made ample provision. It is called *Black Cat* and there is a semi-nude figure of a man with rats creeping upon and gnawing away at his body. This is displayed in stores across the province and young lads and young girls look at these things, buy them and then have nightmares.

HON. MR. PORTER: I want to take exception, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SALSBERG: Here is another one, *Chamber of Chills*. This is displayed in the riding of the hon. Attorney-General.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member put that in an envelope when he sends it across the floor, please?

MR. SALSBERG: That illustrates the attitude of the hon. Attorney-General. He takes it very lightly and would like it sent to him in an envelope. I suppose a perfumed envelope, otherwise the hon. Attorney-General will not like it, but he is allowing our children to read it.

HON. MR. PORTER: I did not want the hon. members of the House to see it.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General should worry about the young children of the province who are exposed to this, and not worry about the hon. members, who have been

around so long they have developed immunity to a great many things.

Here is another one, *The Chamber of Chills*, with some grotesque figure choking a woman.

A clamour rises from the back benches. For them, I have copies of, *Love Experience*, *Love Diary*, *Love Journals*, *Love Problems*. That is what the hon. Attorney-General permits our public and high school children to buy. Here are all of them. I will send them to the hon. Attorney-General.

The back benchers will get them through the back door of the Attorney-General's office. I want to say this is a very serious matter. Not only have demands been made repeatedly to the hon. Attorney-General, but there is quite an outcry.

The journal published by the Ontario Public Schools Trustees Association went to the length of reprinting a very famous article on the harmful effects of comics, which appeared in a national American magazine. They reprinted it in their own journal for the public school trustees throughout the province. I think this article would make excellent reading for the hon. Attorney-General.

HON. MR. FROST: Might I check the hon. member. These are not crime comics necessarily, they are just lurid stories and pictures, not crime comics.

MR. SALSBERG: I disagree.

HON. MR. FROST: They should be sent back. The hon. member gets up and makes a great many statements to the House, and submits the House to a "Chamber of Chills." As a matter of fact, these are not crime comics at all. All the hon. member is doing is taking some magazines with lurid covers and lurid names and submitting them as "crime comics."

MR. SALSBERG: I protest. It is all right for the hon. Attorney-General to try to confuse issues, but when the hon. Prime Minister gets into a matter of this importance, and tries to act in the same manner as the hon. Attorney-General—I resent it, and am extremely

sorry he does so, because it is not becoming a Prime Minister of this province to refer to them as being, "only lurid covers."

HON. MR. FROST: Just because the hon. member produces something with a bright red cover, or something of that sort, and says, "This is a crime comic," does not make it a crime comic at all.

I would point this out to the hon. member, I think we should get down to business. Just send over those things and we will submit them to the law officers of the Crown and the police to see whether they are crime comics or not. I am very doubtful whether they are anything of the sort.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister has made the statement he is doubtful whether those are crime or horror comics. I will take this bundle to those who are concerned. I did not choose those either, I asked someone to pick them and bring them to me, and they were picked at random by young parents who are very much concerned with the problem, and presented to me. The hon. Prime Minister has said these are not crime or horror comics. I shall submit them to the authorities, and teachers, and educators.

HON. MR. PORTER: The fictitious "Mrs. Smith."

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General should be original. That remark came from the back benches. I shall submit them to authorities and ask whether those are in the category dealt within the magazine article which I refer to. This article was distributed throughout the world, and led to a conviction in England of publishers, who turned out some of this stuff, and resulted in denunciation of this sort of poison being sold.

HON. MR. FROST: Will the hon. member send them over to me?

MR. SALSBERG: They were given back. This bundle will go to authorities,

and we will let them decide in what category they are. We will send them to the journal of the Public Schools Trustees Association, which carried these articles. Let them decide whether they should be sold freely on the streets and over the counters to our youth, or whether something should be done about it. They will decide what they are. Let them conclude whether they should be sold to their children.

MR. EDWARDS: What about the radio?

MR. SALSBERG: The radio should be looked into, too. But I am dealing with matters directly under the hon. Attorney-General's Department and his Estimates.

On previous occasions I have suggested—and I do not know why the government has refused to follow the suggestion—that a committee of parents, teachers and other suitable people be set up to advise the government on this problem, people who are not concerned with either printing, selling or distributing this "stuff", but who are concerned with the welfare of the children. Let them advise the government how to cope with this. I am not suggesting reckless and unconsidered raids on places, or mass trials. I am suggesting, however, that we are confronted with a very serious problem and a different attitude is required than the one we are getting from the government, and have been getting all along.

I suggest the setting up of such a committee to make possible some official designation and identification of comic books, placing them in categories that will indicate whether they are suitable to be allowed into our homes, perhaps a stamp of approval of such a committee, or some other method will be found to deal with it, but to turn one's back on the problem and laugh at it cynically, or to try and resort to artifices here, I suggest, is unbecoming and is failing in the responsibility to the youth of the province.

Votes 29 and 30 agreed to.

On Vote 31.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would explain Vote 31, items 5 to 10?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, provision was made under The Matrimonial Causes Act for procedure, whereby the Official Guardian would have power to investigate cases involving a divorce, where custody of children was also an issue. The Act provided the Official Guardian should investigate the circumstances of the children, whose custody was in question, and be in a position to advise the court in deciding how the matter should be disposed of.

I introduced a bill this session to extend that to all cases, whether or not there was a divorce involved, as long as there was custody of children involved. This procedure should apply to every case involving the custody of children. I understand it has worked out very successfully.

MR. GRUMMETT: Item 10 is to cover additional expenses which might arise owing to the introduction of the bill, which was introduced the other day?

HON. MR. PORTER: No, item 10 is for payment made to Children's Aid Societies assisting in these investigations. We use the Children's Aid Societies, through the Official Guardian, who authorizes the Children's Aid Societies in many places to make these investigations, and some scale of payment is made for this sort of assistance.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the hon. Attorney-General what is the explanation of the \$1,000 salary to the supervising coroner? That is not all the salary he receives?

HON. MR. PORTER: That is the provincial share of his salary. The supervising coroner is the coroner for Toronto, and as such he gets his main salary. He also has provincial jurisdiction

as well, and for that extra dignity and work he receives \$1,000.

Votes 31, 32 and 33 agreed to.

On Vote 34.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): On Vote 34. Monthly Allowances to Judges, \$98,000. I think the hon. Attorney-General will remember I brought up at a previous session the matter of having a third County Court Judge in Carleton. At the time I was advised that no representation had been made, and that in any event the judge from the adjoining county would be able to give some relief.

I find out there have been new developments, and the Clerk Registrar of the County of Carleton has written to the hon. Attorney-General, and also to Mr. Hugh H. Donald, Inspector of Legal Offices, and some of these matters were taken up with the Inspector in Ottawa. I understand a copy, which I will read, of a letter sent to Mr. Donald has been also forwarded to the hon. Attorney-General in which the matter was fully explained.

HON. MR. PORTER: What date does that bear?

MR. CHARTRAND: January 28th, 1954. This letter reads as follows:

DEAR SIR:

Re: *Third Judge for Carleton*

I beg to enclose Sessions Civil List starting Monday. You will note there are:

Jury	-	14
Non-jury	-	58
		<hr/>
		72
Add criminal cases	-	2
		<hr/>
		74

This is not a record but close to it. What troubles me mostly is the Remanets. There are 33 on this list. Also we have a large backlog of Remanets from former lists.

With two judges always busy with,

1. Chamber work.
2. Division Courts.
3. Assessment &c. Appeals.
4. County Court Judges Criminal Courts.
5. Surrogate audits.
6. Surrogate contentions &c. &c.,

we cannot keep up with the parade of trials.

Our Criminal work is in pretty fair shape, we only have two cases for the sessions.

By next Monday night I hope to have our Magistrates' Appeals cleaned up.

May I quote the "Guid Buik" in closing, "Come over into Macedonia and help us."

I know that in quite a few cases counsel just cannot get on smartly with their trials and I know some are indolent. I also realize that Judge Madden's sudden death threw a monkey-wrench into our machinery.

Nevertheless, we do need another junior judge and as clerk-registrar I cannot help feeling that nobody knows better how great our need is than I.

Yours faithfully,
Clerk-Registrar.

I understand that recently an article appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen*, during the present session of this House. Under the caption, "Three Judges Tackle County Court List," it reads as follows:

Three judges will preside at County Court hearings next week in a drive to clean up 51 cases remaining out of a total of 76 slated for the current session, County Court Clerk, S. Rupert Broadfoot, Q.C., said this morning.

Three civil actions on the list remain to be tried before a jury. The balance are non-jury cases.

Beginning next Tuesday, County Judge C. W. A. Marion is scheduled to hear 10 cases.

Judge A. G. McDougall is listed to try 15 cases and Judge J. Peter MacDonald will proceed with hearings of non-jury cases.

Mr. Chairman, it has always been said in past years, when I have brought up this matter of a third County Court judge for Carleton, it would be quite possible to carry on with the aid of visiting judges. The experience of the court does not justify that contention. As a matter of fact, as every solicitor in this House knows, the one thing you cannot accomplish in the field of litigation is accurate planning. Sometimes you think a case is going to take 2 days and it is settled in 15 minutes. Sometimes you estimate a case will be settled in a day, and in fact it lasts for 2½ days. If it had been possible for the senior judge to plan in advance, the solution offered

by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) in the past would be workable, but it has been found there is no possibility of planning in advance, and the senior County Court judge is reluctant to have to bring in a judge from another county and saddle the County of Carleton with expenses of \$20 to \$25 a day, if it is not known definitely there will be work for him to do. Our experience in the last 2 years has been that whenever there is a surplus of work the only legal work that can be assigned—

HON. MR. PORTER: I understand the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) to say that the county was saddled with an additional payment. My understanding is that that cost is paid by the federal authorities.

MR. CHARTRAND: I think the county has to pay the judge's expenses at the rate of \$20 to \$25 a day.

HON. MR. PORTER: Oh no. It is paid by the Department of Justice at Ottawa. These accounts come into my office, and if they appear to be correct I send them to Ottawa.

MR. CHARTRAND: Well, it does not change my argument. The senior judge of the County of Carleton is reluctant to ask the judge of another county to come in, when he is not sure there is work waiting for him. Our experience in the past 2 years has been that Judge Marion would come into Ottawa and dispose of the divisional court cases, the rental court cases and other cases listed for the County Court sittings. Outside of that, the senior judge is unable to say in advance when there will be the need for a third judge, with the result that the administration of justice is quite impaired and is why there are so many cases in arrears and pending.

I have raised this matter on several occasions before. I would remind the hon. Minister that second junior judges have been appointed in the Counties of Essex and Wentworth, and that the County of Carleton stands, from the point of view of population, midway between those two counties, and if there is a need for an additional judge in

either of those counties, there is need for one in Carleton. I would ask the hon. Attorney-General to make some comment on this matter.

HON. MR. PORTER: The letter from Mr. Broadfoot is the first official intimation we have had of any need for further judicial services in that area. That has now set an inquiry in motion as to whether or not this is necessary.

It is all very well for us to introduce legislation in this House to provide for an additional county judge in any county, but it is quite useless to pass legislation, unless the Department of Justice makes the appointment.

MR. CHARTRAND: I think there is a postscript to the letter which deals with that matter. It is being looked into.

HON. MR. PORTER: By the Department of Justice? They usually do not look into it until we ask them to. Well, it would be a nice thing to have an extra judgeship in that vicinity. There might be a by-election.

MR. GRUMMETT: Vote 34, item 10. I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would explain that?

HON. MR. PORTER: This is for office supplies and maintenance items of one kind and another for Divisions Courts, sheriffs' offices, registrars, and court officials of that kind. We "pay the shot," to put it shortly.

MR. GRUMMETT: Vote 34, item 13. That is a different story. There is no necessity for back-bench members to be perpetually shouting "Carried" when an hon. member is asking a question. There is no need for back-benchers to try to drown out hon. members who wish to speak.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): There is no intention of drowning out Opposition members, but when you have stayed here for 2 hours listening to some of the hon. members on the other side, it gets pretty tiresome. I was not referring to the hon. member for Cochrane-South (Mr. Grummett).

MR. GRUMMETT: But I resent the action of a back-bencher trying to cut down the opportunity for Opposition members to ask questions, and who do not ask questions themselves.

MR. COWLING: I will ask my question when the time comes.

MR. GRUMMETT: It is the duty of the Opposition to ask as many questions as they wish, and to get information about these Estimates, and it certainly does not become a supporter of the government to keep continuously shouting "Carried," to drown out any questions.

MR. COWLING: Some of the other hon. members have taken a great deal longer than they should have done. So far as the explanation is concerned, it was sufficient for me, and I shouted "Carried." I was not particularly referring to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett).

HON. MR. PORTER: I can understand that the hon. member's temper is becoming a little frayed as a result of the long speeches.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not defend him. He can defend himself.

HON. MR. PORTER: What are you getting "touchy" about now? Who is making the long speeches?

MR. SALSBERG: I am giving you time to think up an answer.

HON. MR. PORTER: Item No. 13. \$6,000 covers certain surveys which were made in that particular district. I will refer to the hon. member to a previous item, to Crown contributions toward preparing plans. That is a statutory provision, whereby judges make orders in certain situations to have a plan survey prepared in certain areas. There are some towns which require almost an entirely new survey, and we have instituted a policy over the last few years of making contributions to these plans and facilities. In many cases it has been a very expensive business to do all

the work required. These survey plans are to clear up the title situation in certain areas where there has never been a survey, and it is very difficult, sometimes, to certify to a clear title. We are making plans to clear up that situation. The two townships mentioned are townships which were not financially able to bear the normal proportion of the cost of the plan, which was particularly involved, in relation to the size of the municipalities, so there was a special item to look after that situation.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, a small matter, but a very, very serious one. The question I would like to present is this: In Toronto, where there are a number of County Courts, 4 to be exact, it has become the habit—a very vile habit—of some collection agencies, not of all, but of some, to take their documents, affidavits or whatever you call them, not to the court nearest to the person they are after, but to the court that is farthest away.

The reason for this is so they can add mileage costs, serving costs and so on. Unfortunately this hits the poorest section of the population. These collection agencies handle small amounts due for household furniture and other items bought for the home, and some people may not always be able to make their payments on time.

When a person falls in arrears, the experience has been that collection agencies take these documents to New Toronto, or to the Eglinton Court, away out at the other end of the city, for people who may live in the Bathurst Street area, in Bellwoods, or St. Andrew. In High Park, they would not take them to the old Junction Court. I have seen them take them to the Eglinton East Court. This adds a great deal of expense and cost to those people, and I think we should stop it.

I have discussed this with the Inspector of Legal Offices of the Attorney-General's Department last fall, when this matter was brought to my attention, after which I also went down to the City Hall to the First Division Court, and discussed it with officials

there, and they agreed the practice is being carried on. It is an old system. They say they cannot stop collection agencies from taking 25 or 50 or 100 cases out to New Toronto, and serving from there. One messenger will take them out, and one messenger will bring them back, but each person served is charged mileage for the service. It is a bit of a "racket," and a horrible "racket" if you ask me.

I wonder if there is any legislation on our books which would compel a collection agency to present its documents in the court nearest to the person about to be served? If the person lives in the centre of the City of Toronto, it should be the City Hall, Division Court 1; if it is in the west end, it should be in the court out around Keele Street. If it is in the suburbs, then probably in New Toronto or in the east end at Eglinton. If there is not legislation to compel them to do that, then I suggest it is high time we enact some legislation to stop this evil practice from continuing one day longer.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Here is another "racket"; Detroit 3, Toronto 0.

MR. SALSBERG: I did not get that, but I heard some visitor sigh. I would like to hear something from the hon. Attorney-General.

HON. MR. PORTER: The Legislation as at present, provides for various Division Courts in Toronto having equal jurisdiction over the whole area. I think there are 4 in the city. There is no provision whereby it has to be in a court which is nearest to the defendant's place of residence.

MR. SALSBERG: Do you not think we should provide such legislation?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know. That is something I would have to think about. I am not prepared to give an answer now. It has worked very well.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, it has not worked very well. It has worked out very well for the collection agencies.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is the way the hon. member always talks. If he will give me one specific instance. He talks in a general way, without mentioning any specific matters.

MR. SALSBERG: I will not let you "get away with that."

HON. MR. PORTER: I have let the hon. member "get away with murder" for a long time.

MR. SALSBERG: Then you are falling down on your job. You should be fired.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member is the one who should be fired. I have given an answer to the question.

MR. SALSBERG: You have not.

HON. MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member want to make a speech all over again?

MR. SALSBERG: I do not want to make a speech. The record will show what you said in reply. I raised a serious question, and it has not been denied. I am not blaming the present Attorney-General for it. It has been the practice for a long time, but he asks me if I will present specific instances. Of course, I cannot. But is it necessary, when he knows they can serve papers from New Toronto and charge mileage for 5 or 6 miles?

HON. MR. PORTER: No.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes they can, and they do.

MR. JOHN YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Andrew has an idea but unfortunately he has been unable to express it. I will correct him to a certain extent.

MR. SALSBERG: So you are going to help me correct it?

MR. YAREMKO: The hon. member has implied that collection agencies are serving—

MR. SALSBERG: Some of them.

MR. YAREMKO: Well, some of the collection agencies are serving from inconvenient Division Courts in order to gain mileage. That is completely incorrect. The collection agencies do not gain one penny in mileage from their costs, because the costs in the Division Courts in the County of York are very small, ranging from \$4.00 to \$10.00, and the mileage involved does not go to the collection agency, but it goes to the bailiff of that Division Court, who has to travel longer distances to serve the requisite papers. The bailiffs do not ask the collection agencies to come and deal with their courts so they will get more mileage. The collection agencies may choose a court of their own convenience in which to have these cases tried. But I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and through you, the hon. member for St. Andrew, that the collection agencies do not benefit by one penny in regard to mileage. Some of them, I must agree, may have other reasons for serving in such a way, but it is certainly not a "racket" to get additional mileage.

I know of certain collection agencies which sue in the most inconvenient courts for a man to defend himself, because he must take a streetcar, and if it is a claim for only perhaps \$10.00, and he may have some "beef," and he will say, "I will not bother, because I will have to travel to New Toronto to defend the case."

The hon. member for St. Andrew should get his complaints straight, and maybe the hon. members of this House would then be able to follow him. But when he says it is a "racket" in order to gain additional mileage, he is completely "off base."

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know what you are so happy about, with that explanation.

HON. MR. PORTER: We were happy to have you sit down. We are not happy now.

MR. SALSBERG: A big section of this province will be very happy, too, when you have another seat than that of the Attorney-General.

I am very happy the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) has given some further information in regard to this problem. He has more knowledge and information about the operation of these collection agencies than I. I present an evil which exists, and which is continuing. Insofar as the mileage charges are concerned, and it may be I may have been wrong, but I presented the information given to me in the City Hall of Toronto in No. 1 Division Court.

HON. MR. PORTER: I may inform the hon. member—

MR. SALSBERG: Will you let me finish?

HON. MR. PORTER: No.

MR. SALSBERG: You will have to let me finish, because I will not yield.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. Attorney-General answer the question. The hon. member for St. Andrew is out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not out of order. I am on the floor, and he is interrupting me. You had better stop him, and make him sit down.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General has arisen on a point of order.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, on all points. I forgot now what the point was.

MR. SALSBERG: There is a good example.

HON. MR. PORTER: May I say to the hon. member for St. Andrew that in the Toronto courts, within the City of Toronto, there is no mileage whatsoever?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I have been assured there is mileage.

HON. MR. PORTER: We do not know who assured you.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member for Bellwoods said there was a mileage charge, but it is not the agency which gets it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Look into the facts and bring them forward.

MR. SALSBERG: All I am asking of you—and it is very reasonable—is, will not something be done to prevent the adding of thousands of dollars of costs—

HON. MR. PORTER: It will be studied and carefully considered.

MR. SALSBERG: It should be carefully considered, and a way found to do away with this evil.

HON. MR. PORTER: If it is an evil, it will be done away with.

Vote No. 34 agreed to.

On Vote 35, item 6.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Attorney-General explain this item?

HON. MR. PORTER: There is an agreement between the province and the City of Niagara Falls under which the City of Niagara Falls polices the Rainbow Bridge, and we pay them for doing that policing of the bridge, and the approaches to it.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Attorney-General tell us if any of the municipalities asked to be relieved of the provincial policing last year?

HON. MR. PORTER: Four asked to be relieved.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Were any new ones brought in?

HON. MR. PORTER: No, we did not take on any new ones last year at all.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Would the hon. Attorney-General tell us what portion of the cost of provincial policing a municipality is expected to pay?

HON. MR. PORTER: Under the policing agreement?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Yes. Would he give us something along those lines?

HON. MR. PORTER: They pay so much a man; \$3,300 per man, plus 6 cents per mile for each mile where he uses his car.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Do they pay anything toward the equipment at all?

HON. MR. PORTER: The 6 cents per mile is paid for the use of the car, and that, over a period, is supposed to cover the cost of the car.

MR. GRUMMETT: I think the arrangement whereby some municipalities are policed by the provincial police is a good arrangement. I am all in agreement with it. I think it tends to good policing in the province, but the great difficulty is that when the provincial police are appointed to take over a municipality, they apparently require more officers than the municipality did, that is, the municipality may struggle along with a very inadequate force, but when the provincial police take it over, they estimate the number of officers required at approximately 1 per 1,000 of population in the community they are policing. The result is the municipalities feel they are unduly burdened by having to pay the cost of the provincial police policing the municipality. In the long-run, I would like to see the day when all the municipalities were policed by the provincial police, because I know they do a much more efficient job than the present arrangement of hiring municipal police to carry on, because in general there are continual disputes between one councillor and another, in regard to the hiring and firing of municipal police, which does not occur when the provincial police take over the policing job.

HON. MR. PORTER: We have some problems arising from it. It is not quite as easy as the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) paints it, but it has worked out very well.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General if there has been any progress toward instituting a 5-day week for the provincial police?

HON. MR. PORTER: No.

MR. OLIVER: No progress in that direction at all? I think the hon. Attorney-General will agree that some of the dissatisfaction stems from the fact that they have not the 5-day week.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know that there is much dissatisfaction on that account. They are given an extra week's holidays during the year; they have other privileges, and, generally speaking, very good superannuation arrangements. There are a great many advantages from being a member of the Ontario Provincial Police. It may be in some of the larger city forces they work shorter hours, but the sort of work in the cities is different. Most of the provincial police are spread out through the country, and are in areas where their work might not be as extensive as in the highly-congested areas. They are not handling great crowds of people all the time. They are patrolling highways, to a very large extent. That is the duty of most of the provincial police officers in the country. And if we were to change the number of hours of work now, it would mean a very substantial increase in the force, and it is difficult to maintain a police force these days, with all the competing offers there are for jobs of all kinds.

MR. OLIVER: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) tell me how many resignations there have been from the force this year?

HON. MR. PORTER: Over 100. It is 118.

Votes 34 to 36 inclusive, agreed to.

ESTIMATES OF DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, a question. The newspapers today prominently reported a charge made by the Provincial Leader of the CCF to the effect that the increase in Blue Cross rates is the responsibility of the Ontario Government, and that the Ontario Government, through its Department of Insurance,

ordered the increase to be made. I think that this might be the right time for the government to make a statement as to whether that charge is correct or not.

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General): Of course, 2 or 3 years ago we introduced legislation to provide authority for the Department of Insurance to supervise the sort of fund which is set up by the Blue Cross, and other hospital insurance funds of that kind. The function of the Department of Insurance is to protect the public who are dealing with insurance companies and other organizations which deal in trust funds, and activities of that kind, where a company or an association take a person's money and make certain definite legal commitments to pay back something at some future date, and, of course, in order to protect people and give them some assurance that the commitment will be carried out, provision has to be made for adequate reserves, and adequate premiums, and adequate income of that company or association, to make their commitment worth anything at all, in order thus to protect the people who put their money in, who pay the premiums, and to make sure that they will get back what is coming to them when the day arrives that they have to go into hospital, or when they suffer an accident, or whatever the case may be.

The Department of Insurance requires a certain standard of financial reserves, and they also require that sufficient premium will be paid to make sure that the commitment will be carried out.

That is a simple proposition, and the Blue Cross, and any other similar type of scheme is now subject to the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance. I do not know whether he found they needed to raise the premiums or not, but it was decided, apparently, that they did have to raise them in order to meet the commitments they were making. If they want to protect the people who put in the money, then they have to have enough money to pay the claims. That is the very simple position, that I am sure the Department of Insurance, whether they were the ones who made the suggestion

in the first place or not really does not matter, the point is that in order to make the fund sound, and to protect the people who pay money into it, the premiums had to be raised.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I think we have to take a serious view.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, what in the world would the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) expect? After all, you have 1,000,000 people in the Blue Cross. These people are entitled to protection. They are entitled to know when they pay a premium, that it is sufficient to meet the obligations called for in the policy. A great deal of nonsense is said about this business. As a matter of fact, the amount of increase in Blue Cross rates is nothing compared with the increases in the provinces which have adopted state insurance. As far as the Department of Insurance is concerned, they were absolutely right in doing it. What would the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) expect?

HON. MR. PORTER: And, as a matter of fact, they say that when we amended the Act to make provision for that, it was passed with the unanimous approval of this House, including that of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, and it was requested by some of the hon. members opposite.

HON. MR. PORTER: And the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was "all for it." It was passed in silence.

MR. SALSBERG: The "hon. member for St. Andrew" is never in favour of increasing the burden on the masses of people by any form of legislation you may ever introduce.

HON. MR. PORTER: Just nonsense.

MR. SALSBERG: And if you thought you managed to wiggle in a piece of legislation—

HON. MR. FROST: There was no "managing" at all. It was a straight matter of honesty. Let us get on with business.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry, I am extremely sorry, but—

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) can go ahead and speak on the budget tomorrow all he likes.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the matter belongs here if I may suggest.

HON. MR. FROST: Go ahead, then, we may as well put up with the hon. member and be done with it.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) does not realize how bored we are with it.

HON. MR. FROST: This business of listening to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) gets tiresome. If he would confine himself to reasonable limits, but to vapour all over the place on pure nonsense.

MR. SALSBERG: I resent and reject any such suggestion. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should not forget—and I say to him with all the respect I have for him as an individual—that he has a small Opposition here. If the Opposition were larger, undoubtedly there would be greater division of the task the Opposition has to do. Unfortunately, we are a small number.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The people looked after that.

MR. SALSBERG: We have a small number in Cpposition at this time, and some hon. members—

HON. MR. PORTER: The people do not want many people like the hon. member.

MR. SALSBERG: And there is no reason for any impatience because the Attorney-General's Department is being kept on the floor for 2 hours.

HON. MR. PORTER: This is the Department of Insurance, now.

MR. SALSBERG: I say it is scandalous on the part of any hon. member of the government—

HON. MR. PORTER: This is a different department. Wake up.

MR. SALSBERG: It is scandalous to suggest that I, or any hon. member, is wasting time. Whoever heard a complaint when the Attorney-General's Department is kept on the floor for 2 hours or more? What do you want to do, "railroad" the Estimates through? If you do, say so. I apologize for nothing I have done tonight, and I refuse any suggestion that it was "vapouring." The questions I raise are vital and important, and so have been the questions raised by every hon. member on this side. We are doing our duty in raising them, and we would be remiss in our duty if we did not.

HON. MR. PORTER: What is the question?

MR. SALSBERG: What I am on the floor now about—

HON. MR. PORTER: That is what we would like to know.

MR. SALSBERG: —The question of the Blue Cross, and any attempt to say that this does not belong here is an evasion of the issue.

HON. MR. PORTER: What is the question? Has the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) a question?

MR. SALSBERG: Don't lose your temper.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am not losing my temper, I am asking the hon. member if he has a question?

MR. SALSBERG: Do not be impatient; be quiet, and you will get it.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member is just wasting the taxpayers' money standing there.

MR. SALSBERG: The time we are taking, is the most valuable contribution we can make.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) confine himself to the subject, or please sit down? He is indulging in personalities, and not discussing the Estimates.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, it is up to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). Whenever his Estimates are up, he behaves in that way. No other hon. Minister does that.

HON. MR. PORTER: What is the question?

MR. SALSBERG: The point I want to make is this, that this is not a trivial matter.

HON. MR. PORTER: Well, what is the question?

MR. SALSBERG: I do not have to make it a question to please the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter).

HON. MR. PORTER: Then it is a speech.

MR. SALSBERG: It is whatever I prefer to make it. I am dealing with the Blue Cross, and I suggest it is not a trivial matter.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, might I refer—

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to please let me finish this statement.

HON. MR. FROST: All right, go ahead.

MR. SALSBERG: I have respect for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). May I ask him, please do not make matters worse. When his Attorney-General is handling Estimates, he gets "rattled," and he "rattles" everybody else. I am suggesting this is a serious question, because Blue Cross is used by tens of thousands, if not hun-

dreds of thousands of people. Now, such a service, when it increases the rate by 26 per cent. is adding a terrific burden to an enormously large number of people, and it is therefore a very important question; not trivial and not secondary.

The government, in reply to my question, tried to justify the action of the Department of Insurance in asking the Blue Cross to order the increase. They are, therefore, supporting the action of the Department of Insurance, and I suggest—

MR. D. M. KERR (Dovercourt): No.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said they were perfectly justified in doing that.

MR. KERR: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) said that he did not know whether they did or not.

MR. SALSBERG: But the hon. Prime Minister, who is head of the government, said they were absolutely, positively, right in doing that.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) makes so many mis-statements, I cannot keep track of them all.

MR. SALSBERG: He said they were positively right in doing so, and I say increasing the rates is not the only way to cope with this problem.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, let us clear this up. It has been published in the papers. The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) can read it if he wants to; in fact, no doubt he has. He only reads and states what appears to him to be desirable.

MR. SALSBERG: We all do that.

HON. MR. FROST: Here is a statement in the *Telegram*. I think I saw something in the *Star*, and also the *Globe and Mail*, but Mr. MacDonald quoted the letter from the Provincial Superintendent of Insurance—that

would be Mr. Whitehead, I assume—to the Director of Blue Cross, dated last November 23rd, which concluded with these words:

"I feel that the proposed rates for hospital plans are most necessary," D. W. Ogilvie, Toronto Manager of Blue Cross, replied today that Blue Cross lost \$400,000 in January and February this year, and would lose more money in March. "Mr. MacDonald should know better," said Mr. Ogilvie, "we didn't raise our rates because anybody told us, we raised them because we had to."

Mr. Ogilvie maintained that the rate increase could be attributed to the increase in hospital rates, and also to the greater number of patients being admitted to hospitals under the Blue Cross scheme. "As to Mr. MacDonald's charge that the government had ordered the increase," Mr. Ogilvie said, "they didn't tell us to, they agreed with our figures that an increase was necessary." William Grey, of Chatham, President of the Blue Cross, said the hospital cost had doubled since the Blue Cross system of rates was established 10 years ago.

Now, sir, a 26 per cent. increase is a very moderate increase in view of the hospital rates elsewhere in Canada, outside of Ontario altogether. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Blue Cross is operated by the hospitals of Ontario—I believe that is right—and is a great co-operative scheme to provide service at cost. If their cost cannot be met out of premiums, they request the Superintendent of Insurance to increase them. He looked it over and agreed. There is the situation. That is all there is to it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, the point I wanted to make was that when we approach a problem of this character, that is going to affect so many people, it is not the easiest way out that is the best. The simplest way out was to do what was done, obviously, increase the rates, and since Blue Cross is operated by the hospitals, and since the hospitals are finding themselves with

very large deficits every year, it is not unreasonable to say that the increases in Blue Cross rates are meant to help the hospitals cover their deficits, which, I say, the majority of workers who have Blue Cross, through their factory schemes, should not necessarily be called upon to cover.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, that point is quite out of order for this Estimate. This is a matter of insurance, and payment for insurance. If the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) thinks we should subsidize Blue Cross, or any of the insurance companies, he can raise that on another occasion. It has nothing to do with this Estimate.

The point is, the Superintendent of Insurance has no jurisdiction and no right to suggest that the people of Ontario should subsidize anything. His job is to see that things are actuarially solvent and that is what he has done.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not suggesting that we subsidize any insurance company; I am suggesting it may be the wisest and the best way for us to subsidize our hospitals.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member can discuss that on the budget.

MR. SALSBERG: I discussed it this afternoon on a bill, but we should help with the cost of hospitals and, perhaps, make unnecessary the raising of rates of the Blue Cross. I suggest it is the only way out, and may I say for those hon. members in this House who may be resentful at the time taken, let us not lose our tempers.

HON. MR. PORTER: We heard it all this afternoon.

HON. MR. FROST: I want to be fair to the hon. member, but I point out, he is completely out of order. This has nothing to do with this Estimate at all.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, it has.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member can speak tomorrow. He is

speaking on the Budget Address, and I suggest he deal with this in his Budget Address tomorrow.

MR. SALSBERG: Our Department of Insurance did that, and when we come to the Estimates of a department or a branch of government that has done certain things, it is up to the hon. members to utilize that occasion to make their points and raise their questions.

I want to conclude by merely saying what I wanted to say before, that the organized workers were up in arms when the issue arose, and they have asked for an investigation of Blue Cross. Let us not forget that. Newspaper editorials were written about it, and the matter is not over yet. It is evident by the prominence every newspaper gave to the words of the new leader of the CCF Party—he did not speak for me and I am not speaking for him—but I suggest it is a big public issue and let us not be impatient with each other when matters of such magnitude are raised during the Estimates.

That is what we are supposed to do. Whether the government will see eye to eye with me is another point, but I think I am not out of order. Certainly I am not taking the time of the House unnecessarily, and no member should feel we have wasted any time, even if he may disagree with everything I have said throughout the evening, because it is only 2 hours and 15 minutes since we began consideration of the Estimates of one of the most important departments of government.

Vote 77 agreed to.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): A few of the highlights concerning education may possibly be in order before we commence the detailed examination of the Estimates, and, of course, the big factor in our educational situation today is the increase in school population as the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon) remarked this afternoon.

The enrolment in our elementary and secondary schools in the province is a little over 915,000. There are thousands more—probably 15,000 or 16,000—in the universities. The increase in school population over last year is 58,023. Next year probably the increase over this year will be in the neighbourhood of 60,000, which means that approximately 1,500 new classrooms will be needed for next year's work.

As the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Child) remarked this afternoon, the costs of the construction of classrooms are coming down somewhat, but, even so, some funds in the neighbourhood of \$30 million will be needed to provide those 1,500 classrooms, perhaps not quite that much, but fairly close to that figure.

Of course, as the hon. members of the House have heard before, we are now paying grants for the construction of classrooms only, and I am glad to be able to tell the hon. members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that most school boards in the province are now apparently prepared to admit that that policy is a necessary one.

At the outset there were some of them who were trying to evade the innovation, but now for the most part they accept it as a necessity under present conditions.

Another problem, following naturally on the increase of school population, is the supply of teachers. I am glad to be able to say our emergency plan is producing, so far, as many teachers as have been needed this year. About 1,100 teachers are in the schools of Ontario today whom we would not have had if it had not been for this emergency plan. I fancy I do not need to detail the operation of it, but I can suggest to the hon. members that it is a rather delicately-balanced mechanism, and I am hoping that no hon. member will ask, when the testing time comes in June, for any concessions for individuals which may, if granted, throw the scheme out of operation.

We are expecting to obtain, as we have discovered just recently, a fair number of teachers from the British Isles. There are a number who would

like to come, we have found, and we are considering plans at the moment for making it reasonably easy for teachers to come from the Old Country.

There was a time when we required in Ontario that a teacher coming from Britain, or anywhere else for that matter, might teach on a letter of permission for a year and then write professional examinations.

That seemed not quite what should be done. It seemed to me we were stressing a little too much our own professional courses. Now, arrangements are such that we accept teachers from any part of the British Commonwealth and Empire—and only from the British Commonwealth and Empire—who can present documents showing they have taken professional and academic courses of the same length of time as we require in Ontario, and we let them teach on a letter of permission for a year. If they have done good work, they may go ahead under the regular plans we have for our own teachers, and ultimately obtain permanent Ontario certificates.

There is a particularly fine staff in the Department of Education, and I should like to remind the hon. member of this House, Mr. Chairman, that we have additional burdens these days laid on our inspectors, particularly our inspectors of elementary schools. Those who are dealing with suburban districts have many problems, and those who are working in remote areas have problems of a different kind, equally serious. We are working our elementary school inspectors rather hard. They are responding to the needs of the situation and I should like to pay a special tribute to those inspectors.

As the hon. members of the House know, it has long been the procedure for a city or town which desired to do so, to appoint its own inspectors of elementary schools under our own regulations, of course, and approved by the Minister. We have extended that now, and any city or town which would like to appoint its own secondary school inspector, an inspector of high schools, may do so under our regulations, but

even when that is done, the department still stands ready to assist in any way it can.

Through the entire situation in education runs our policy by which we are trying, wherever and whenever we can, to insist that the stress and emphasis must be on the basic essentials in education. We are trying a new plan to place this stress, especially—and of special interest—on the use of our own language—English. For this reason and for this purpose, we are bringing over from the Old Land this summer, Professor Gurrey, who is coming to speak at our various summer courses, and to point out what is done in the Old Country in the matter of methods of teaching English, and stressing generally correct usage of our own language.

Mr. Chairman, this outline requires perhaps only one additional item and that is, that we are getting a wonderful response throughout the province in the carrying out of the legislation passed last session to provide for the training of retarded children.

There has rarely been such a gratifying response to anything, rarely have there been so many letters of appreciation of what the government is doing, as have come in this matter of training and educating, if we can, the retarded children who are not admitted to the regular schools.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps that is sufficient at this hour of the night. If I may then proceed with the details of the Estimates, I shall do so.

Votes 37 and 38 agreed to.

On Vote 39.

MR. SALSBERG: On Vote 39. The Ryerson Institute of Technology, is it the intention of the government to build a new school for that college—a new structure?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as soon as we can arrange to do so. The enrolment is increasing so fast and the services are extending so rapidly that a new building will be required just as soon as it can be arranged.

MR. SALSBERG: Do you intend to use the present site, or move it elsewhere?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: There are arguments on both sides of that, Mr. Chairman. There are those who think the present site is an ideal one because it is in the centre of a factory or industrial district. There are others who would prefer to take it outside. There are arguments on both sides. However, the present feeling seems to be to have it outside of the city, but close enough so there will not be too much transportation necessary.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I wonder whether the hon. Minister would explain Vote 39, item 20.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: We work with the Department of Labour in the matter of this agreement. We have, for instance, schedule K1 instruction for the armed forces; the army, navy and air force. In that case we get 100 per cent. reimbursement from the Dominion Government. We have schedule K2 under which we do all we can in regard to training for defence industries. In that case we get 75 per cent. reimbursement from the Dominion Government. Schedule M is for rehabilitation. 50 per cent. of the expense involved in that case comes back.

Then we have schedule A. This is the apprenticeship training scheme in which my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (hon. Mr. Daley) and I co-operate. We share the expenses of training apprentices sent to us by the trade unions, contractors and others.

Schedule K deals with supervisory and foremanship instruction. In that case we get 50 per cent. reimbursement from the Federal Government.

Vote 39 carried.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): In connection with Vote 40, can the hon. Minister tell us about the enrolment at these various teachers' colleges? Is enrolment higher than last year or not?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: It is not quite as high, Mr. Chairman, as it was last year, and there is a reason for that.

This year we have in the teachers' colleges two types of courses. One course is for applicants who have 8 papers of grade 13 and the other is a 2-year course for applicants who have completed Grade 12. The number of those in the one-year course is 1,306, and the difference between that and 1,732 is the number in the two-year course; 84 are in the Ontario College of Education taking the "Public Central Option" as it is called.

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) wishes me to explain why the number is down 200 last year, I will do so. The reason is the emergency plan. We are taking into a summer course those who have completed Grade 12. We give them 6-weeks' intensive training. We then allow them to teach for a year. We bring them back the second summer for 6-weeks' intensive training again, then we allow them to teach for another year. Then we require them to attend a teachers' college for 1 year.

By means of that we have obtained in the neighbourhood of 1,100 new teachers. Not all of those in these summer courses are people with only grade 12 qualifications. Some of them have B.A. degrees, or Grade 13. I am glad to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the great majority of these new teachers are really doing well in their schools. The percentage of failures is very low. As so many of them are taking advantage of that emergency plan the number of teachers in the teachers' colleges has been reduced somewhat.

I may say too that last May, when I was up north at the Head of the Lakes, I heard in various places that there were not enough teachers from that area being trained and getting into the schools, and so, although the summer course here was full, I agreed to put on a similar course at Port Arthur. I told members of school boards and councils there if they would undertake to do enough publicity work to get 25 prospective teachers into a course at the Lake-head, it would be organized. And they

got us about 56 and I am glad to say that all but 4 were successful.

Vote No. 47 carried.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): On Vote 48, what decision was finally reached about the construction of the Toronto Teachers' College?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: The Toronto Teachers' College has been commenced on a site on Carlaw Avenue in Toronto, an excellent site in an excellent part of the city. I am informed that construction began yesterday.

MR. SALSBERG: I am extremely sorry to hear that because it shows that the government has ignored the appeals and the requests made to it by almost every educational institution, by the Teachers' Association and by the students themselves, not to proceed with the plan to construct the new building away from the centre of the city.

The teachers have gone to the extent of canvassing hon. members of this House. They have written and besought Toronto members to intervene and prevent the government from proceeding with its original plan. Their argument was, in my view, very logical. I myself discussed this matter with the hon. minister (Mr. Dunlop) early last summer. In fact, I suggested a certain area on Bloor and St. George Streets where I thought it would be logical to build a college because it would be close to existing libraries and other educational facilities, beside being close to students' residences. It is not easy to see how, in the extreme northeast of the city, where there are zoning regulations in force, how students will be able to find accommodations.

The main consideration behind the arguments against the government's decision was that the college was being moved too far from the centre of other educational facilities in the city. Students would be deprived of the chance to use the library facilities of the university, the public libraries, and other institutions located within the central area. There are—or there were—possibilities of obtaining land and I am sorry the

government finally decided to begin building where it has. If the department is going to proceed to build the Ryerson Institute also outside the city they are, in my view, making another serious mistake. Most of the students live in the centre of the town where they can rent rooms. They will have to travel out and back and they will be divorced from the facilities which the campus provides. The decision is illogical.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: This question was gone into most fully. This one Teachers' College is not going to be enough for Toronto for very long. We are getting one in the eastern part of the city. We hope to put another in the western part. As far as using the university library is concerned, the university does not allow other people to use its library.

Many suggestions were made for a site. I was informed that some people wanted the Teachers' College located in the centre of the city so that the students could hear the best preachers on Sunday. I said to them: "Do you suppose the students are going to go to church from the college or from their boarding houses?" They had not thought of that. Various other ideas, good enough in their way, were put forward. As to Bloor and St. George, the site the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) suggested, I suppose we could have put it there for a couple of million dollars, but that seemed an unnecessary expenditure when it is so easy to go from Carlaw Avenue to the centre of the city at any time.

MR. SALSBERG: An hour-and-a-half's trip.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: 20 minutes.

MR. SALSBERG: These students have no automobiles.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Street car. We examined the suggestion that there should be a residence, and I found that of the 539 students, 370 live at home and 37 commute, so only 136 were boarding anywhere. I am prepared, Mr.

Chairman, to forecast that the years will show that we have made the best possible choice of a site.

MR. CHARTRAND: With regard to Vote 41, item 15. I presume that in the past there were so few students, that their numbers did not warrant the creation of any special institution for them in Ontario, but as the population increases, would the Minister tell us if there is going to be any institute within the Province of Ontario?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: We have, as hon. members probably know, a school for the deaf at Belleville with about 400 attending, and a school for the blind at Brantford with about 200 attending, and to these schools, particularly to the school for the blind, pupils are sent by the Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and these provinces pay the fees. We send our French-speaking pupils, deaf or blind, to these institutions in Montreal. We have not very many of them. I think there are 21.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): In last year's Estimates there was an item for "Guidance — \$37,000" included under "Special Services." I do not see it there this year. Would the hon. Minister explain?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, we have reorganized some of our work, very much for the better. We have put together in one group, "Guidance," "Attendance"—(that used to be called "Truancy")—"Statistics" and "Special Education." So "Guidance" has not been taken away at all, but it will be found where these other items are, in one branch. Even greater stress has been placed on "Guidance." We took Mr. Beattie, who was in charge of "Guidance," and put him in charge of the 4 divisions I have mentioned.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I am glad to hear that, because it is a real worth-while service.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Would the hon. Minister tell us something about the correspondence

courses? Is the number of students taking the correspondence courses increasing or decreasing?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: These correspondence courses are provided, as probably most the hon. members know, in the first place, for children in remote areas in the Province, who are too far from a school to attend. That part of it is decreasing, and I think perhaps that is a good sign. They are getting to school. I had a case the other day where a new school was opened, and 7 children who previously had been taking correspondence courses were able to attend this school, being taken by bus. That part of it is decreasing, I am glad to say.

The other part of it—the correspondence courses, shall I say, the high school courses and vocational courses are increasing somewhat. We have 843 classes for New Canadians; however, they are not correspondence courses.

MR. SALSBERG: On item 39, Vote 41, "Summer Camps." Does that mean the province operates summer camps for children?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Perhaps this is the place to explain about the summer camps. We have two of them, Bark Lake and Couchiching, into which we take young people, boys for 3 weeks, girls for 3 weeks, and then repeat that. These are young people who are sent to us after having been chosen by the principals and staffs of secondary schools of the province. They are all young people who are going to spend one more year in school, and we have them there to train them to go out and act as counsellors in the non-profit camps. They join the staffs of camps conducted by the churches, the YMCA, the YWCA, and so forth, and when they go back to their schools, they are well versed in "camp technology"—if there is such a word—and really it is very important and very successful.

MR. SALSBERG: I agree it is very important to provide instructors for these camps, but this may be a good

time to remind the government—and I hope I will not have to apologize for reminding it—that in July of 1944—and I am now quoting from an editorial in the *Toronto Daily Star*, which says:

In July, 1944, on a tour of Northern Ontario, Mr. Drew said his government was planning to construct summer camps for children as part of a post war programme. It is our intention, he told the press, to build camps in suitable places where the children of Ontario will have the opportunity to live in the fresh air of the northern woods, and build up their bodies in healthful surroundings.

Ten years later, I was shocked to read in the *Toronto Telegram*, underneath a picture of the hon. member for St. Patrick, who is photographed in a most unusual position, holding something to his mouth—I do not know whether he is blowing up a balloon, or drinking from a balloon, but his cheeks were puffed out, and his eyes were closed as he holds this thing to his mouth, and it says underneath:

A. Kelso Roberts, M.M.P. for Toronto St. Patrick, blows up a balloon for one of the 120 "kids" attending the Progressive Conservative picnic—

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): I did not have any government assistance for that.

MR. SALSBERG: It goes on:

For many of the young guests, it was their only outing of the summer.

What a distance between promising and facts! Ten years ago, the head of the Progressive Conservative Government promised camps in the north: 10 years later, the Progressive Conservative member gives the kiddies the one and only chance at a summer camp, to be out in the open spaces, to get ice cream and blow up balloons.

Be that as it may, it is never too late to mend, and never too late to keep a promise, and I would like to appeal to the government to live up to the

promise Mr. Drew made, when he promised summer camps so that every child can breathe in the wonderful air of Northern Ontario, and build up its body.

Let us not remain guilty before the children of this Province.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it quite clear that I hope the hon. member for St. Andrew was not purporting to quote my words.

MR. SALSBERG: No, I was quoting from the *Telegram*.

MR. ROBERTS: In fairness I should say my experience last year and the year before has been that where there were children who were in need of summer camps, it was possible to find them. Ten years ago, and for a period during the war, and perhaps after the war, it was not possible, as there was some shortage of camps in those days.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, it was found there was a better way to do exactly what hon. Mr. Drew promised, and we have been assisting—and I would like the hon. members to note these figures—199 non-profit camps in Ontario. These 199 camps in Ontario were attended last year by approximately 32,000 boys and girls. So, if one may so so, we found a better way, and it is working out nicely.

Votes 41 and 42 agreed to.

On Vote 43.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Would the hon. Minister tell us the nature of the expenditures for the Public Libraries Branch, salaries \$18,700? What is the nature of that expense?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Vote 43, "Public Libraries Branch": There is a fairly large staff there under Mr. Angus Mowat. I wish hon. members of the House would step in and see this place at 206 Huron Street on the ground floor. It is one of the finest sights imaginable

for a person interested in such matters. The books are all boxed, and go out to places all over the province.

Votes 43 to 45 agreed to.

On Vote 46, item 4.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a statement in the *Oshawa Times Gazette*, of a meeting held recently by the Board of Education there. It says:

A booklet called *The Canadian Trades Alphabet* met with strong disapproval from some members of the Board of Education last night and was described by one as "Premeditated and wilful chiselling of our educational system."

Board members were told by T. R. McEwen, Public Schools Inspector, that he had received a copy of the booklet with the suggestion that it should be distributed to Oshawa school children.

The Canadian Trades Alphabet—most of the letters in it refer to the quality of a manufactured product—had already been approved in Toronto, stated Mr. McEwen.

Then, it goes on:

And this is an example of the kind of thing members will read:

"G is for General Motors
And GM means 'Good Measure'
We're always planning far ahead
To add to your driving pleasure."

Would the hon. Minister care to comment on that?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: I did not see it this year, but I did last year. It is not authorized by the department; it is entirely a private enterprise, and if School Boards agree to a request to distribute it, we cannot stop it. I am not sure whether it is published in Toronto or not.

MR. D. McM. KERR (Dovercourt): It is not. There was a request for it, but the board refused. It is an American

firm which prints it, as a means of advertising, and the board's policy is definitely against any advertising.

MR. SALSBERG: I received a number of complaints several months ago. I have not been able to follow them through, and I am, therefore, conveying a question to the hon. Minister at this time, so he may have the opportunity of answering.

The complaints I received were that quite a number of textbooks used in our schools were American books, rearranged, and are labelled as Canadian editions of those books. I did not have a chance to follow it through. I did not see the books, but I have had a few calls about them.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether to his knowledge, or the knowledge of the department, it is a fact that there are American textbooks merely done up so they can be circulated as Canadian editions, and if so, is the department taking steps to do away with them, and to provide textbooks written by Canadian authors, and produced for Canadian children?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: There are a few of them. It was in the nature of an emergency. Books were needed. The American books looked as if they might be useful with certain changes, and if printed in Canada. They are disappearing and there will be none very shortly.

Votes 46 to 48 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 49.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Will the hon. Minister tell us something about this "Provincial and Dominion-Provincial Bursaries," in the amount of \$320,000? Would the hon. Minister tell us how many recipients there are, and what amounts were contributed by the Federal and Provincial Governments, and how much went to each person?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, these are most useful bursaries. They assist young people who wish to attend university, the College of Art, a teachers' college, and various other

institutions, and they often make just the difference between attending and not attending for a good many young people whose means are supplemented by summer work and that sort of thing.

The Federal Government provides \$100,000; this government provides the other \$220,000.

Many of these bursaries are granted according to the needs, and whether the recipient lives in the same town as that in which the educational institution he wishes to attend is situated. Sometimes it is \$150; sometimes it is \$250. Last year, there were 1,536 recipients.

Vote 49 agreed to.

On Vote 50.

MR. P. MANLEY (Stormont): Item 2, "Cost of Education of Non-Resident Pupils," would the hon. Minister explain that?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Perhaps I could do that best by mentioning one or two examples. For many years the department has been paying fees of secondary school pupils in such cases as, let us say, Shuniah Township, in the neighbourhood of Port Arthur, and other unorganized districts where the children are sent into a school in a city or town nearby, but there is no high school in the district and no immediate prospect of having one. That is the case around Kenora, North Bay and a number of those places; Sudbury is an example of it. A hunter friend of mine came to me last autumn, and said that he had been hunting near some lake up in the remote part of Muskoka—if there is a remote part of Muskoka—and a certain guide had been particularly good to my hunter friend, and that guide had a problem; he had a son about 12 years old whom he wanted to send to school, but he had to send him 4 miles. He did not mind that, but the School Board told him that he had to pay fees or he could not send his boy there. The School Board said further, "We will take him in for two weeks, but then you will have to provide fees or take him away." The guide was not able to pay, or felt he should not have to pay, so I made enquiries, and I found that this guide is

living in a part of the province where there is no school section at all, and the Department of Education pays the fees for that boy. There are many such cases. It has been increasing in recent years. We will have to find some way to get some of the people in the suburbs of those northern cities, prosperous people, to pay a part, at least, of the cost of secondary school pupils. We have made a little arrangement. We are trying to break the news to them gradually.

MR. MANLEY: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) say how many of those pupils there are in Ontario?

MR. DUNLOP: I am sorry, I did not hear that.

MR. MANLEY: I was wondering if the hon. Minister could give us the number of such pupils, because the item is over \$1 million.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Well, there is about \$1 million worth of youngsters, I guess.

MR. SALSBERG: That is one baby.

MR. MANLEY: I did not know the hon. Minister was putting a price on them like that.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) a question? On item No. 1, I find the amount is \$60 million for "General Legislative Grants." I think we have to remember that a few sessions ago, the basis for awarding the grants was changed, and we were supplied with quite a long chart, which is quite complicated. I wonder if the hon. Minister would agree that that chart should be incorporated into the Educational Report that we are given each year? I looked it over, and I found no record about it.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: I think there is no objection at all to doing that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHARTRAND: This would be an easy way to find out.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Yes, we will put it in.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 50, so that no one will ever rise and say that we, in Opposition, had the opportunity and did not utilize it, or that I sat here when it went through, without a murmur, I want to say a word or two on the question of grants.

This is one of the main items in the Estimates, and I want to draw the attention of the government, as I have done in the past, and as other people are trying to do, that the promise of the government to pay 50 per cent. of the cost of education is not being lived up to. In an area like Toronto, the grant is now about 12 per cent. of the cost of education. If the promise of government had been lived up to, if the Toronto area were to receive 50 per cent. of the cost of education, the tax rate in Toronto would drop by many, many mills, and it would constitute one of the greatest assistances to the citizens and the home owners of Toronto. That the feeling to which I give expression now is quite universal was made apparent only a couple of days ago when the Ontario School Trustees Council decided to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to increase provincial education grants.

I am quoting from the *Globe and Mail* of the 22nd of March where the report read as follows:

Meeting Saturday, at the Royal York Hotel, the council appointed a subcommittee to present data to the Prime Minister. A brief prepared by H. A. Dickinson, St. Marys, said that increased educational demands are effected in an unfavourable proportion in municipal taxes on real estate. Sources of municipal taxation are limited, and the continuance of present trends will result in real hardship to municipal taxpayers, which could create embarrassment in the financial standing of municipalities, the brief said.

This resolution, I think, stresses the widespread feeling of the citizens of this province, and the feeling is that the government is fully capable of living up

to the promise, and paying 50 per cent. of the cost of education. The government does not do it, and therefore not only reneges on a promise, but also—the burden of educational costs upon that level of government which is least capable of meeting it.

I feel also, Mr. Chairman, at this point, objection should be taken to the continuation of the policy, as expressed by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) against the so-called “frills” in our school construction. The hon. Minister mentioned earlier this evening, in his introductory remarks—and I think the records should be kept straight—that many municipalities, despite the financial difficulties they are in, are proceeding with their construction programmes that do provide those facilities that are generally recognized as basic and essential, to which the hon. Minister calls “frills.”

In Toronto, for instance, the Lawrence Park Collegiate required \$1 million for additional construction work, and this province contributed to that programme the munificent amount of \$24,000. Now, you did not cut out the “frills,” Mr. Minister, and I am glad that the Board of Education of Toronto did not cut out those recreational facilities that are so essential for the well-being of our children. I do not consider them “frills.” No Board of Education will consider them “frills.” We need more swimming tanks, more assembly rooms, more recreational facilities in every school. We will then have less corner gangs; we will have less truancy, and less delinquency, and fewer tragic experiences.

At this point, I think I would not be out of place if I were to mention that in my riding, a few months ago, a tragic event took place. A young lad was shot by policemen who found him, and a few of his friends, on private property. It was assumed that they broke in, although the boys who remained alive denied that they did so. I am not defending their presence in the basement of that house or that building, but it is important that the other boys said they were walking around the streets, that the window was open, and they entered it. Now, let us not laugh.

MR. D. M. KERR (Dovercourt) : Did they break the window?

MR. SALSBERG: No, the window was open, the boys said.

MR. KERR: Well, he was in.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not saying that they should have gone in. I am not defending the boys. But please let us be reasonable about a matter of this sort. I do want to say, though, that I am convinced—and it is one person's opinion—that if we had more facilities for recreation, and for community activities in the neighbourhood from which that boy came, he and his friends would, perhaps, not have been wandering the streets that Sunday night. And he was a boy who went to the Sunday School around the corner. The head of Knox Church came to the funeral, and mentioned that he was one of their best pupils.

MR. KERR: On Sunday night?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, but after Sunday School services were over. Yes, I want facilities for the young people on Sunday evening—certainly I do, and there is nothing wrong. I want the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Kerr), who made the interjection, to realize that there are many families cramped and crowded together because of the housing shortage, to such a point that the homes they live in provide very little opportunity for recreation or for family life of the sort we all desire.

And let us not too easily dismiss this problem. I say therefore that recreational facilities, gymnasiums and swimming pools are no longer frills, they are essential to our school system, and I feel that this has to be said at this time, when we are dealing with the Estimates of the government.

One could continue much longer on this point, but I think that is enough and I am sure that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will not be able to say next year, "You had a chance when the Estimates were up and you never said a word." Let it be recorded that I said everything that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), as a member

for Toronto, should also have said. He has an area in his riding that requires swimming pools and recreational centres just as much as other areas of other ridings in the cities.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. members will be so kind as to look at some of these Estimates in detail, they will find "physical fitness and recreation, \$360,000," they will find appropriations for music, for physical and health education and for summer camps, and if there is anything more we could possibly do under ordinary circumstances to provide for recreation, I do not know just what it could be.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) called them "frills."

HON. MR. DUNLOP: And regarding that promise, Mr. Chairman, back in 1943, at that time the government did undertake, as I understand it, to pay 50 per cent. of the cost of education, and did so. The cost of education was not so very much in those days, and the promise was carried out. The grants for education in the year 1944 totalled \$8,700,000. They have gone steadily up from that time, until now, as hon. members will notice in the Estimates, the total for grants is \$60,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, circumstances are so different in different municipalities and different localities, whether it is a city with a large number of factories, with a huge industrial assessment and a big population, and it does not seem reasonable that the government should pay as much of the cost of education in that place as it does away up north where money is sometimes scarce. There are places in Ontario where this government pays 92 per cent. of the cost of education, places where it pays 75 per cent., 40 per cent., and so on, according to assessment, according to the wealth of the people. In all places it is calculated according to the population. So I should like to assert—and I think the hon. members of the House will agree—that we are doing a fair thing by the municipalities and by the School Boards.

Vote 50 agreed to.

MR. OLIVER: On the Vote for physical fitness and recreation, is there a corresponding amount given by the Government in Ottawa in this regard?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: In reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, permit me to say that we are reimbursed to the extent of \$75,000 by Ottawa.

Vote 51 agreed to.

MR. SALSBERG: On miscellaneous grants—and this is my last rise on the Estimates—it is the only way I can get a banging on the desks, announcing this is the last time, and I say this without prejudice—Mr. Chairman, I will rise to make a plea which I have made to the government on a previous occasion, and I feel called upon to repeat it and to express the hope they will give more favourable attention to this plea than they have done in the past.

It is this: that the government set up a branch for cultural activities in the province.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is the Communist line.

MR. SALSBERG: Culture has become a Communist project. The hon. Attorney-General should be careful of what he labels "Communist." He seems to have been reading "Joe McCarthy" a great deal.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member cannot affect anyone with that line.

MR. SALSBERG: Now the Hydro vice chairman is opposed, the hon. Attorney-General is opposed, and there is only the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Education left to whom to address myself.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Do not let us rush the hon. member on his "culture."

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister is not interested in culture and does not know what it means. He is busy all the time re-winding little motors in the back room of the Hydro.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member wants one in his head.

MR. SALSBERG: Now he is even applauding himself. He likes himself, and is very happy he is alive.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member should get on the right frequency.

MR. SALSBERG: How can he know about frequency? The hon. Minister holds a dropper, and puts drops on the rewound motors.

My appeal is there be set up a branch for cultural activity in the province within the Department of Education, that the government set aside a sum of at least \$250,000 a year for that special branch, that the government appoint a director for that branch, and that the purpose of this branch and the task of the director appointed by this government—not by me—will be to help in the development of the arts in all its branches in this province.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, this is not an outlandish proposition. Like some of my other proposals, you will in time adopt it. I am continuing to hammer at it, and you will gradually begin to realize it. It takes time I know, but I hope it will not take many, many years.

I say that a province as rich as ours should play a far greater role in helping those heroic people who are devoting their lives and their talents to the development of our native culture. It is not to our credit, Mr. Chairman, when one of the outstanding ballets in the country, our own National Ballet, should find it impossible to practice in one place, but be compelled to move around from one location to another in order to develop the talent of those people who are members of the ballet. That is the experience of the National Ballet Co., of which we are so proud.

Last summer, this group was actually trouping around from one public building to another because they could find no hall in the City of Toronto which they could call home to practice in. When they made a frantic appeal for funds—I know when I speak about ballet, I am

speaking about a form of art which is not to the liking of every hon. member, but will they please keep quiet about it, and not make it known to the whole world? It is nothing to be proud of, I assure them.

Miss Franca was obliged to appear before audiences at recent performances and appeal to all present to please contribute so that they might continue their tour and bring their arts to the people of this province.

I say, Mr. Chairman, it is not to the credit of this province that it allows a situation of this sort, and it is not to our credit that the Toronto Symphony Orchestra had to, a few weeks ago, go around with "cup in hand" and appeal for contributions, in order to continue.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): It is done throughout the world.

MR. SALSBERG: And it is not to our credit when young artists, composers and writers, find it impossible to continue their work because of a shortage of funds, because of a lack of stipends, prizes and scholarships which would enable them to devote themselves to uninterrupted work in their chosen field.

It is not to our credit, nor to the credit of the Dominion Government, when they allow a distiller to save the National Theatre Festival from going under. It was a distiller who saved the situation.

Now Mr. Chairman, I could develop this point much further, but I have spoken on it before, and I am merely bringing the idea again to the attention of the government. You see, Mr. Chairman, we have no excuse for not setting up a branch of this sort. To those who may think I have political motives, let me remind them that all I suggest is that this government do it, appoint a director to decide the stipends and scholarships and prizes, buy works of art, help establish a centre where the Ballet Company can continue its work, where our amateur groups can practice and put on performances, where our composers and ceramic artists can carry on their work. Certainly if I am willing to trust this government, it can trust itself.

You might argue the Federal Government should do more, and I will agree with you. It is true that some of the recommendations of the Massey Commission remain a dead letter, and the government has failed to implement them and to provide the funds recommended. But we can do much more within our province and within our jurisdiction. To the best of my knowledge the Quebec Government is spending more on the native arts than we are in Ontario.

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): They have an income tax.

MR. SALSBERG: We can do it without income tax. We have surpluses. We have millions of dollars available at our disposal, and I suggest we take but a fraction of the surplus, a "measly" \$250,000, and set it aside for this type of work.

The national Leader of the Conservative Party, when he was Prime Minister, was a person with whom I found it very difficult to get along, but as we all know, Mr. Drew has certain interests in the arts. When I made such a proposal during his presence in the House, he didn't reject it. It would have gone against his reputation to have rejected such proposals, so I found myself in a unique position when the then Prime Minister did not reject them in an outright fashion, but instead, he rose and said, "There are some sound proposals which the hon. member made, and I will consider them."

I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Education to give some leadership in this regard, to chart a new field and set an example to other provinces. I want to assure the hon. Prime Minister that if this were done, it would be to his credit.

The hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Cathcart) is not very impressed by the proposals I am making, but he will like it in time. A taste for these things must be developed and he will cultivate a taste and eventually like it.

I conclude with an appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to give it serious thought, and I assure him he will find a

very large segment of our population—and may I say a very important segment—will appreciate it, and will give him all the support possible. He will do something that will remain to his credit when many other deeds of his will have been forgotten.

The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edwards) spoke today about the Shakespearean festival. It was a great event and I am glad he spoke of it. Let me tell the hon. members that many things which have happened in the Province of Ontario in 1953, will have been forgotten when the Shakespearean festival will be remembered, because it was a very important cultural innovation, and this province should be proud of it. If the hon. Prime Minister will accept my proposal, he will also be doing something which will be to his lasting credit and to that of his government.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: If hon. members will observe and study these Estimates, I hope they will reach the conclusion that we are doing very much more for culture in this province than has been suggested. Notice the grants we are making to the six principal universities in Ontario—how much of their time and of their energy they are devoting to the arts and to culture is beyond computation. How can we do more for culture in this province than we are doing? This is not a centralized effort. We are not getting it from any one particular source. We are letting the universities do it, the College of Art, and many organizations of that character. These places are fields for culture, and fields for art of the best kind.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Minister agree to call a conference in the near future of all recognized and established professional associations and discuss this problem with them—meet all the Ontario Societies of the arts, of music, of the dance, and of the drama, and talk over this problem with them, and seek to arrive at an understanding which will help to implement the proposals they will make to him?

Vote No. 53 agreed to.

Vote No. 54 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: That ends the Department of Education Estimates. While the House is in a state of exhaustion, I would like to take the miscellaneous Estimates at the very end of the book. That, I may say, is not a sort of "catch all"; it is purely bookkeeping entries. There is \$100,000 for miscellaneous revenues on ordinary account, and \$150,000 on capital account.

I have explained this item year after year. No one has been able to understand it, including myself. It is the place where the hon. Minister of Education, for instance, when he referred to "payments from Ottawa"—passed them through that account.

Next year that item will not appear in the Estimates. A different provision is being made. It always seems to me that item is entirely out of place. This is the last year in which it will appear.

Vote 184 agreed to.

Vote 185 agreed to.

MR. SALSBERG: How much money is in it?

HON. MR. FROST: \$250,000, not a cent of which will be spent. It never seems to me to have any relation to the accounts.

HON. MR. FROST moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the committee begs to report progress and moves for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would move that tomorrow the House shall meet at 2 o'clock for the purpose of adjourning at 5 o'clock, due to an arrangement which affects the press.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns the present

sitting thereof, it shall stand adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and that rule 2 of the Assembly in that regard be waived.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: The debate on the budget will continue tomorrow afternoon, with the possibility that we shall

take the first part of the Health Estimates, or do some work on the Order paper. We shall listen to the speeches first.

I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.36 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Wednesday, March 24, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 24, 1954.

Second Report Standing Committee on Municipal Law, Mr. Beckett	747
Second Report Standing Committee on Mines, Mr. Mapledoram	747
Final Report Standing Committee on Education, Mr. Brandon	748
Cemeteries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading	748
Theatres Act, bill to amend, Mr. Nixon, first reading	748
Resumption of Debate on the Budget Address, Mr. Fishleigh, Mr. Dempsey, Mr. Wren, Mr. Root	748
Public Parks Act, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	763
Municipal Act, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	763
Assessment Act, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	763
Registry Act, Mr. Porter, second reading	763
Land Titles Act, Mr. Porter, second reading	764
Magistrates Act, Mr. Porter, second reading	764
Judicature Act, Mr. Porter, second reading	764
Security Transfer Tax Act, Mr. Frost, second reading	764
Succession Duty Act, Mr. Frost, second reading	764
Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	764
Milk Industry, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	764
Charitable Institutions Act, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	764
Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	764
Farm Products Marketing Act, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	764
Department of Health, Estimates, Mr. Phillips	765
Motion to Adjourn	774

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 1954

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Today we have as our guests in the galleries, the students of the Picton Collegiate Institute, brought here with the assistance of the members of the Picton Rotary Club, and His Worship, the Mayor of that community.

Also, the students from the Dovercourt Hobby School, and the Downsview Public School, both of Toronto.

Later on, we are to have as our guests, 22 exchange teachers and 4 members of the executive of the League of British Commonwealth and Empire teachers. This group will be entertained by Mrs. Davies, assisted by other ladies, in our apartment. I am not now extending an invitation to hon. members to join that group, because I am afraid we would not have a quorum if I did.

We are happy to welcome students to our Assembly day after day, and we hope you have enjoyed what you have learned so far, and that you will continue in knowledge and understanding as we continue with our session this afternoon.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. H. E. BECKETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Beckett, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presents the following as the Second Report of that committee:

Your Standing Committee on Municipal Law begs leave to present the following as its Second Report:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 51. The Telephone Act, 1954.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. CLARE MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Mines and moves its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Mapledoram, from the Standing Committee on Mining, presents the Committee's Second Report, as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 95. An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Bill No. 96. An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act.

Bill No. 97. An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Lines Act, 1951.

Bill No. 98. An Act Respecting Persons Who Bore or Drill Wells for Water.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. W. E. BRANDON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third and final Report of the Standing Committee on Education and moves its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Brandon, from the Standing Committee on Education, presents the Committee's Third and final Report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.
Introduction of bills.

THE CEMETERIES ACT

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the outset, this bill will be referred to the Committee on Health, and it is drawn according to the recommendations given us by the Select Committee of the Whole House.

I would like to offer the congratulations of the government, and particularly the Department of Health, to the chairman of this committee, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), and, in fact, to each member of this committee, for the way they went about gathering evidence, and the use of parliamentary procedure at all their meetings. They certainly studied this from every point of view, and brought in some very, very sound recommendations. The amendment has to do with four things.

(1) For the establishment of a Cemetery Advisory Board.

(2) For the designation of inspectors.

(3) For the licencing of persons who sell cemetery lots, and

(4) For the supervision and investment of perpetual care funds and for the passing of accounts in respect to such funds.

THE THEATRES ACT

MR. HARRY NIXON moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Theatres Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Would the hon. member please make a few observations?

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill, consisting of two sections.

The first section provides that no class "C" or drive-in theatre may be licenced in a township without the approval of the council of the township.

The second section repeals clause "B" of section 19 of the Act, which now provides that "no municipality may refuse to licence a theatre when a licence therefor was issued under the Act." That section will be repealed by this bill, if it carries.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to table answer to question No. 54.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. H. F. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak on termites, bad bacon, or pigs with curly tails, I am going to speak and vote for the Estimates as set out, plus any amendments which are favourable.

As I did last year, I am going to offer some timely suggestions:

First of all, the budget brought down is a credit to any government—\$360 million with a surplus of \$58 million is indeed a great achievement. But, may I ask, is this budget appreciated by the public at large? Have 100 people written congratulations? Have 50 people, have 10 people? How many have had 5 letters or phone calls out of 5 million people? I venture to say not one.

It was Julius Cæsar who said: "Brutus, why do you hate me? What have I done for you?" That is

exactly the way the municipalities appreciate it. And you know what happened to Cæsar! Next week the Mayors and Reeves Association will be having a meeting and demanding that more grants be given them to relieve the poor taxpayer. All year you will be having delegations demanding more and more. It is the method which is not right. We operate by the subsidation or grant method. But just wait until the "sour revenue" starts to fall and we have to cut down on the grants. That is when the trouble will start.

The only way that any government can overcome the difficulty is to gradually take one field of endeavour in its entirety. For example, education, and leave welfare to the municipalities, but I believe that they will readily agree so that credit then can be placed where credit is due. This would have to be accomplished by degrees—you cannot snatch candy from a baby.

In passing a budget of this size, \$360 million, one approaches it like an already filled-up Boston Bull pup, walking forward for its dish of Pard. The mere thought of so much money almost overwhelms one. I remember, when I was just made an alderman and we used to pass the budget amounting to \$80 million, we had to go over it item by item. We were also invited to sit in with the Board of Control and help them with the Estimates. I remember when I was at the drugstore at Bloor and Yonge, I used to go back to the store at night and spread the newspaper out on the dispensary in the back of the shop. I would look over the news: "City Council Gives \$2 Million to the Toronto University." Then, I would look out of the peek-hole into the front of the shop and there would be a woman much too fat looking at the chocolate bars. Then she would say: "I take that one," so, I'd ring up a sale of 5c. on the cash register and then go back and read the paper: "City Council Gives \$1 Million to the Sick Children's Hospital." Goodness, did I do that? By this time, another customer comes in and I ring up another cash sale: One Coca Cola and a stick of gum, 10c. The world certainly

is topsy-turvy when it comes to finances. However, that is the way it is.

I must say a back bencher has not much opportunity to say what goes in the budget and what stays out. For example: The Greater Toronto Business Men's Association was formed, which is made up of the presidents of 13 business men's associations. The purpose of which is to give guidance to their representatives on the Metropolitan Council, and in general see that Bill 80 works out a success. Where there is dissension in various communities, it will try to iron them out before they get to the rambunctious stage as many of the deputations do before our committees here.

Mr. Alfred Cowling (High Park) and I were delegated to call on hon. Mr. Dunbar and ask him for \$5,000 to help defray expenses of the organization. We were also delegated to ask the Metropolitan Council for \$5,000. With this sum, we would set up an office and really go to work. Mr. Arthur Lascelles of the Metropolitan Council told us by letter that the council did not have the power to make such a grant but he hoped legislation would be brought forward as they have many other requests. The hon. Mr. Dunbar said he would see us, but he was not in favour of making such a grant as then every business men's organization would be after him for a donation. With that attitude, I ask you, where can you get?

In looking into our future as far as finances are concerned, it is a little hard to prognosticate. In the United States the consumption of cigarettes fell 2 per cent. and will likely drop again this year. On the other hand, the consumption of beer has increased due to people staying at home and looking at television. I believe the Liquor Control Board is doing as good a job as it is humanly possible. It is impossible to please everybody. The new liquor stores opening up are clean and dignified. So are the new brewers' warehouses with their large parking lots and I see no need of selling beer and wines in grocery stores as advocated by one Liberal member, Mr. Wren. The policy might be acceptable

to a few, but not to the public at large. I met one of the executives, the other day, of a large candy and cake chain. I said to him: "I see you have amalgamated with another firm." He said: "Yes, business is not what it used to be. Years ago a husband would buy his wife a box of candy Saturday night, but now the style is to be thin so he takes home a case of beer instead and they watch the television." In some respects this is not a good thing. We have a population here of 5 million people and we have population in jail of 5,000, according to the Select Committee Report on Penal Reform. Whereas, in Spain they have a population of 29 million with only 28 thousand in the jails.

I have an idea that excessive drinking in Ontario has something to do with it. When you sit and look at the television and they flash on the screen that cold bubbling beer, it is no wonder the consumption goes up. But, the point is this: Our children see these advertisements and mothers and fathers sit drinking the beer. France, for example, is nearly down and out due to the drinking in the small towns and villages which should be the backbone of the country. The point I am trying to make is that we are up against the tough proposition of how to keep it in its proper place. I am certain that no one here would deprive a man or woman of a glass of beer, but it is the excessive drinking which fills our jails and ultimately our old folks' homes. Man is supposed to be temperate in all things. I think the education must come in the homes. I was brought up in a very Christian atmosphere. We had family prayer every Sunday, but now, with the noise of the radio and television and the phone, it has been done away with.

I must say in my closing remarks that a \$58 million surplus is a lot of money. I believe if I made that amount of money I would immediately take off for Mexico, the way those income tax fellows hound you. No bailiff would be tougher. With my small income, I had the income tax inspectors in the other day. Two fellows about 6 feet 3 inches. They approached my desk, one foot at a time, holding up a card. With one

accord, they said, "We are special income tax inspectors." By this time, I had slumped almost under the desk, only my head showing. So, with an income of \$50 million, one would have to have nerves of steel. Yes, income tax is a killer. Not only to the rich, but to the poor. I have a salesman. He lives in a taxpayer's house in North York. You go in the back door because he has not the money, as yet, to cut the front door in. He has 6 boys. Well, last year he had a good year, made \$10,000, so, I said to him: "Russ, why don't you pay off that 10 per cent. second mortgage and pull your foot out of the mud?" So, that was what he did. But, this year has been poor and he has to pay last year's income tax. Well, the poor fellow has lost his car to meet payments and they have garnisheed his drawing account. Every time the phone rings, he winces in his seat. No second mortgage holder could be as tough as that.

Well, we are talking about the wrong budget, but I only point out these things to show this huge budget of \$360 million only reflects the prosperity of our people as a whole.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which would fairly shake you off your seat, but I cannot get a seconder.

MR. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew): I might second it.

MR. FISHLEIGH: This is a good motion, but I would just as soon the hon. member for St. Andrew did not second it. It is too good.

Here in Ontario we have been paying a bonus to our citizens for years, but getting no thanks. Ontario is the wealthiest province of all, yet Alberta, which is steeped in oil, is planning to pay a bonus to its citizens. We have been practicing Social Credit for years—we call it Municipal Grants. The plan I have to offer is a matter of bookkeeping. It will not change the budget of Ontario. If we give away \$134 million per year, why not give it direct to the citizens—if we have 4 million people entitled to vote in Ontario, the bonus for each individual would be \$33 each year.

Now, how would I give the money away? Simply this way: if a School Board, Hospital Board or an institution were entitled to dollars, the money would be made payable to the School Board, but the cheques would be sent to the citizens who would endorse them over to the School Board, etc. In this way our citizens would become acquainted with the good deeds this government is doing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you think you would get a seconder for that?

MR. SALSBERG: I withdraw.

MR. FISHLEIGH: I am very pleased.

Hon. members may say this is too much work. The Dominion Government sends out cheques each month for baby bonus and old-age pension. Surely we could send out these cheques once a year.

Mr. Speaker: Hang on to your hat! The amendment to the motion is as follows—if I had a seconder!

That this government, during the coming year, give study to the possibilities of paying a bonus to each citizen in Ontario who is qualified to vote. This bonus to be equal to the amount given to the municipalities, schools and institutions, etc. The said sum to be made payable to the municipalities, schools, etc. The owner and holder of the cheque to endorse it over to the school, institution or benefiting municipality.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on the budget. I want to speak on a subject which arose yesterday morning in a meeting of the Lands and Forests Committee. I want to say something for the good people of Hearst, one of our northern towns. I lived in that country 40 years ago. There was a very good presentation of their case made before our committee yesterday, and I think it deserves some consideration. They wish to be allowed to export pulpwood up to the amount of 30,000 cords, which is a small item in a

community where, according to available reports, they have 3 million cords. Of course, there is bound to be some opposition from the big pulp companies. When they want to buy pulp, they buy it wherever they choose, with the idea of conserving their own resources. But I think the people who want to sell pulpwood should be given the right to sell it.

I do not believe in the idea that we should send all our pulpwood to the United States. We would never have built up our own huge mills and given employment to so many people if we had adopted that policy. But I think there should be some happy medium. When people buy a tract of timber for saw-mill purposes and are forced to cut down to a 3-inch top, they have to dispose of the smaller wood which could be used as pulpwood. The pulp companies complain they cannot get a market for their product. They should be given a chance. The large companies want to buy their pulpwood where they can get it the cheapest, and are forcing the smaller companies to sell at a ridiculously low price. The smaller companies should be permitted to sell in a market of their own choosing and where they can get the best possible price.

I wish now to turn to the subject of horse racing, bookmakers and sweepstakes. My idea about bookmakers is perhaps a little different from that of other hon. members. In my opinion, they should be out in the open. I suppose in the City of Toronto today, there are between 3,000 and 4,000 bookmakers, all of them under cover. What we want to see in this country, is the transaction of these affairs, whenever possible, made in the open. The hotels, and other places are all under government supervision. Why should not the bookmakers also be?

Why should a man not get a licence for a "book," the same as for any other business? Bookmaking will be carried on no matter how hard you try to stop it. I do not think it can be stopped. Many people like to bet on the horses once in a while. I think there should be a different method from that which is

followed today. Running after the little fellow who takes a \$2 bet, and letting the "big shots" take \$5,000 bets in hotel rooms, is no good.

I think the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) made an investigation of the sweepstakes in Ireland. I may have the wrong impression of this matter, but how many people in Toronto, and in Ontario, buy sweepstake tickets? Why should we not have sweepstakes in the Province of Ontario? I understand of all that money collected, only a very small percentage—about 10 per cent.—actually goes to hospitals. I believe we could run a sweepstake on a race at the Woodbine in Toronto and help our hospitals, by giving them a substantial portion of the money received.

Many people seem to be afraid to speak about these things, but I am not. I am not afraid to speak about anything which I think is right.

I have one or two other items about which I want to speak. I do not think we should have to pay for conversion of the hydro lines in Eastern Ontario. Fortunately, down in Eastern Ontario, we have 60-cycle, and do not have to do any changing of our equipment at all, and I do not think the Hydro should ask us to pay for it. The people in Western Ontario enjoyed Hydro for years before we did, but now we are expected to help them pay for conversion.

I do not think we should have to pay anything at all. They tell me it is only a small percentage, but I do not see any reason why we should pay any percentage whatsoever.

We expect to have a boom in our iron-ore business in Renfrew. The Algoma Steel Company has taken up their option there and the future looks very bright for that industry. We will need good roads. We expect the traffic will be tremendous down there, and I hope the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) will see to it that our roads are in good condition for this great boom in the iron-ore business.

I want to say a word in defence of the "highways irregularities." I do

believe you can blame only one man in this Government for the roads scandal, and it is not the hon. Minister at all. It is the Deputy Minister of Highways who is responsible for anything which has happened. It is not the "little fellow" at all, it is the Deputy Minister who looks after the actual work, under the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister does not know anything about the clerical end of the work. I want to back up the hon. Minister. I say there should be no reflection on him, because half the people in the country do not understand the situation.

It is not the "little fellow," it is not the hon. Minister. The man who is responsible for carrying on the business is the Deputy Minister. Do not even blame the contractors. Who would not take all they can get?

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, speaking on this budget debate today, I have a few remarks I first want to make about my constituency, and on matters which are important to those people.

I would like to read a news item to the hon. member of York East (Mr. Beckett) which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, dated March 23rd, Tokyo.

Kenora Thistles drubbed Waseda University, 17-1, tonight in the opener of a 10-game series in Japan by the Canadian team. Kenora is Western Canada intermediate champion of 1953.

I have approached the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) on 2 or 3 occasions, to see if he might help the citizens of the Kenora district who have financed this trip, to see if he might be of some financial assistance to us in carrying on the good name of Ontario and the good name of Canada.

I repeat what I said in the House the other day, if his Worship the Mayor of Toronto would give us a small portion of that \$5,000 he is willing to give the Maple Leafs, we would be glad to charter an aircraft, and send the boys to Moscow, to do something about that other situation.

I would like to speak about one matter regarding highways, but not the main subject of my remarks. That is, the matter of highways snowploughing in the northern districts. There was a great deal of confusion about this, and I am very glad the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) made some pertinent remarks as he concluded, because they bear out something which I might have to say on the situation.

Despite the continued imposition of the Provincial Lands Tax, which in some parts of the unorganized territory amounts to more than any tax which the same people would pay in municipalities, the Department of Highways initiated a policy—or at least issued a declaration—some months ago to the effect that they were going to terminate the snowploughing of roads other than King's Highways.

After some considerable difficulty I finally received a letter from the Deputy Minister of Highways, dated December 31st, 1953. On page 2, the letter outlined finally what the department's policy might be in this regard. For the benefit of the many people in the district who had enquired about this important subject over many weeks, people in industry, Statute Labour Boards and those in isolated parts of the district, etc., I was able to pass on what I thought was an intelligent interpretation of the department's policy in this regard. On January 8th, 1954, I sent out to all the people interested a mimeographed copy of the letter I had received from the Deputy Minister of Highways.

The letter was no sooner in the mail, than the following notice appeared in the newspapers as a paid advertisement. It said that the local Conservative Association had received the following wire that morning:

Minister of Highways informs me private road ploughing will be carried out immediately, as in the past.

This advertisement appeared on January 9th, 1954, and indicated that the hon. Minister of Highways had intimated that the letter of the Deputy

Minister of December 31st, 1953, was of no effect. It has created, therefore, a very strange situation, because, as I said, it took some months to get an opinion on the subject from the department, and then when the opinion was secured, the local Conservative Association apparently—and I do not say "officially," but apparently—under authority of the hon. Minister advises the public at large that the statement of the Deputy Minister is not correct. It does make one wonder who might be running the department.

One other subject about which I wish to speak for a few minutes, is something I have raised in this House each year, and that is the work of the Standing Committees of this House. I was pleased that, in the past two sessions, the hon. Prime Minister has gradually agreed to more and more work being passed on to the Standing Committees, but we still have the difficulty of several committees meeting at the same time. I do not think any hon. member of the Opposition, and certainly many hon. members of the government, can intelligently follow the work of these committees when they are meeting at the same time each day the House sits.

I do not know why, if necessary, these sessions cannot be extended so that the work of these committees can be properly attended to.

I agreed, in principle, with the remarks of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) when he said the other day that each committee chairman, when reporting to the House on a subject as to approval or disapproval by committees, should indicate what the basis of that report might be; in other words, to report to this House all the opinions in a general way which were expressed for or against a particular piece of legislation. Because it is impossible to attend all committees, and therefore the hon. members of the House who cannot be there must perfunctorily adopt a motion to approve the work of the committee.

I am particularly disappointed, too, Mr. Speaker, that one important Standing Committee of this House does not

see fit to meet, that is the Labour Committee of this House. I think it is fundamentally one of the most important committees of the House, and certainly labour people in the province make up an important segment of our population, and I cannot understand why the hon. members of this House cannot have the benefit of the experience and the suggestions and advice which might come from people in the labour ranks and people in industry, who might want to have informal discussions on labour matters.

I do not subscribe, as does the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Kerr), to the opinion that members of the labour unions are like the cuckoo birds, and the leaders of labour groups are "parasites." They certainly are not, because they make up, in the main, some of the most responsible people and some of the most honourable people who live in this country.

On the question of labour I have some remarks I want to make, and while I am not given to speaking from notes or reading speeches, I am going to follow my remarks on this subject fairly closely because I do not want to be misunderstood in what I might say.

I sincerely believe that there should be a clear line of division between labour and management. The efficiency of the one balanced against the efficiency of the other can only result in good for all of us. Industry has certain security guarantees—so should labour.

The voluntary revocable check-off seems to be an essential part of union security, and it is indeed regrettable that the check-off should have become the issue in the northern mining strikes and perhaps that issue may not have developed had the unions divorced themselves of politics.

As a man of lifelong association with labour, and as one who is proud of the accomplishments of our labour unions, I cannot help but repeat what I have said many times in the past, that the trade union movement courts serious delays in its progress when it becomes directly associated with a particular political Party.

I think the fear behind negotiations in the mining strikes was a fear of a guarantee of funds to a socialistic political Party rather than an apprehension of a measure of security to a valid trade union. One has only to look at Britain to assess the fearful consequences, both to the worker and to industry, of direct political ties of the trade union movement. There are many sound labour union leaders in Britain today who realize that their destiny lies in the representation of their workers, rather than in the plunging of their members into a political field—in other words they realize that a compulsory check-off of *political* dues is becoming less and less acceptable.

I do not suggest that union members should not participate in politics but I do suggest that a member of a trade union should be free to make his own choice of political association and that dues collected by check-off (compulsory or voluntary) should not be used for political purposes.

It is no coincidence that the leaders of the mining strike were CCF in stripe. There is no doubt that some leaders looked more to self-perpetuation than to the interests of the mine workers. There is no doubt that the newly-elected leader of the CCF Party in Ontario will indirectly use a portion of dues of many workers to tell only the CCF message, together with the \$10 the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) gave.

I believe the voluntary revocable check-off to be a deserved right of trade unions to bring a measure of security and increased efficiency to their organizations and I will support that principle. I do say, however, that the individual members of those unions should take care that there is then no compulsory check-off of a portion of dues collected by voluntary check-off for political purposes of one Party. If each card-carrying member wishes to pay to support of the coffers of any political Party I will say "you are a good citizen—you support a Party of your choice."

As a matter of fact, the very fundamental weakness of political action of trade unions is the association of that action with one Party. And while it is soft pedalled now, the real object of CCF leaders is nationalization and when the state becomes the boss the worker is the first to lose hard-won freedoms.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Could I put a question, please?

MR. WREN: So I would say in all earnestness to our labour organizations—go forward in your good work and we will support you, but in the interests of your own welfare and safety I entreat you to retain the right always to accept or reject a political person or a political Party.

There are people in the north who are well aware of the plight of the gold industry and of the workers in that industry. There is a large section of our population dependent upon that industry, a section composed of many walks of life whose incomes are no greater than the miners, but who, like the miners, are eager to advance their lot. But it might well be better to concede a point now, and wise men often retreat to re-form, rather than place one's life and one's destiny in the hands of an unknown and an untried political group.

So I say to labour, "Go after the check-off; you need it; you can use it wisely, but be careful you retain the right to support by ballot and by material things the CCF, the Liberals, or the Tories, as your own common sense dictates. If the CCF has a programme which appeals to you, they do not need a compulsory check-off of your dues to succeed." The CCF is aware, however, that they cannot get the funds they need without a slice of union dues, because so far they have not produced a policy which the individual worker is willing to buy.

There is one inescapable fact which the CCF group does not tell labour about. That is the truth that the great and fearless leaders who built the trade union movement did not associate their

members with any one political Party. The direction of their support is indicated by the results of national elections and by the changes which took place from time to time.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Would the hon. member (Mr. Wren) permit a question?

MR. WREN: I have quite a lengthy address, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, over the week-end—

HON. MR. PORTER: Everybody else answers questions.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I guess we do not count.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Perhaps he cannot answer the question.

MR. WREN: I am not averse to answering questions, but I wanted to finish my address, to save the time of the House. When I conclude, I will be glad to answer any question—or try to.

Over the week-end, the hon. Minister of Highways took exception to and issued a challenge, according to the press, to me to make statement in the Legislature which the press reported I had made outside this House.

I am glad to accede to the request, and I submit herewith, a clear statement of my opinions on this highways trouble.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Highways has yet to make a statement on this problem since he was quoted by the press as declaring the problem to be a "one division" investigation involving only a few thousand dollars. Since subsequent events have indicated that such is not the case, it is the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Highways to report fully to this House.

Likewise, it is the responsibility of the Provincial Auditor, as I understand his obligations, to report on these matters to this House particularly as

they affect practices and policies of any department. In the absence of the reports of those two responsible officers (the Minister and the Provincial Auditor) and in view of the keen public interest in this matter, it is necessary to proceed as members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition with investigations of our own along avenues which are not already closed. My own conscience will not permit me to contain questions which this House and the public should hear answered and I refer particularly to questions concerning policy rather than information at this time concerning irregularities. It is not my intention to condone or to protect any person who may have committed an offence while in the employ of this department; they must accept full responsibility for failure to resign their posts if the policies which were followed were not agreeable to them. On the other hand, the government and particularly the hon. Minister of Highways must accept responsibility for policy which may have made any alleged irregularities possible, policy which developed a wide area in which irregularities could take place.

It is now no secret that the aggregate total of tenders bids accepted, subtracted from the aggregate total of final costs on contracts represents a very impressive sum of money and these wide variations are not confined to particular divisions. They may be a few thousand or many millions of dollars. There is the clear indication that there has been, in many instances, a very definite absence of proper pre-engineering of jobs and that estimated quantities have borne strange relation to actual quantities submitted for payment. The practice of any Minister of the Crown in accepting the lowest bid of any responsible bidder is sound. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the lowest bids accepted, in many cases, bore no relation to reality, and that examination by any responsible professional engineer would have produced in many cases, and in many jobs, the immediate statement that a job could not be completed for the amount bid, and

evidence before the proposed Select Committee will show how true that statement is.

The point here is that the division engineer and the field engineers do not award contracts. The award of a contract or the selection of the lowest responsible bidder for award of contract is the final responsibility of the Minister of Highways, and before that responsibility is discharged he should assure himself that the Estimates of his own department are within reasonable engineering bounds. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister was either misinformed by his staff or without advice of competent staff proceeded with awards of contracts at impossible figures. It was there that the area was created to make possible certain improper practices. Contractors reached a point where their funds were exhausted and in order to complete the project had to seek adjustments to compensate them toward completion of the work. It was then that professional engineering staffs had to make adjustments or reclassify contracts as to quantities of one kind of material as against quantities of a higher priced material and we do not know whether these reclassifications were carried out under instructions of the Minister of Highways or his authorized representative, or were carried out by negotiation between engineers and the contractors affected.

It does not seem possible that this activity could have taken place in so many contracts without the hon. Minister being aware that it was being done. If the hon. Minister was not aware that reclassification of quantities of material was taking place, then I submit that he was not paying proper attention to the administration of his department.

Meanwhile, the questioning of engineers and other staff commenced both by the Provincial Auditor's Department and by the Department of Highways. Engineers came away from these sessions in extended confusion for practices which had seemingly been accepted now became, to some officials, unacceptable and the impression seemed to develop

that their thinking should be channelled along the line that the only wrong committed was that certain miscalculations had been made and that a few had taken advantage of an opportunity for personal gain. These men met in the Westminster Hotel and in other places to hear incomprehensible explanations and could only conclude that they should think that which they did not believe and could only conclude that an attempt at "brainwashing" was being made.

I have personally interviewed engineers both within and without the department. I have talked to contractors who have, and who have not, worked for the department and I cannot find a conclusion from any of them but that the circumstances which have developed were inevitable due to the policies of the department issued from Queen's Park.

I now repeat that the policies are the responsibility of the Minister and it is the Minister and the Minister alone who must explain to this House why he permitted a practice to develop or continue which was unsound from an engineering standpoint and which left so much opportunity for breach of trust and possible manipulation.

But let us forget the words "scandal," "fraud," "swindle," and so on, and dwell for a moment on this important aspect of the problem. Without having to in any way affect the course of trials against accused and without in any way affecting the course of possible civil trials the hon. Minister of Highways could have provided this House with a clear outline of the policies of the department in these matters. Then the members of this House and the people of Ontario would have been better equipped to fairly assess the situation, for if the policy was sound and sensible and without possibility of creating areas of serious wrongdoing, and that there was within that policy every known precaution to deter alteration of contract basis, then the people would have supported your present method of determination of the problem. Alternately, the thinking is widespread that someone might be coasting attention

only upon those who allegedly committed offenses instead of turning the light upon the persons and conditions which made those alleged misdemeanours possible.

Now we are in the position of correcting a very unhealthy situation and of ensuring that it shall not happen again. Perhaps members of the Opposition should have been much more aggressive in the last 5 years in examining activities of this department. Nevertheless, it is the duty of the Opposition to now reveal the problem fully in all its apparent phases and guarantee to the public that, not only will the present situation be cleaned up satisfactorily, but that proper safeguards will be established to guarantee that it will not happen again.

I suggested in Windsor last night that I would urge the Liberal Party to press for the formation of an Ontario Highways Commission, headed by a professional engineer of at least 20 years' good standing in his profession and paid a salary equal to his abilities and responsibilities. The Vice-Chairman should be the Minister of Highways of the government of the day and the third member one appointed from the Opposition of the day, at a salary equal to that of the Minister. An advisory committee, composed of leaders in highways association, highway users, municipal groups, labour and industry would be appointed to recommend, review and advise the commission, the Cabinet and the Ministers of the Legislature. With this kind of commission, present troubles could not have developed. If appointed now, it will prevent recurrence of these difficulties and further establish policies and practices as free as humanly possible of political machinations in highway matters.

At the present moment, it is the direct responsibility of the hon. Minister of Highways to fully report to this House on the policies and practices of his department under his stewardship. I full well realize that the hon. Minister suffered unfortunate injuries which kept

him from his desk for a long period and his concurrence with some policies may have therefore been tacit only. Nevertheless, he is responsible to make full and complete report so that the Select Committee to be appointed and all the hon. members of this House will be fully aware of the policy in effect over the whole period of difficulty so that this Committee and the House will be able to properly analyze irregular activities in the light of policies in effect.

My responsibility in this matter is not to the hon. Minister but to the Select Committee and the Legislature, because I submit the Legislature is supreme.

Therefore, I will produce evidence, supported by reliable witnesses, before the committee after the hon. Minister has clearly stated the policy under which his officials have conducted their responsibilities, and after the Provincial Auditor has reported his findings on the policies in effect, before this House, or before the Select Committee.

The Minister, I submit, and the Minister alone—not the hon. Prime Minister, nor anyone else—must make this report, and, Mr. Speaker, if for any reason he is not willing or is unable to do so, then he should step down until the Select Committee has reported on this matter to this House.

MR. JOHN ROOT (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker: At the outset of my remarks I want to say that it is a pleasure to sit in this Legislature under your fair and impartial direction. I want to express my regret that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is unable to be in his seat. I trust that he may soon be back directing the affairs of his department. I welcome two new members. Their victory at the polls was a personal tribute and a vote of confidence in the government.

A few days ago we listened to a wonderful Budget Address. After listening to that address, the 11th in a series of such addresses, it is not hard to understand why the people of Ontario vote confidence in this government at every opportunity.

The hon. Prime Minister as Provincial Treasurer has established a record that has never been equalled in Ontario, 11 budgets, everyone balanced, with a surplus. The per capita debt has dropped from \$126.71 to \$123.91. This is the 6th year in which there have been minor tax reductions. Ontario has about the lowest provincial tax structure of any of the provinces. We have no sales tax. Our gasoline tax is 2c. to 4c. per gallon less than that in 5 of the provinces. At the same time the budget is highlighted with special grants for hospitals, cancer research, Canadian Institute for the Blind, education, teachers and civil service superannuation. This budget will make Ontario a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to some of the problems that confront the rural people in general, and some problems that affect the people of Wellington North and Dufferin in particular.

The constituency that I represent comprises two-thirds of Wellington County and two-thirds of Dufferin County. It is, I think, the finest rural riding in the Province of Ontario. It is a rural riding that is feeling the impact of the great industrial expansion that is taking place in this province.

The Department of Highways, by the generous grants and subsidies it provides, has made rural Ontario a much more attractive place in which to live. Most municipalities are now able to keep roads open for motor traffic 12 months of the year. This makes for a more speedy transportation of the produce of the farm: milk, livestock, fruits and vegetables, poultry and eggs. This improved transportation makes it possible to provide a better product for the consumer. Open roads have made it possible to operate school buses and give the rural children the advantage of a secondary education—something that was difficult to provide before the very generous provincial grants provided by this government made it possible for municipalities to keep their roads open 12 months of the year.

In the year ending March 31st, 1943, the total road subsidy to the municipali-

ties was \$3,589,480.73. Similar figures for the year ending March 31st, 1953 was \$29,699,222.48. For the current fiscal year it is estimated that the assistance will be in excess of \$31 million.

In the fiscal year 1942-1943, the expenditure on King's Highways and secondary roads was \$15,027,706.54. For the same purpose the expenditure in 1952-1953 was \$84,691,385.39.

The people of my constituency would want me to say to the hon. Minister of Highways: "We appreciate what you and your department have done to improve the King's Highway system in Wellington North and Dufferin. We appreciate the very generous assistance you have given to our local councils for the maintenance and construction of the roads in our counties, townships, towns and villages."

Mr. Speaker, about 1937 the government of that day added some 2,000 miles to the King's Highway system in Ontario. For some unexplained reason they brought a number of highways to the border of Wellington North and there they ended. I could mention No. 25 coming north from Burlington to Acton; No. 19 from Stratford to Tralee; No. 89 from Cookstown to Primrose; No. 87 from the Lake Huron area to Harriston; No. 23 from the

London area to Palmerston with a branch down to Teviotdale. It must be a great source of irritation to tourists and others using these highways to come to the end of pavement and realize that, if they are going to jump the gap which is Wellington North, they must travel on the gravelled country roads. Heavy provincial traffic using the county road system places a burden of taxation on the people of Wellington North and Dufferin, that does not seem quite fair. We realize that this situation was not created by this government, but we hope that this government will find a way to correct this situation at an early date.

Agriculture is the basic industry in the constituency that I have the honour to represent. When Agriculture is faced with difficulties, it affects every line of business in the community. Farm people today are faced with a steady increase in the cost of production, and at the same time a steady decline in the value of the products they have to sell.

Mr. Speaker, to give you some idea of the increase in the cost of operating a farm, I will quote from "Agricultural Statistics for Ontario, year 1952." Using 1935-39 as a base, calling it "100," we find some very interesting facts. We find the following increases had taken place by 1952:

The cost of taxes and interests had increased.....	152.4 per cent.
The cost of gasoline, oil and grease had increased.....	170.9 per cent.
The cost of fertilizer had increased.....	183.0 per cent.
The cost of farm machinery had increased.....	193.2 per cent.
The cost of hardware had increased.....	199.5 per cent.
The cost of farm family living had increased.....	208.2 per cent.
The cost of equipment and materials had increased.....	216.3 per cent.
The cost of feed had increased.....	230.2 per cent.
The cost of commodities and services had increased.....	231.8 per cent.
The cost of seed had increased.....	242.0 per cent.
The cost of building materials had increased.....	275.6 per cent.
The cost of farm wages had increased.....	436.7 per cent.
The cost of binder twine had increased.....	456.6 per cent.

These are the latest figures available and there is nothing to indicate that there is any over-all change in the trend for increased cost of operating farms.

What about the other side of the

picture? In 1951, farm prices hit a peak and the downward trend started to develop. To give you some idea of what is taking place I will quote from the same statistical report.

	1951	1952
The value of milch cows.....	\$296.00 per head	\$227.89
The value of other cattle.....	165.50 per head	134.40
The value of sheep and lambs.....	34.46 per head	28.68
The value of swine (allages).....	39.87 per head	27.28
The value of poultry.....	1.50 a piece	.88
The value of wool.....	.80c. lb.	.35c. lb.
Total value of milk production.....	164,852.00	161,751.00
Total value of principal field crops....	383,137,000.00	338,572,000.00

A drop of approximately \$45 million.

These are the latest figures available, but we all know that farm prices are still following the downward trend that started in 1951.

I think every member in this House realizes that a condition of this kind cannot continue indefinitely without having a serious effect on our whole economy. I hope that the leaders of industry, business, and labour realize that they have a responsibility to the farm people as well as to their own particular groups. If our economy is to remain sound, the prices of all commodities must be kept within a reasonable balance.

I feel that the problem that is confronting agriculture has been created by a loss of export market to take care of our surplus production. No doubt many factors have brought about this loss of export market. Perhaps our high cost of production and our high standard of living have priced us out of some markets. No doubt the trade policies and the financial policies of our Federal Government has been a contributing factor in the loss of other markets.

It would be a fair question to ask "What has the Government of Ontario done to assist Agriculture to keep down the cost of production and to provide markets?"

Mr. Speaker, the rural electrification programme that has been carried out by this government has already given to 85 per cent of the people living in rural Ontario the cheapest source of power available. I mentioned that the cost of farm machinery had gone up 193.2 per cent.; the cost of gasoline, oil and

grease 170.9 per cent.; the cost of farm wages 436.7 per cent. In the same period, because of policies pursued by the government and hydro, the cost of electrical power over rural Ontario is practically the same as it was 10 years ago.

I have mentioned the increased assistance for our municipal roads and the improved highway system that makes our markets more readily accessible. I could mention research at the OAC and OVC, two of the finest institutions of their kind in the world.

Now I want to point out what this government has done to develop markets. The overall policies of power development, highway development, the policies of the Department of Mines, of Lands and Forests. Education, Health, Welfare, Planning and Development as well as the policies of the Department of Agriculture have made Ontario the most attractive place in Canada, a land of opportunity, in which to establish a home or an industry.

Half of the New Canadians have established their homes in Ontario. The population of Ontario has increased approximately 1 million since this government took office. A million people create a great market for every line of business.

When we check the per capita consumption of food, we realize that our increase in population alone takes care of great quantities of food. I will use a chart that gives the per capita consumption in 1951 of many farm products:

PRODUCT	PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION IN POUNDS		1 MILLION PEOPLE CONSUME
	1935-39	1951	Lbs.
Pork	39.8	67.8	67,800,000
Beef	54.7	44.1	44,100,000
Veal	10.5	7.7	7,700,000
Mutton and lamb	5.6	2.6	2,600,000
Canned meat	1.4	4.9	4,900,000
Hens and chickens	15.6	19.7	19,700,000
Other poultry	2.8	3.5	3,500,000
Eggs	30.7	34.6	34,600,000
Cheddar Cheese	3.5	4.1	4,100,000
Other cheese	0.2	0.7	700,000
Evaporated milk	6.1	18.1	18,100,000
Condensed whole milk	0.6	0.7	700,000
Fluid whole milk	408.05	420.6	420,600,000
Butter	31.0	22.6	22,600,000
Lard	3.9	8.1	8,100,000
Flour	184.8	153.3	158,300,000
Potatoes	192.3	200.3	200,300,000
Dry beans	3.7	5.2	5,200,000
Dry peas	5.7	2.2	2,200,000
Tomatoes (fresh)	15.4	18.3	18,300,000
Tomato products	10.0	15.5	15,500,000
Fresh fruit	50.5	63.5	63,500,000
Canned fruit	6.3	11.3	11,300,000
Canned vegetables	10.8	18.5	18,500,000
Cabbage and greens	16.2	19.3	19,300,000
Carrots	15.4	13.6	13,600,000

A great market created largely by the policies of this government.

Another great market has been developed by the Department of Travel and Publicity. It is estimated that 1,534,114 tourist cars entered Ontario in 1953 to stay for approximately 6 days. These cars carried an average of $3\frac{1}{2}$ persons who would consume 96,649,245 meals. Another 4 million cars entered Ontario with approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ people for one to two days. They might consume 40 million meals. These two groups alone purchase 136,649,245 meals.

In 1952, figures show that in one year an additional 5,229,132 people entered Ontario by rail, boat, bus, air, taxi and other means. Every day this group consumed another 15,667,396 meals.

A million new people and the tourist industry provide markets for a tremendous volume of farm produce. They

create another market by giving a living to thousands of people who supply goods and services to new people and to tourists.

Mr. Speaker, where would agriculture in Ontario be today if this government by its policies had not made possible a great industrial expansion giving a living to a million new people, and by developing an expanding tourist industry?

The farm people have no objection when labour, business, and industry receive a fair share of the national income, but they do object when there is a steady decline in the price of farm produce and at the same time the cost of services, equipment and labour is advancing. I hope the leaders of industry, business and labour will develop policies that are fair to the basic industry—agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems that confronts rural municipi-

palities, perhaps all municipalities, is the problem of financing the services they provide for people. Some 25 to 30 years ago rural people, to a large extent, lived out their life and did their business in their own community; taxes were levied on the real estate they owned and this system was reasonably fair.

Today conditions have changed. During the last war a policy of decentralizing population started to develop. People lived in the suburbs or the rural communities and drove to the large centres to work. To make this possible, the municipalities started keeping roads open 12 months in the year, 24 hours a day. This was an additional service paid by municipal tax and provincial subsidy. These additional services have speeded up the decentralization of people and, in many cases, our rural schools are overcrowded. New schools have to be built and paid for by municipal tax and provincial grants.

This situation has created a great problem for our local officials and a burden of taxation on farms and small businesses. That, in my opinion, is not fair.

The small business man pays municipal tax on his dwelling-house and his business establishment. The farmer pays municipal tax on his dwelling-house, his barns and his land. The man who drives out of the municipality, to earn a living, pays municipal tax on his dwelling-house alone. The tax he pays on his ability to earn goes to Ottawa in the form of income tax, so that he is unable to pay his fair share to the municipality for the services it provides. I am not suggesting that he is not paying enough taxes. I am saying our present system of allocating the tax dollar is not fair.

I mentioned that 25 to 30 years ago, rural people did their business in their own community. Today, with open roads and motor transportation, that has changed. A large percentage of the cash business is done in the great corporation stores—Eaton's, Simpsons, A & P, Loblaws, Dominion Stores, and many others—leaving the credit business and what is left to the local merchant, the man who pays the municipal tax.

The corporations pay the bulk of their tax in corporation tax to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, to give you a picture of what is taking place in Canada with regard to allocation of the tax dollar, I am going to refer to *Hansard*. The hon. member from Wellington South gave some very enlightening facts in the address he delivered in this House at the last session. If you turn to volume 31, page E-4, you will find at the bottom of the page a chart. This chart shows that the division of the tax dollar in Canada is following a definite trend.

Year	Federal	Provincial	Municipal
1939	51.17 %	18.82 %	30.01 %
1952	78.022%	10.312%	11.672%

I suggest to the hon. members that Ottawa is not playing fair with the municipalities, or the province. We cannot go on indefinitely with a policy of decentralizing our people and centralizing the tax dollar in the Federal Treasury.

With the policy that Ottawa is pursuing, our municipalities would be in an impossible position if it were not for the great increase in assistance they are receiving from the Ontario Government, and remember, that this assistance comes out of their reduced share of the tax dollar. The policy of decentralizing people, and at the same time centralizing the tax dollar, is placing the greatest burden on the rural municipalities. They must provide roads, schools and services for people. They have no corporation stores or head offices to tax. They have no industry to tax. If they secure industry, the neighbouring city will try to annex the industry. If the rural people try to protest, they are told you cannot stand in the way of progress.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot go on indefinitely. If we are going to decentralize our population, we must at the same time decentralize our tax dollar.

This government—the Government of Ontario—has, and is pursuing, that policy. In 1943 the grants for municipal roads was \$3,589,480.73. The estimate for this year is in excess of \$31 million. The total grant for schools in 1944 was \$8,700,000. The grant in 1953 was \$57,700,000. In 1943 the Department of

Welfare spent \$12,525,178.76. This year the estimate is \$20,461,019.49.

In 1943 the province was paying to our hospitals, our sanatoria and the Ontario hospitals \$10,015,847.86. In 1953 Ontario paid for the same institutions \$33,016,922.38. The Department of Municipal Affairs has advised me that the provincial subsidies to municipalities, Boards of Education, local boards and public hospitals for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1944, was \$19,697,486. The same subsidies this year will be \$138,999,000, an increase of \$122,404,610. In 1955 there will be an additional increase of, approximately, \$7 million provided in the unconditional grants. Let us not forget that this increase in assistance to our municipalities was provided at the same time that Ontario's share of the tax dollar was cut almost in half.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come, I think it is overdue, when the Federal Government will have to recognize that we cannot continue decentralizing people and at the same time centralize the tax dollar in the Federal Treasury. Ottawa might follow the example of this province by giving to the municipalities an unconditional per capita grant that would help pay for the schools, roads and services. If not a grant, then some form of re-allocation of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks, I want to repeat what I have said before. We have inherited a goodly heritage in this Province of Ontario. Much of what we enjoy today is the result of the vision, the courage and the hard labour of those who have gone before. The people of Ontario are becoming history-conscious. Organizations such as the Women's Institute, the Federation of Agriculture, the Junior Farmers, historical societies and others, would like to see a museum or pioneer village established to preserve the story of the development of rural Ontario.

We have those in our midst who would try to tell the rising generation that our system of free enterprise has failed the people. I suggest that a pioneer village would be a yardstick by which to measure our progress. A pioneer

village would be a memorial for all to see, a place where we could realize that people with faith in God, with vision, courage and initiative can lay the foundations for great developments.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, than an institution of this kind would have an effect on the basic thinking of our people that could not be valued in dollars and cents.

MR. R. M. MYERS (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

THE PUBLIC PARKS ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Public Parks Act."

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. OLIVER: Are these bills going to committee?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: They are all going to committee.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE REGISTRY ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend The Registry Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: This bill will be referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend The Land Titles Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: This bill will also go to the Legal Bills Committee.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend The Magistrates Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: This will also go to the Committee on Legal Bills.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act to amend The Judicature Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: This will also go to the Legal Bills Committee.

THE SECURITY TRANSFER TAX ACT

HON. MR. FROST moves second reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend The Security Transfer Tax Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

HON. MR. FROST moves second reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL SUBSIDIES ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1953

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. OLIVER: Is that going to committee?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

THE MILK INDUSTRY

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 69, "An Act respecting the Milk Industry."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 107, "An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT, 1952

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act."

MR. OLIVER: On this bill I think the hon. Minister should give a more detailed explanation than he did the other day. It involves quite a change in the application of the Act.

HON. MR. FROST: We will hold that bill over.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Dent in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

HON. MACKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, before we start the regular votes in the Estimates, I would like to say a few words regarding our Department of Health.

First, I would like to speak in regard to the expansion of beds in our hospitals, particularly our general hospitals and our sanatoria. Since the inauguration in 1947 of the present hospital construction programme which makes available to hospitals a provincial grant of \$1,000 for each new, active treatment; of \$2,000 for each new chronic or convalescent bed; \$8,500 for each new psychiatric or detention bed, as well as \$2,500 for each new tuberculosis bed, and \$1,000 for each nurse's bed in a residence, and approval has been given by the province to contribute towards 18,693 new beds made up as follows:

Active treatment beds	11,735
Convalescent beds	241
Chronic beds	2,652
Psychiatric beds	311
(as given by the hon. Prime Minister in his budget)	
Plus—approved detention beds	7

In our sanatoria, we have 896 beds and in nurses' residences 2,851 beds.

Now these programmes consisting of 18,693 beds up to February 28th, 1954, represent a commitment by the province to assist hospitals and sanatoria by provincial capital grants in the amount of almost \$33 million, the exact amount being \$32,920,432, of which \$26,692,000 already has been paid.

If we were to look at the maintenance grants in this province for general hospitals only, we would find this—and as a matter of fact one of the hon. members of the Opposition stated last night that we should pay the full indigent's costs—we are paying more than that. We are paying it on the basis of public-ward beds for every day of the year, regardless of occupancy, as well as supplementary grants on indigent patient days.

To give this House some idea of the increase in the amount of this grant previous to 1946, when this new pattern was adopted, the largest grant given in any year was \$1,600,000 to all the hospitals. In 1946, the first year after this new type of pattern for grants to hospitals was adopted, we increased that by 4 times, giving the hospitals \$6,400,000.

Last year we paid to the hospitals in maintenance grants over \$9 million, and that is not giving any credit to the \$6,800,000 which was given a year ago toward rehabilitation of obsolete services which is in the capital field and which I did not include in the \$33 million already mentioned.

If we were to go to our Ontario hospitals, we would find this picture: as of December 31st, 1953, we had a total of 21,170 people who were under our care. When I say, "21,000" I do not mean they were all within the hospital; there were over 18,000 in the hospitals; there were some under observation in their homes; there were some in our boarding homes which we have in various parts of the province; there were some in our rehabilitation homes, making a grand total of over 21,000.

In order to give this House some idea of the cost of operating our 17 Ontario Hospitals for the mentally ill, which includes the two schools, one at Orillia and the other at Smiths Falls, in 1943, the government was spending \$6.5 million. This has increased by leaps and bounds over the 10-year period, until this coming fiscal year you will notice I am asking you for over \$20 million, or approximately \$20 million for the care of these unfortunate people

who have to be cared for within our institutions. That does not count in any way the capital costs which our Department of Public Works, under the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger), is going forward with a progressive programme continually.

To give you an idea of what the government is doing in that regard—in fact we are carrying on a programme of which we are very proud in the way of an extensive mental hospital building programme—at the new Port Arthur Hospital, 460 beds will be available within a month or two, with contracts let for another 400, and the ultimate capacity we expect will be 1,100 or 1,200 beds. I expect the tenders will be going out from the hon. Minister of Public Works within the next 2 or 3 months for a new 1,100 or 1,200 bed hospital at North Bay. The selection of a site is now under consideration.

At Brockville, 5 units of 100 beds each will be completed this year, plus one unit of 100 beds, already in use.

At the Hospital School at Smiths Falls, the first two groups of buildings to accommodate 1,800 beds are now occupied by 1,100 patients. Accommodation for a further 400 beds is under construction now—ultimate capacity 2,400.

I may also say, regarding our mental health construction programme, that plans are being prepared for a 500-bed group of buildings at Kingston and further extensions are to be made at Hamilton and London. I think hon. members will agree with me that this is a formidable extension programme in the field of mental health.

I will turn now, Mr. Chairman, to the subject of tuberculosis. We are very proud of our record in reducing the mortality rate from tuberculosis in this province. The death rate is, in fact, lower than that in any other province in the Dominion, in spite of the fact that Ontario has the second largest group of Indians of any province of the Dominion, British Columbia being first and Quebec, I believe, third.

The Indians have a mortality rate 9 to 11 times greater than that of white people. In the year 1900 or thereabouts, we had a mortality rate in Canada of some 102 per 100,000. This has dropped steadily and in 1952 it was 8.4 per 100,000. In 1953, last year, though records are still not complete, we think it will turn out to be in the neighbourhood of 6.5.

Unfortunately I cannot make the statement that I made last year. Our Director of Tuberculosis Study felt last year that the incident rate also was falling, as well as the mortality rate. We cannot say that this is absolutely true. We know that the problem of tuberculosis in this province, as well as in every other province of the Dominion, is still a great one, and we must keep up our preventive programme. There are one or two factors which play a great part in it. The first is our increase in population. Our population increased, due to births and the influx of immigrants, by 851,000 in the 10-year period. We have found, in respect of those coming from other countries, that the change of food, climate and so on makes them more susceptible to tuberculosis, probably 2 or 3 times as susceptible as we are. This is especially so in the first 2 or 3 years after their arrival. Later on their susceptibility seems to drop, though we have had only 5 or 6 years in which to judge of this.

I am going to end my remarks by turning to that dread condition known as cancer. The Ontario Treatment and Research Foundation is doing a magnificent job. So are the Ontario Cancer Institute and the Ontario Cancer Society. Each of them has a job to do, the Society in welfare work and the collection of funds, the Institute in the construction of our new radio therapy institute on the Wellesley site, and the Foundation in operating and administering the programme over the whole of Ontario.

Last year I think I stated we had the one Cobalt bomb at London. Just last week they began the installation of a Cobalt bomb at the General Hospital, Hamilton. So far as the information is concerned which I have obtained from

the Ontario Foundation, they believe the next bombs will be assigned to Windsor, Kingston and Ottawa.

I think we can be very proud of the work they are doing, which is backed by this government in a big way, as will become apparent if hon. members will consider that 90 per cent. of the money—certainly 85 per cent.—of a total amount of \$9 million or \$10 million in all will be provided by our Provincial Government.

Vote 52 agreed to.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I refer to Vote 54, item 32. Last year and the year before, I expressed interest in that very terrible disease, heart disease, and I was impressed by the co-operation shown by the hon. Minister of Health in replying to me on both those occasions. I wonder if he will be good enough to tell us what progress is being made in research into this great killing disease?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The sum of \$200,000 will be provided this year for research into this. The figure of \$12,000 which appears in the Estimates is for the payment of the maintenance of office staff and others. In fact, it is completely for the administrative staff.

MR. GRUMMETT: What are the particulars of the Provincial-Federal Agreement in item 11 of Vote 54?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: May I say that the Federal Government and the province have an arrangement with regard to hospitalization only in the first year, under which each of us pays 50 per cent. of the cost. After the first year these people become a municipal responsibility.

MR. GRUMMETT: How many patients were involved in this hospitalization?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I have not the number of patients here, but I have the total cost of indigents for the year 1951-52. In those two years the cost was \$50,000, of which half will be paid by each of the senior governments. As a matter of fact, the number of indigent

hospitalizations in Ontario during the year 1952—adults and children—was 692. We had relatively few in our mental hospitals. As I explained in the case of tuberculosis, the incidence of mental illness does not begin to rise until after the first year.

MR. MANLEY (Stormont): With regard to Vote 54. I notice an item there of \$47,900 in salaries and another item of \$6,300 for services, and I would like to ask what are the services which we are giving to civil servants?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The reason for that amount is that we are hiring new staffs, particularly new medical practitioners, who have taken their course and have the degree of D.Ph.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): What services do they give to the members of the civil service, which requires a staff of that size?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The Department of Health looks after all the civil servants within this building, and the East Block, and, as a matter of fact, with Ontario growing we have offices in the old Sick Children's Hospital, several offices on Richmond Street and in other places in Toronto. The number of civil servants is also growing, just as our population expands. This extra money is for the setting up of new medical offices to look after these civil servants and others outside the Parliament Buildings.

MR. NIXON: What does the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) mean by "look after"?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We examine all civil servants when they commence their employment. We look after all civil servants when they become ill during the day, and treat emergency cases whether medical or surgical. If the hon. member will go up on to the third floor, he will see we have an office there. We expect we will have further offices, and that is what this money is provided for.

MR. NIXON: does that apply to the outside staff, to the civil servants in

municipal hospitals, reformatories and so on? Have you any medical officers located at these institutions to give service to members of the staff?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We have no officers set aside for that purpose but our staff of doctors does look after the civil servants in those places during the time they are working, and examines them when they take up employment.

MR. NIXON: Does that cover the families as well?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: No. That is while the staff is at work.

MR. NIXON: It looks like a lot of money.

MR. MANLEY: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the amount paid for salaries is out of proportion, compared with the value of the services rendered.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Does the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) mean that we are paying too much in salaries?

MR. MANLEY: According to the figures here we are only getting \$6,300 worth of service, against \$47,900 spent for salaries.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: May I say this to the hon. member, that one of these offices is comparable to a doctor's office. We have to pay salaries for the doctors and the nurses and the administrative staff of those offices. That is what the item "salaries" represents. The maintenance does not amount to very much, because we do not supply them with a great deal of material—just bandages or whatever they need for emergency work.

In a doctor's office the main items are for rent and the payment of office staff. And a doctor does not buy drugs, he sends the patients to a drug store.

MR. NIXON: That is not correct. He supplies certain drugs. That is, any doctor to whom I ever went did.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Well, the doctor is very foolish if he does, because he gives them away—most of them. I did.

MR. NIXON: That has not been my experience.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, on item 37, I notice the province gave \$3,500 toward the chlorination of water supplies. I would like to say just a few words about that.

I believe the hon. Minister is very pleased with the results being obtained from the experiment. But we are concerned about some opposition to the chlorination of water supplies, and especially when the opposition comes from a very important source, such as the morning paper here, the *Globe and Mail*.

As you know, just a few weeks ago, they published articles opposing fluorination and combined them into a pamphlet called "Fluorination, Boon or Blunder?" I think I should say a few words about that, to keep the record straight in Brantford.

The pamphlet reports Dr. Charles Dillon as a Scottish Research Dentist located at South Shields, England. They represent him as a distinguished bio-chemist, with an established reputation as a student of the effects of fluorine upon the teeth.

What are the facts? In the first place, Dr. I. D. Leitch, Medical Officer of Health for the County Borough of South Shields, in a letter dated the 11th of February, 1954, writes:

I may be sadly ignorant but I don't know of any Dr. Dillon practicing dentistry hereabouts.

J. R. Forrest, Dental Officer with the Ministry of Health writes in a letter dated March 22nd, 1954:

Dr. Dillon is not a bio-chemist, neither has he any qualifications in medicine or chemistry. He is a native of Jamaica and holds an American Dental qualification. He practices in Fort William in the north of Scotland.

Dr. Dillon's only connection with South Shields is a study which he appears to have made of, at most, 42 extracted teeth from that town.

On that basis, the morning paper accepts as gospel truth everything he has to say about that town. They accept as true, and publish, Dr. Dillon's statement that the water supply of South Shields has a fluorine content of 0.76 to 0.85 parts per million added to water from underground deposits of fluorides.

The *Globe and Mail* should know that there is not one dentist, or doctor in 10,000, who is capable of analyzing a water for its fluorine content. In 1950, Dr. Weaver, the only man entitled to be called "the English Research Dentist of South Shields", reported that the water supply had a fluorine content of 1.4 parts per million. Dr. Weaver's papers, surveying the dental health of more than 4,000 children, have been published in the *British Dental Journal* and are recognized as most valuable contributions to fluorine research.

The *Globe and Mail* quotes Dr. Dillon about the effects of fluorine on teeth as follows:

The pulp chamber becomes progressively blocked by calcific matter gross enough to be demonstrated in radiographs. There is no reason why the process should stop here. This progressive degeneration of vital tissue may affect the development of the alveoli, the development of the root and dental periosteum, and in course of time, bring about the degeneration of the attachment apparatus and its blood supply resulting in early progressive periodontal disease and wholesale loss of teeth.

Professor Angus M. Thomson of the University of Aberdeen was asked to comment upon this statement. In a letter dated February the 10th, 1954, Dr. Thomson writes—

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Would the hon. member give me the date of that, please?

MR. GORDON: It is dated February the 10th, 1954. He was asked for his opinion of this statement, and he describes the statement by Dr. Dillon as "poppy-cock." He said:

This quotation is absolute rubbish. Radiographs of teeth in fluoride and controlled areas have been made by the thousand, and probably hundreds of extracted teeth have been examined in section. No changes such as he describes have been noted and I am perfectly sure that they do not exist.

A world authority on periodontal diseases (that is diseases situated or occurring around a tooth was asked his opinion of this same statement, and he described Dillon's theories as "poppy-cock." In regard to the professional reputation of Dr. Dillon, Professor Thomson, in the same letter, comments:

Dr. Dillon published some very bad in vitro (test tube) experiments in the *Dental Practitioner* about the beginning of 1953 or end of 1952 and drew completely unjustified conclusions about the health of living persons and their teeth. As a consequence, Parfitt, Longwell, Forrest and I concocted a reply which was published in the same journal, probably about April, 1953.

The *Globe and Mail* quotes from a paper by Dr. Dillon published in the *Dental Practitioner* that he has observed "a marked degeneration of pulp tissues." The morning paper does not say that Dr. Dillon reported on only 29 teeth from South Shields and compared them with 4 teeth from low fluoride areas.

Even a layman can recognize that this is not scientific reporting, and can understand how and why Dr. Dillon has no professional recognition from his confreres in dentistry or chemistry.

The morning paper reports Dr. Dillon as follows:

Experiments prove the condition in South Shields does not occur in neighbouring areas having unfluoridated water. Tests made on pulp deposits of South Shield's teeth showed a high fluorine content average of 530 p.p.m. in 5 teeth.

What is the truth about this statement? Here is the reply from the British Minister of Health:

So far as the 530 p.p.m. of fluoride in the pulp deposits is concerned, this may be so. Pulp stones are similar in many respects to dentine, and the fluoride content of dentine, in areas where there is no fluoride at all in the water, has been found to be between 160-200 p.p.m. It increases in direct proportion to the amount of fluoride in the water, but even Aurora, McClure and Likins, found that the dentine at 360 p.p.m. very much less than Dillon's figure. I think it must be realized that Dillon's chemical estimations are considered by experts in chemistry to be completely unsound and his arguments unscientific.

From the presence of calcareous deposits or pulp stones in the South Shields' teeth, Dr. Dillon claimed to show that the ingestion of fluoride leads to degenerative changes of the dental pulp, periodontal membrane and other tissues. Apparently he is not aware that pulp stones are a common occurrence in any area, irrespective of the fluoride content of the water. In his book *Oral and Dental Diseases*, Professor Stones states,

The incidence of pulp calcifications has been studied by Hill (1934) who has found that they occur in 66 per cent. of all teeth between the ages of 10 and 20 years, and the figure rises to 90 per cent. when the age group is between 50 and 70 years.

J. J. Hill's work on the pathology of the dental pulp is published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 21.820.

The morning paper quotes Dr. Dillon as follows:

Dillon, in quoting his experiments in South Shields, England, believes that mottling and its progressive implications bear no exact relation to the total fluorine content of the water, but are related only to the "tissue destroying or poisonous fraction of fluorine in the water"

And adds its own interpretation as follows:

This theory means that every sample of drinking water containing fluorine (natural or added) may have a different poisonous fraction, regardless of the amount of fluorine contained in it.

What scientific values have these two statements?

Dr. Longwell, the distinguished chemist and Principal Research Officer in the Department of the Government Chemist, states:

Dillon gives a method of determining the "toxic fraction" of the total fluoride content of water. Whatever "toxic fraction" may mean, the method of determining it is valueless.

J. R. Forrest of the Ministry of Health adds these comments:

It is unlikely that Dillon's estimation of the fluoride content of enamel and dentine or of pulp stones is any more reliable. In an article published in November, 1952, he reported that one tooth from an area with 0.10 p.p.m.F in the water had a fluoride content of 1,000 p.p.m., whilst another from the same area had 112 p.p.m. With 0.18 p.p.m. the fluoride content was said to be 500 p.p.m. These widely varying findings are in marked contrast to the consistent results obtained by more reliable research workers, some of whose figures were given in the table on page 49 of the report issued by the United Kingdom Scientific Mission which visited Canada and the United States.

The *Globe and Mail* quotes Dr. Dillon as declaring that experiments prove the condition described in South Shields does not occur in areas having unfluoridated water supplies, and that the steep rise in tooth loss between the ages of 31 and 40 in South Shields is due to periodontal disease caused by fluorine. The British Minister of Health replies that these theories are not borne out by the fact. Dental Officer, F. R. Forrest, who has made an independent

survey of South Shields with fluorine in the water, and North Shields with no fluorine in the water, has found that even up to 35 years of age, only 9 per cent. of the women of South Shields were wearing dentures compared to 35 per cent. in North Shields.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should rely on the statement issued by our Canadian Dental Association, and I would close by quoting the words of Abraham Lincoln, when he put the matter in a somewhat different form. He said, in a letter to the editor of the *Illinois Gazette* on August 11th, 1846:

That it is an established maxim of morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify nor excuse him.

In my few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I have given what has been obtained in Britain in connection with that article, and it shows it is completely valueless, and to what extent some will go in opposition to this experiment.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon)—and I want to congratulate him upon his enthusiasm regarding chlorination of water as a partial preventative for decay in teeth, especially of our younger people—I would like this House to appreciate the position of the Department of Health.

We have two files, one containing the "pros," and the other containing the "cons." If I were to go through them even rapidly, it would take me several hours.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that we are not against fluorination. We do know that it is one factor we feel in the future will probably be used—probably. But we must not forget the other factors, such as oral hygiene and excessive carbohydrate intake, and so forth.

We have evidence from outstanding people, professional, scientific and lay people, who come out in favour of it, and we have just as many against.

I will grant you that the Ontario Dental Association, and the Canadian

Association—and I believe the American, but I am not sure—have endorsed it, but I have been waiting for a letter from the American Medical Association which I have not received. I was also awaiting letters from the World Health Organization, and the Canadian Medical Association, and from the latter, I received a letter dated December 1st, 1953, which reads:

To my knowledge, the World Medical Association has not endorsed any research project concerning fluorination, complete or incomplete, and certainly nothing to this effect appears in our statement.

They go on and say:

It seems to be regarded that a number of people are writing to the Canadian Medical Association reporting on this subject certain conclusions or recommendations which may or may not be true, somewhat dependent, it would seem, on the point of view held by the individual or body which is quoting it.

I have an excerpt from a letter from the World Health Organization, dated November 13th, 1953, which I will read. They have promised me as soon as further work was done, I would hear of it. The letter reads as follows:

The World Health Organization has not expressed any official views on water fluoridization schemes.

I think that answers the hon. member's question.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Health would explain item 14, on Vote 54, "Federal Health Grants—Operating Fund, \$500,000." It seems a very large amount for an operating fund.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: It is simply a revolving account which we have with the Federal Government. We make application and get the money back which we have paid.

MR. GRUMMETT: What is the object of the fund?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Under the federal health scheme, we have a project whereby, first of all, we receive the project and either approve or disapprove. If we approve, we send it on to Ottawa where they may approve or disapprove. If it is approved, it comes back to us. We pay out the money, then we make application to Ottawa to pay us back that money. This \$500,000 is the amount we pay for paying it out, and applying again. It is simply a revolving account.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, item 33, "Research Council of Ontario—waste research"—I do not find any reference to that in last year's estimates. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on it.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Under the Department of Planning and Development, we have the Research Council of Ontario, which has carried out a research project on leaves. They want to carry out a further research project for us on waste such as sewage, garbage, and perhaps industrial wastes, as well as more study on leaves and grass cuttings, etc.

This is simply to aid them with the Estimates of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development and is a special project which we have asked them to take care of for us.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): While we are still on Vote 54, item 28, "Alcoholism Research Foundation, \$149,500", when the hon. Minister presented the Third Annual Report of this Foundation a few days ago, he made a very interesting statement to the House which I, of course, thought was based on the research of 3 years' experience of this particular Foundation.

Among other statements, he said there was some 2½ ounces of fusel oil which is a deadly poison in every Imperial Quart bottle of liquor.

HON. MR. FROST: Was not my explanation satisfactory?

MR. NIXON: I want to get it from the hon. Minister. The hon. Prime

Minister does not know anything about this.

I touched upon this a few days ago when the hon. Minister was out of the House, when I read a statement from an authority in Windsor which said that the hon. Minister's statement was "erroneous", "misleading", and he applied several other terms to it. I am sorry I have not it before me now, but he said the hon. Minister was exactly 1,000 per cent. out in his statement.

At that time, the hon. Prime Minister suggested the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) had just secured new bifocals and as soon as he got used to the new ones, he would make a subsequent statement to the House, correcting the impression he left on that occasion.

If the hon. Minister has become accustomed to his new bifocals, it seems to me this would be an appropriate time to clear up that situation.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: May I ask the hon. member if he has ever made statements which were considered "erroneous", etc. and all those other large words he used?

MR. NIXON: Never. If the hon. Minister has any knowledge of any such statements I have made, I would welcome hearing of them.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I hope the hon. member sitting to the right belongs to the Presbyterian Church or some other good Christian organization and tells the truth.

In the first place, the Alcoholic Research Foundation has nothing to do with the distillation process of alcohol. They have to do with the people we send there who cannot handle it, who are called "chronic alcoholics."

I have asked the University of Toronto to give me a statement on this, which I have not as yet received, and I have asked the Professor of Pharmacology, Professor Rogers, for this statement, but as I say, I have not as yet received it. I will admit my statement was high. I was speaking of the imperial gallon rather than the quart, and whether the bifocals had anything

to do with it or not, we will leave as erroneous also.

MR. SALSBERG: On Vote 54, there are two items I would like to deal with. The first is item 18, providing \$25,000 for the Victorian Order of Nurses. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this excellent organization for the fine service it is rendering and the important contribution it is making to thousands of homes, particularly working-class homes, on their daily rounds. I think it is one of the few organizations which should, whenever we have an opportunity, be singled out for recognition, and I would personally suggest that the amount be increased.

If I could, I would make a motion to increase it, but I am only able to move to reduce and not to increase. That can only come from the Treasury benches.

I respectfully suggest to the hon. Minister and to the government to give serious thought to the suggestion of increasing the amount to the Victorian Order of Nurses so they may continue to render the outstanding service they are now giving. I think it is generally recognized they are short of money, and I am sure they could extend their work. They already have a fine record, but they could improve their work if we were to give them more money. Unless the hon. Minister is prepared right now to increase this amount, I will continue. This is not a question, it is a suggestion.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I am prepared to announce a \$1,250 increase which the hon. member will see in Vote 54, No. 31, "St. Elizabeth Visiting Nurses Association." That is a group of 18 or 20 nurses who are paid on the same basis as the Victorian Order of Nurses, and are doing identically the same work. We will give consideration to the hon. member's suggestion.

MR. SALSBERG: They should both be given more. I now want to say a few words on item 28, "Alcoholism Research Foundation," from a rather different point of view than that touched on by the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

I consider, Mr. Chairman, the problem of alcoholism as one immediately under the jurisdiction, and responsibility of the Department of Health. Whether it has a certain percentage of harmful oils—some of the hon. members are now referring to it as "diesel oil"—or not, I think it is universally recognized and generally agreed that alcohol taken in large doses has a serious ill effect on the health, both physical and mental, of those who consume it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it abundantly clear that I am not a prohibitionist, I am not even a teetotaler, and I am not advocating restrictions. I am, however, aware that more should be done than is now being done to avert a more serious and more harmful effect on the health and mental condition of the people. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we are doing enough.

The rise in consumption of alcoholic beverages is truly alarming. I am not blaming the government alone for that. I blame it on a number of other factors, the government being only one. I have had an opportunity of looking at some of the latest figures of this development, and I was shocked as I am sure most hon. members would be, if they were to get these facts. For instance, the amount spent for liquor in Ontario in 1944 was \$146,506.512, but in 1953, that had jumped to \$320,371,138—more than doubled in a 9-year period. It is true we are not as badly off as some other countries where the consumption of alcoholic drinks is higher than is the case with us, but it is high, and what is worse, it is getting higher all the time. I suggest it constitutes a serious social problem. It is an economic problem, as some people insist, but it is primarily a social problem, and I recognize also that we cannot do away with it by decree, nor by legislation alone. But by doing away with the basic causes which drive people to excessive drinking—and those causes are many—I do suggest though that we should do all we can to reach the minds of people to teach and advise them of the harmfulness of it and the need for reducing consumption.

I think this item we are dealing with, the "Alcoholism Research Foundation,"

has not the scope nor the finances nor the staff to do that. They are doing a good job. The staff which the hon. Minister has gathered together, I understand is of a very high calibre. They are good people, with a well-established reputation and they are making advances.

That is all to the good and is appreciated, but I would suggest we extend their scope and tasks, and at the risk of making some hon. members smile, and laugh, I want to repeat a suggestion I made in the Committee on Government Commissions when the functions of the Liquor Board were before us.

I was very serious then and I am very serious now. It was my opinion then, as it is now, that we should seriously consider having an educational campaign on this question that would reach to the entire population. I suggested then we should utilize every bottle of liquor we sell to carry some message to the people. I see nothing to laugh at in that. The Liquor Board could put a label on these bottles and advise people that excessive consumption is harmful—labels saying "Do not drink if you can get away without touching it, but if you must, do not consume too much."

I think this is a very sound proposition and I find that in some countries where sales of liquor are controlled by governments, the selling agencies are doing something of this sort. Sweden is one example.

I would go even further than this, and advocate that we have proper signs in every liquor outlet, every liquor store and beer warehouse advising people to "go slow", and to realize that excessive consumption is bad for them. I think that if we persist along these lines we shall reach more people than have ever been reached before, with the advice of the harmfulness of this practice of which nearly all of us are guilty to a greater or a lesser degree.

In conclusion I should like to suggest that we also extend this campaign to our schools, from the lowest grade to the highest classes in the universities. I think it would be very good if we could centralize this type of educational

campaign within the Department of Health, because this is primarily a matter affecting physical and mental health. I would like to see the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) get this extra task, and I should like to see the money required for it made available on a grand scale, and for a long period of time.

If we were to take a percentage of the profits we are now making from liquor, and devote it to this preventative work of the Department of Health, we would be making a departure which in my view would be exceedingly worth while.

Vote 54 agreed to.

Votes 55 and 56 agreed to.

MR. GRUMMETT: On Vote 57, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us about the benefits which have accrued since 1951?

HON. MR. FROST: I wonder if the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) would leave that question over. It is 5 o'clock and I do not want to keep the House sitting. We can go back to this.

We are down to item 57. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the committee begs to report progress and moves for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we assemble at 3 o'clock. There are several committees and it would not be feasible to meet at 2 o'clock. We shall meet at 3 o'clock, and there will be a night session. We shall proceed with the debate on the budget and with the Estimates.

I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.03 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, March 25, 1954

Afternoon Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 25, 1954.

Eighth Report Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Nickle	777
Third Report Standing Committee on Mining, Mr. Mapledoram	777
Final Report Standing Committee on Legal Bills, Mr. Robarts	777
Disabled Persons Allowance Act, 1952, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading	778
Community Centres Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	778
Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	778
Fire Marshals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	779
Legislative Assembly Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	779
Certain Lands re Port Arthur Ontario Hospital, bill respecting, introduced by Mr. Porter, first reading	779
Public Service Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, first reading	780
Liquor Licence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, first reading	780
Pharmacy Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading	780
Travelling Shows Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, first reading	780
Resumption of Debate on the Budget Address, Mr. Myers	782
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Hunt, agreed to	784
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, second reading	784
Estimates, Department of Health, Continued, Mr. Phillips	796
Recess, 6 o'clock	805

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker : Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1954.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very glad today to welcome the students from the Vaughan Road Collegiate School, the St. Michael's Choir School of Toronto, the Rolph Road Public School, Toronto, and the students from the Public School of Welland, Ontario.

Not only are we happy to welcome the students from Toronto day by day, but it is an extreme pleasure to have, as our guests, those from outside our city. We trust the students from Welland have enjoyed their trip to the Museum, and the instructions and lectures they have received while in the Parliament Building.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. M. NICKLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Nickle, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, begs leave to present the following as its Eighth Report:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 14, An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys.

Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Bill No. 25, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. CLARE MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Mining, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Mapledoram, from the Standing Committee on Mining, begs leave to present the following as its Third Report:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 94, An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. J. P. ROBARTS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Second and Final Report of the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Robarts, from the Standing Committee on Legal Bills begs leave to present the following as its Second Report.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 35, An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Warehouse Receipts Act.

Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

Bill No. 58, The Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954.

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Infants Act.

Bill No. 75, The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954.

Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Petty Trespass Act.

Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act, 1952 (No. 2).

Bill No. 117, An Act to amend the Judicature Act (No. 2).

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act, 1953.

Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

DISABLED PERSONS ALLOWANCE ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Disabled Persons Allowance Act, 1952."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the only amendment to this Act is in respect to persons who are completely disabled, and who are in receipt of Workmen's Compensation benefits, or war pension benefits.

We have found in some cases that workmen or veterans, who might be in receipt of a small pension or allowance, cannot benefit under this Act, and by this amendment, provision is made to supplement any pension they are receiving up to \$40 a month.

The other amendment is to make it possible, when the Federal Government brings down its proposed Disabled Persons legislation, for us to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government, without having to call a special session of the Legislature for that purpose.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Community Centres Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment was designed to bring the compensation of the Community Centres Board in line with boards appointed under The Municipal Act and the Public Parks Act.

LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in this bill are made necessary by reason of the revision of the Statutes of Canada, and by the enactment last week by the Parliament of Canada of a new National Housing Act. These amendments are to bring the Loan and Trust Corporations Act into line with that legislation.

THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the new section contained in this bill will put into statutory form, the standards for couplings for 1½ inch, and 2½ inch fire hose, required by regulation since 1950. It is generally designed to implement the hose thread standardization programme.

A great deal has been done toward the standardization of hose threads for the purpose of fire equipment throughout the province, and a very large amount of money has been spent by this government to bring this about.

This bill, in substance, is designed to make sure that they cannot turn the clock back, and revert to some other standard of hose couplings, once the new standard has been introduced.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the first point in this bill is to substitute the "Chief Election Officer," for the "Clerk of the Crown in Chancery," to fit in with the amendments which will be brought forward in respect to the Election Act, which I hope to have ready for introduction tomorrow.

The second provision is to deal with a situation as it affects the hon. members of this House.

Under the present legislation, as the hon. members are aware, certain advances may be made to hon. members, to Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, against their indemnities. These advances are charged against the accrued indemnity, and the accrued expense allowance.

As the hon. members are aware, ⅓ of the total indemnity is earmarked as an expense allowance, and is not subject to income tax.

Hon. members who have been drawing the allowance up to \$90 a month, against their indemnity, have found, in some cases, they have had some difficulty with the Income Tax Department, which regards that as income, and does not recognize the fact that part of that, at any rate, should be regarded as expense allowance.

This will provide that the whole of drawings of this kind, up to \$90, will be drawings as against the expense allowance only, so there will be no difficulty or complication in that respect.

CERTAIN LANDS RE PORT ARTHUR ONTARIO HOSPITAL

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act respecting certain lands in the City of Port Arthur, occupied by the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Hospital in Port Arthur, of course, is on property which is owned by the Provincial Government. Certain arrangements have been made with reference to sewers and other facilities of that kind, and certain statutory clarifications have been considered necessary, and this is to deal with the situation, which I understand is not controversial. This is confirmation, really, of the agreement which has been arrived at.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: And requested by the City of Port Arthur.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. I understand it was requested by the City of Port Arthur.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): You mean an agreement between Port Arthur and the government?

HON. MR. PORTER: Perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger) could go into the details of that situation better than I.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: The title to the property was never properly cleared, and has been pending, apparently, since 1939.

It was necessary to clarify the whole situation, and to introduce this bill. Otherwise, it would have required a Private Bill, and it was too late to get the Private Bill into this Legislature.

There is nothing controversial about it.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment will bring the Registrars of Deeds, and their staffs, into the civil service on the same basis with respect to past services, as the other branches of the service.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, section 4 of the Election Act, 1951, deals with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and this amendment transfers the powers and duties to the Chief Election Officer. Wherever the expression, "Clerk of the Crown in Chancery" appears in the statute, "Chief Election Officer" is being substituted.

THE PHARMACY ACT, 1953

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. members of this House will have in mind the question as to why this was not proclaimed last year. May I say to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that we had word from the Federal Government saying they were going to make some major changes in the Food and Drug Act, which comes under their jurisdiction, and we held back proclamation of this Act until we received the new Food and Drug Act, which was either just before Christmas or immediately after—I am not sure which.

Then, owing to that fact, there were two minor changes which we had to make in these amendments, one of which is designed to give legal recognition to the professional activities of veterinary surgeons. The other provides that the Dean of the Faculty of Pharmacy at the University of Toronto is a member, ex-officio, of the council.

I might just say one more word, Mr. Speaker. The College of Pharmacy has recently become a faculty of the University of Toronto.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

TRAVELLING SHOWS ACT

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Travelling Shows Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have been Treasurer of Ontario for some years, but up until last year I have never heard of the Act. We have made some changes in it, and the Comptroller of Revenue tells me they are sufficient for the purposes of regulation. These are some minor changes to bring the Act up-to-date.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Before the Orders of the day I would like to ask a question of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). On two occasion, in the House this year, he has given hon. members a list of contractors, 9 of them, I think, whose books and records have been seized for purposes of investigation. I ask the hon. Attorney-General if it is a fact that we are now going beyond contractors in the seizing of books, records and papers? Is it true that a lawyer in the City of Toronto has had his office closed and his books and records seized in the past few days?

HON. MR. PORTER: I am informed in this connection that one of these contractors, whom I mentioned, had lodged some of the books in a certain legal office. That is why the seizure was made there.

MR. OLIVER: It was because of this lawyer's relation with the contractor?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) if he can inform the House concerning the motion asking for the tabling of the agreement, and correspondence relating thereto made available? Is the delay occasioned by any failure to consent on the part of the federal authorities?

HON. MR. FROST: I meant to mention this matter before in this House.

There is no difficulty about tabling the agreement. The difficulty arises because there are several thousand pieces of correspondence. This question is a very broad one. If it had referred, for instance, to letters dealing with specific matters it would be far easier. But I understand the motion is so broad it involves all the correspondence with the Federal Government, which comprises ordinary correspondence concerning a thousand and one routine matters. As I say, there are several thousand letters, in addition to the agreement and the other matters referred to.

I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) should make his motion an order for return, and the papers could be laid before the Select Committee.

An attempt to make copies of these letters would involve a great deal of time and several thousand dollars of expenditure. There is no objection to letting matters come before the House and the committee. It is all a question of detail in doing it.

MR. OLIVER: May I say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister will appreciate the difficulty there is in differentiating between certain types of letters and others. I think, if he will give me the assurance that this information will be laid before the committee at the commencement of its sittings, I shall be satisfied.

HON. MR. FROST: I shall be very glad indeed to do so. This is a matter of detail, involving the difficulty of bringing all the letters down. In fact to make an order for return takes them out of circulation—they are being used, and so on. To make copies is, obviously, a matter of considerable time and expense. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) wants to do is to read the letters and we are very glad to help him to do that.

MR. OLIVER: I think—and the hon. Prime Minister will probably agree—I should press for the agreement itself to be tabled.

HON. MR. FROST: Of course. I think the agreement might be tabled right away if it is desired.

MR. OLIVER: That may not be necessary.

HON. MR. FROST: If I might revert to a motion and refer to this as a notice of a motion in relation to the bill, which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has introduced in connection with the Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to introduce a motion, of which I give notice, that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to consider the question of the allowance for expenses payable to hon. members of Select Committees sitting in the intervals between sessions of the Legislature under the provision of section 63 of The Legislative Assembly Act—the committee to sit at once and report to this House. If there is a recommendation, it can be incorporated in that bill. I propose the committee should be composed of 5 members, 3 from the government and 2 from the Opposition.

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition agrees, and if he will give me the names of two hon. members of the Opposition, I will be obliged. I might solicit the appointment of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) but without in any way limiting the hon. Leader of the Opposition in recommendations he may wish to make.

I might point out that the present allowance for expenses simply does not meet the out-of-pocket expenditure of the committee members. There are some important committees being appointed and I think we should recognize the fact that members sometimes have to meet the most extraordinary expenditure.

I was myself down in Ottawa last Friday night. I arrived there late at night and I left quite early the next morning. The only dissipation that I had was to invite the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs (hon. Mr. Dunbar) to breakfast, and my bill up to that time was \$17.35. I can assure hon. members that it was only a modest meal.

As for hon. members, who have to take the other two meals, luncheon and dinner, I do not know how they squeeze it into the allowance of \$20 a day under present conditions. We might as well face that, and I am going to ask the Select Committee, if the House agrees to the motion, to give this situation due consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

THE BUDGET

MR. R. M. MYERS (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I propose to say a word or two about the Ontario Department of Welfare. Perhaps the greatest satisfaction I experience from being a member of the Legislature is in bringing to the attention of the department from time to time the case of some deserving man or woman eligible for one or other of the Ontario pensions. Many of the persons in need of assistance are what might be called borderline cases, and when doubt existed as to whether or not an applicant qualifies, the benefit of the doubt was given to the applicant.

It would seem that the influence of the Department of Welfare on the people of Ontario must be an ever increasing one. While the population of Ontario has increased tremendously in recent years, the increase in the numbers of men and women over 60 years of age has increased twice as rapidly as the increase in the general population.

Pension plans are very desirable features of our industrial life, but they add to some of our problems. For instance: usually an employer prefers to engage a comparatively young man so he may participate in the pension plans adopted very generally by industry in Ontario, and if a man seeking employment is over 40 or 45 years of age he may experience difficulty in finding work. Then again the men who, while able and willing to work, are retired and forced into idleness at 65 or thereabouts, present another problem.

There are in Ontario 46 Homes for the Aged operating under The Charitable Institutions Act with 3,600 beds, and it is interesting to note that of these:

- 14 are operated by the Roman Catholic Church;
- 14 by local charitable organizations;
- 7 by the Canadian National Institute for the Blind;
- 4 by the Salvation Army;
- 6 by other religious organizations;
- 1 by a fraternal order.

I think all of us were impressed when the Elderly Persons Housing Act was

introduced in 1952, and the amendment to the Charitable Institutions Act providing for grants of \$1,000 a bed for new construction was introduced in 1953, and it might be of interest to the House to know something of the result of the legislation to date.

So far only two municipalities, Owen Sound and York Township, have completed low housing rental units. These are rented for approximately \$30 per month for single persons and \$35 for couples, comprising in all 168 suites. Other units are in course of construction in Brantford, Windsor and Hamilton which when completed will provide 128 additional units.

Since the grant of \$1,000 a bed authorized in 1951 for new construction, 3 new homes and an extension to another home with a total of 97 beds have been completed; 3 new homes with a total of 226 beds are under construction, and plans are being drawn for 3 new homes and 3 extensions which will have a total of 370 beds.

It is to be hoped that charitable organizations and churches will be encouraged by the available grants to extend the means of caring for our old people.

While it is all very well to provide accommodation in homes for people unable to care for themselves, we must bear in mind that the problem is not solely one of institutional care—there is a need in all of us to fill a useful place in life, and that brings me to the address made by the Minister over a network of radio stations about a month ago when he said:

At this time four departments of government, namely, Health, Welfare, Education and Labour, are engaged in rehabilitation work. These programmes involve numerous factors: medical treatment, vocational training and guidance, and placement, to mention a few. It is our intention to work for an immediate revision of our rehabilitation services.

I interviewed the Deputy Minister and some of the senior officials of the department as to the proposal men-

tioned in the Minister's address, to revise and expand the rehabilitation services rendered by the department, and obtained details of cases where disabled men and women had been trained and were able to again lead a useful life. I am sure you will be interested in learning something of the results accomplished.

First, let me say there are several associations doing a wonderful work in connection with the training and placing of persons suffering from a physical disability. Two of these, whose names frequently appear in files, were allowed to inspect our Amity Rehabilitation Centre at Hamilton and the centre maintained by the Society for Crippled Civilians at Toronto.

Now then for two or three typical cases from the department files.

There is the case of the young man, age 24, who has been paralyzed since the age of 2. The case came to the attention of the department in 1951. The young man had little education but a great deal of courage. It was decided that watchmaking would be an appropriate trade. This trade is taught at Ryerson Institute. To prepare him for admission to Ryerson he first matriculated. He is at present at Ryerson and doing very well.

Another case concerns a man, age 47, who lost a leg in 1948 and had not worked since. He was given a course in shoemaking at the Amity Centre and he is now employed at the centre as a supervisor.

There is the case of a young woman crippled because of polio. She was given a business training course. She is now the head girl in a factory office and works from her wheel chair.

Another teen-age and crippled girl was interested in sewing. She was given a course in tailoring and power sewing machine operating at the Amity Centre. She now has employment with a well-known firm of Hamilton tailors and earns \$40 a week.

The files of the department contain many similar cases. The costs of education and training are shared, usually by

the municipality and one or more departments of the government. It was satisfying to note from the files that industry has been co-operative in finding work for trained disabled persons.

The files disclose that finding employment for these disabled persons is a long, tedious process before suitable work is found—in one case there were 8 failures before permanent placement.

It is a great satisfaction to me, and I am sure to all of us, to know that the business of the training and placement of disabled persons is to be intensified, and I am pleased to know that the region comprising the counties of Waterloo, Wellington, Halton and Peel has been chosen as the one where the first studies are to be made. No doubt this forward step will result in other action which will give further service to the handicapped people of Ontario.

MR. STANLEY J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I wonder if that bill could be left over for a couple of days. This has been our busy week. Every night has been taken up with some function or other, and during the day we have attended committee meetings. I, for one, have not had an opportunity to look over the bill and I would appreciate it very much if the hon. Prime Minister would leave the bill over until next Monday, for instance.

HON. MR. FROST: If the hon. member insists, I will agree, but I would suggest to the hon. member that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) proceed with second reading and give the explanation of the proposed legislation, which may assist the hon. member in connection with his appraisal of the situation. In committee I will be very glad to give the hon. member, or indeed any other hon. members, the fullest latitude to discuss it.

The principal matter relates to conciliations and, I think, it would perhaps assist the hon. members of the House if the hon. Minister of Labour gave a detailed explanation of the problem, and then on that section in committee I can assure the hon. member the fullest latitude will be given if he desires to speak at that time on labour relations generally, and we will not raise any objections.

MR. GRUMMETT: That would be satisfactory to me.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to clear one question. I will allow the hon. member to make a statement now.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker, provided when the bill goes into committee of the Whole House, I am permitted to go beyond any specific section.

HON. MR. FROST: That is quite all right.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the question whether it would not be more agreeable—

MR. SPEAKER: Let us have something before the House. We have nothing right now. May I ask that the motion be made, and we have discussion later. We are getting rather involved.

HON. MR. DALEY moves second reading of Bill No. 110, "An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act."

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the government a question along the same line raised by the hon. member (Mr. Grummett), but to add this: that the government agree that nothing take place except the explanation by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and then an hon. member move adjournment of the debate, so that the debate itself on second reading which is the debate on the principle of the bill, should take place at a time when the hon. members will have had an opportunity of becoming

thoroughly acquainted with so vital a matter.

I think that would be acceptable, otherwise it is not, because I think the hon. members are not prepared to discuss this bill; we did not get it until 3 o'clock yesterday.

HON. MR. FROST: I would point out to the hon. member there is a great deal of work on the Order paper.

MR. SALSBERG: I know, but we got it too late.

HON. MR. FROST: I can assure the hon. member the bill will pass, but I will extend to him the same privilege which was extended to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett).

MR. SALSBERG: That is very wrong.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act of 1950, there are a number of things which I wish to bring to the attention of the House, and I wish to discuss some things in connection with labour relations which are not included in the Act.

When I introduced the original Act in 1950, I said at that time there would be things in it which might require changes, but that I felt it would take time and experience in its operation to determine just what those changes should be. Well, 4 years later, I am back with the bill before the Legislature to make the alternatives which I consider necessary to make improvements in our administrative practices.

First, I should like to say we are proud of the results which 4 years of operation under the Act have brought. I think it has worked exceeding well, and the amendments which I propose do not disturb the basic framework or principles upon which this legislation is founded.

I would like to read at this point a summary of exactly what has gone on. Since collective bargaining legislation

was first introduced in Ontario in 1943, there has been a noteworthy improvement in the relations between employers and employees. Although trade union membership in Canada has doubled since 1931, so that one might have expected a rise in militancy on the part of trade unions, the percentage of persons who have gone on strike, lawfully as well as unlawfully, in the last decade has not risen to any great extent. Out of the working force of 3,782,000 non-agricultural wage and salary earners in Canada in 1952, only 120,818, or 3.2 per cent., were on strike during that year. The 10-year average was 4 per cent. That decade includes the year 1943, the eve of the introduction of labour relations legislation in Canada, when the percentage was 7.5; 1946 when the Federal Government's policy was challenged by trade unions and the percentage was 4.7; 1950 when the strike of railway employees occurred, raising the yearly percentage to 5.7.

The percentage of unlawful strikes constituted only a small fraction of these figures. Union recognition, formerly a major cause of industrial strife, is now dealt with effectively under the legislation, and strikes because of the refusal of an employer to recognize the trade union representing a majority of his employees, now rarely occur and are of very short duration.

By and large, the Labour Relations Act of 1950 has worked well, and the experience of the Department of Labour, as well as the briefs submitted to the government and to the department by interested groups of citizens, do not indicate the need for any major amendment except in one respect, and that is the conciliation provision of the Act.

Now, experience has indicated the need for some minor amendments. I will not deal with them at this time, but they will be included in the bill.

It is recommended that no provision be included in this Act requiring compulsory arbitration. A great many people have made representations to the government that we should have compulsory arbitration, in what are known as "vital industries"—public utilities—

arising through the negotiations for collective agreements.

Compulsory arbitration of such disputes is opposed by trade unions, and by most employers. The adoption of a principle of compulsory arbitration, if carried to its logical conclusion, would inevitably lead to wage fixing, price fixing, and profit fixing, by a government agency.

The experience of the last decade in Ontario indicates that disputes in industries of this nature can be dealt with fairly effectively under existing legislation, and, up to the present time, the public has not been seriously inconvenienced. During the discussions preceding the preparation of the 1950 legislation, a scheme was drawn up providing for compulsory arbitration of disputes in public utilities and hospitals, and empowering the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to declare that any industry involved in a dispute which might effect the health or welfare of a community, be subject to the compulsory provisions of the legislation.

After considering the scheme, the government determined that it should not be included in the bill which was ultimately presented to the Legislature.

I want to pay tribute to those who have had a part in the organization of our hospitals. I would say if any group of people needed the bargaining power in union organizations, it was the employees in the hospitals.

Some years ago, this government granted them the right to organize. I am very happy to say that many times, when discussing this problem with the people whose duty it was to organize these workers, there has been no question of strike, and I think it would be an unnecessary piece of legislation to have compulsory arbitration, even in the hospitals, which in my opinion, are one of the most vital projects.

It is recommended that no change be made in the legislation which would empower the Labour Relations Board to terminate bargaining rights ("decertify") of trade unions which engage in unlawful strikes. It is a function of the

Department of Labour to settle strikes, whether lawful or unlawful, and any legislative provision which destroys bargaining rights of a trade union, representing the majority of the employees of an employer, makes the task more difficult.

I do not think my conciliation officers should be dealing with these parties in an endeavour to settle the strikes and it is considered that nothing in this Act in the nature of decertifying a union be enacted because, in the opinion of some, it has gone on an unlawful strike.

I would like to give a brief summary of statistics. I have them here. I will not read them, but they will be included in *Hansard*. They will show the actual strike results of the workers in Ontario. As I say, I will not read the whole thing, but I will simply call the attention of the hon. members to one or two items.

In 1952, which people thought was a very bad year, when there were several very important difficulties in industry, which were eventually cleared up—in the Ontario jurisdiction, the estimated total of wage and salary workers in non-agricultural industries in Ontario was 3.0 per cent., while in the whole of Canada, it was 3.4. So you will see our record has been very good. In the period from 1941 to 1946, it was 3.5 for Ontario, and 4.2 for all of Canada.

In 1947, to 1952, it was 2.4 per cent. in Ontario, and 3.0 per cent. for the whole of Canada.

Between 1941 and 1952—covering that period of time—it was 2.9 in Ontario and 3.6 for the whole of Canada.

So hon. members will see in the actual administration of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the record does not disclose that the Act has not worked reasonably well, in spite of various pieces of labour legislation in other provinces, which differ from ours, but that the over-all picture of ours can be considered to be pretty good.

I will now file this statement in full, and it will appear in *Hansard*, as I have said.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF THE INCIDENCE OF STRIKES IN ONTARIO INDUSTRIES
1941-1952*

*Number of Workers on Strike in Ontario as a Percentage of the Estimated
Total of Wage and Salary Workers in Non-Agricultural Industries
In Ontario Jurisdiction*

	Estimated No. of Wage and Salary Workers in Ontario Jurisdiction ¹	No. of Workers on Strike in Ontario ²	Percent Workers on Strike to Total Wage and Salary Workers Ontario Jurisdiction per cent.	Canada per cent.
1941	941,000	27,979	3.0	3.4
1942	975,000	27,179	2.8	4.1
1943	1,077,000	36,282	3.4	7.5
1944	1,073,000	31,979	3.0	2.6
1945	1,037,000	46,551 ³	4.5	3.3
1946	1,064,000	48,796	4.6	4.7
1947	1,135,000	17,403	1.5	3.3
1948	1,174,000	14,004	1.2	1.3
1949	1,224,000	29,504	2.4	1.6
1950	1,274,000	41,240	3.2	5.6
1951	1,306,000	37,363 ⁴	2.9	2.8
1952	1,344,000	40,336	3.0	3.2

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE:

WORKERS ON STRIKE TO TOTAL WAGE AND SALARY WORKERS

1941-1946	3.5	4.2
1947-1952	2.4	3.0
1941-1952	2.9	3.6

¹Total wage and salary workers in Ontario, as estimated by the Labour Force Survey section of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, less an estimated number of workers in steam railways, communications and banking, under federal jurisdiction.

²Strike figures from annual reports on strikes and lockouts, published by the federal Department of Labour. These figures do not include workers involved in strikes in industries under federal jurisdiction.

³Official figures adjusted to include an estimated 2,128 workers involved in the packinghouse strike in Ontario.

⁴Compiled from preliminary figures in the Department of Labour monthly report on strikes and lockouts.

*NOTE: Because of the type of classification used in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics published data on employment, it is impossible to obtain exact figures on the number of workers in Ontario who are employed by industries under federal jurisdiction. Reasonably valid estimates can be made for employment in the main federal industries—railways, telephones, radio broadcasting, and banking, but it so far has proved impossible to account for workers in lake shipping, civil aviation, and federal civil servants. Although it is likely that the number involved is a relatively small proportion of the total number of wage and salary workers in Ontario this gap in the available data means that the incidence of strikes in Ontario, as indicated by the percentage figures in this table, tends to be an underestimate.

At the outset, I should like to pay tribute to the good sense and judgment which has been displayed by the great majority of business people and labour leaders in this province. Against the mighty growth of industry in Ontario in the past several years, these men and women have worked hard to promote industrial peace which is the only atmosphere in which industry can thrive

and our people be prosperous. In their bargaining they have been keen and alert and have made substantial gains for their members. At the same time, our business has increased. If ever a province has grown both in its economy and prosperity and the attractiveness of our economic climate, I should like to point to the index which we have in the Department of Labour. Every new

factory and every new shop or office building more than two stories high, and every addition or extension to them must be erected according to plans approved by our engineers. For the last four fiscal years, the value of new plants or buildings is as follows:

1949-50	\$ 65,116,450
1950-51	116,826,900
1951-52	104,088,400
1952-53	158,339,800

Up to the end of February, 1954, the value of new plants for which plans were approved was \$120,078,600.

So you can see we are not falling behind. Industry still has great faith in this province.

For the 4 complete years and the incomplete figures for the current fiscal year, the total value of plans approved was \$564,450,150. This was for every type and kind of industry and business.

Union activity has continued unabated during these past 5 years, and nowhere has the trade union movement made more gains in membership, and I believe, in economic conditions, than in Ontario.

If ever a government has had a vote of confidence as to its approach to industrial relations and economic development, I think it is the present Government of Ontario.

We have not thrown road-blocks in the way of the trade union movement as it moved along in its organization drives. There have been no sudden and unsettling shifts in our policies on labour relations. Both labour and management have realized that it has been our desire to see as much bargaining as possible carried on between the parties themselves without the intervention of the Department of Labour.

We have felt that we have created an atmosphere in which good industrial relations can flourish. We have been impartial in our application of the legislation we administer. At times, we have been accused of being "soft" or "weak," but our critics have mistaken an attitude of confidence on our part that sound judgment would prevail in any situation, even if a dispute were bitter.

All of us have responsibilities and we must assume and discharge them. There is no place where this is so necessary than in connection with collective bargaining. Too often, people are prone to make irresponsible attacks on government to cover up their own indecision, their bad guesses, their lack of qualities of leadership, their lack of courage to face the facts of situations, and to tell these facts to the people they represent.

I believe in people and I have always felt that you must rely on the good sense of the people. I have done that all through my political career, and I have never felt let down in my confidence in the people. I come from a large industrial riding and three times in the 10 years I have been Minister of Labour, I have gone back and laid before its people the record of service of the government and, particularly, what I have tried to do in the Department of Labour. Each time the government has been returned, with a growing representation, to voice the approval of every section of the province. So that only goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, that the people recognize sound administration, and will fight shy of any group or Party that does not treat all sections of our people on the same basis.

And so they prefer to support a government that is drawn from every element of our community seeking to keep this province strong and prosperous.

In the field of industrial relations, we have had some stirring times and difficult problems. But we have never retreated from the idea that government intervention should come only after the parties have done their utmost to resolve their own problems. We are always on the alert for trouble, and will always do our best when we are called on to help.

Before I get into the actual discussion of the things contained in the Act, I would like to mention a few of the things we have included.

With regard to municipal employees, representations have been made continuously to me that these should be

included under the benefits and the provisions of this Act. It is well known that when the Act was first established it was felt that as municipal employees worked for municipal councils properly elected, these men should not be included in the Act, but that if the municipal authorities so wished they could pass a by-law which would have the effect of including them.

I myself have always felt that the municipal employees, like all other workers, should have the right to the benefits and the protection of organization, and come under the protection of the Labour Relations Act. So, hon. members will recall, we changed the Act so as to include all municipal employees. If the municipal council, the elected people of the municipality, decided it did not want the Act to have this effect, it could pass a by-law accordingly.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the results have been very good. A great many municipalities have their employees' organization and there have been very few, indeed, which have seen fit to pass a by-law excluding their people. I say definitely, with these rulings in mind, that for a municipal government to pass a by-law excluding its men is undesirable. In the first place, the men are entitled to its protection, and, in the second place, the citizens of the municipality are entitled also to the protection that this Act provides for the continuance of their services. Without this Act, civic employees can strike overnight. Under this Act, there are certain procedures, conciliation and various other steps, which provide protection for the citizens as well as for the organized workers. So I make the statement very frankly, I do not believe municipal authorities should pass municipal by-laws preventing the men from enjoying the benefits and protection of this Act. However, we do not take that right away from them. They are elected, and they have to appear before the people at the end of their term.

We received many recommendations that there should be strike votes before a union would be permitted to go on strike. I have refused to write anything

of the kind into this Act. I do not think a person would have to be very naive to know that it was not the unions which asked for this. I am one of those who believe that an organization, such as a trade union, has responsibilities. I do not believe any interference with the internal policy of a union is desirable. Unions, after all, have their own constitutions and they should be permitted to conduct their own affairs. I see in this suggestion, if we adopted it, interminable delay which would settle nothing, the necessity of appointing scrutineers, places of voting and a means of deciding who should be eligible to vote on the question of a strike.

No, Mr. Acting Speaker, as has been suggested, I would have to establish who were eligible to vote. Consider what would be entailed. How would I collect the voters? Those hon. members who were present at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Lands and Forests this morning will know how the workers in that particular industry are scattered over miles and miles of bush. How could I ever conduct a vote among such people? It would be impracticable. And I believe it is wrong that legislation should interfere with the conduct of a union. In my opinion, this is the type of thing which should be left to the parties who are concerned in the bargaining. Why should we interfere with the orderly process of the parties determining for themselves what they should include in a collective agreement? That is the privilege of a trade union.

To my way of thinking, this legislation was never intended to do the collective bargaining for either party. This legislation is intended to clear away the preliminary disputes which could arise as to the right of a trade union to represent the employees in a given unit, as to the recognition by the employer of the trade union chosen by his employees as its bargaining agent, so that the parties may get down to bargaining for an agreement.

I have discussed the question of a strike vote before a strike would be legal. I feel if there is any doubt or hesitation on the part of anyone whether

a strike is or is not supported by the employees, this can only be resolved by the men themselves taking a greater interest in the operation of the union to which they belong. Large unions, such as the Railway Brotherhoods, have conducted strike ballots in the past and no one has ever questioned the results. If, through indifference or through any other reason an employee finds himself on strike without expressing his views on the subject, he has no one to blame but himself, because he has not taken any part in the meetings of the union at which strike action is approved.

My experience leads me to believe that the locals of national and international unions are meticulous in carrying out the provisions of their constitutions before carrying out strike action.

In connection with this matter, it is interesting to note that a similar, though less drastic proposal, was formally rejected in the British Parliament last month by Prime Minister Churchill. Sir Waldron Smithers had suggested strikes be made illegal except where the workers themselves voted by secret ballot in favour of the walkout. Sir Winson replied: "The government has no intention of departing from the established tradition in this country, under which the trade union movement is left to manage its own affairs to the fullest extent possible without government interference."

We have had a great deal of discussion concerning the check-off which is considered to be a form of union security. There are no provisions in this Act for compulsory check-offs. I believe the check-off, or any form of union security, should be acquired through collective bargaining. It can and has been achieved, first, by establishing confidence in the minds of the workers and, second, by establishing a feeling of security in the minds of the employers. Organized labour has received great impetus in its efforts in this province. The Act gives the workmen the right to belong to the union of their choice without fear of discrimination. It gives them the right of free bargaining, and it requires the employers to deal with the

workers' representatives. It states the pattern of conciliation and arbitration, and nowhere else has organized labour made the progress that it has made right here in Ontario. The unions' security, in my opinion, is in the realm of collective bargaining, and I will not, as Minister of Labour, recommend legislation in that field. If we followed that course, we would soon legislate collective bargaining out of the picture, and everything would be done by legislation. I might point out there are 12 states in the USA which have legislation for check-off purposes. They require, as would be required here if we passed such legislation, certain things such as the signing of the cards and so on. But in none of these states is it compulsory. The Taft-Hartley Act makes it illegal, although the authorization card is signed. That is exactly what this suggested Act would require. None of those states have legislation requiring collective check-offs, and, if the collective agreement expires, the check-off expires, too. So if the card is signed over there and the agreement terminates, the check-off is gone with the agreement.

The clinching point about all this American legislation is that it does not make the check-off compulsory by legislation, but regulates it where it has been won by collective bargaining. This leads me to believe our position is sound.

As I see it, the best place to leave this question is right in the hands of the parties. Let me turn to the bill itself. One of the first changes we propose to make has to do with the recognition of bargaining through a council of trade unions. The best example I can give is in connection with the great Niagara power project. Wages and working conditions on this immense construction, which involves an expenditure of over \$300 million, have been fixed by collective bargaining between the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission Board and a group of 17 or 18 international trade unions represented by a trade or trades union council. The whole operation has proceeded without a hitch and a collective agreement has been signed. This

shows clearly what can be done in the way of collective bargaining.

We are therefore inserting in the legislation provisions whereby bargaining by such councils will be acknowledged and protection under the legislation given to their agreements. You must understand that bargaining through councils is by voluntary arrangement between the parties, and councils are not given the right to apply for certification under the legislation.

The next important change which is being made is to change the conciliation process to reduce delays. I may say that the question of delay has caused us considerable concern in the department and we have endeavoured to carry out the procedures under the Act.

I am making two suggestions to the Legislature for changes:

- (1) To reduce the times in which steps are to be taken under the Act;

- (2) To empower the Minister of Labour to refuse to appoint a Board of Conciliation where he considers it would serve no useful purpose.

As to the first item, we have cut 24 days off the times provided in the legislation. Five days have been cut from 20 days allowed under section 11 of the Act for the commencement of bargaining. Fifteen days have been cut from the 50 days during which bargaining must continue before an application for conciliation services can be made under the Act. Four days have been cut from the times allowed for the selection of the members and chairmen of boards of conciliation.

I should like to point out to the House that The Labour Relations Act requires that the parties shall "bargain in good faith and make every reasonable effort to make a collective agreement" (section 11). Before the Labour Relations Board will grant a request for conciliation services, it endeavours to satisfy itself that real bargaining has gone on. As many of you are aware, it is unusual if several meetings do not take place between the company and union representatives before an agreement is reached. Re-

member the parties are bargaining "on their own," and no conciliation officer is in the picture at this point.

When the conciliation officer comes on the scene, he has 14 days, or such further time as the parties may agree upon, or as the Minister may allow, to arrange a settlement of the dispute. This period cannot be reduced because our experience shows that all parties are anxious to spend the time in concentrated negotiation. If the time limit expires and the parties are anxious to continue their meetings with the officer, it is obvious that the time will have to be extended to complete the work.

I may say that I am proud of the job which the conciliation service has done. We have 11 officers in this type of work, and for the fiscal year 1952-53, for which our annual report has just been filed, these men handled over 1,000 conciliation matters. 600 were settled by them. Over 100 were still going on at the end of the fiscal year. Some 295 boards of conciliation were established.

The first step in the procedure, therefore, is to get the board constituted, the second is to get it to sit, and the third is to get the report in from the board if a settlement is not effected.

I can say the system has worked very well, even in the face of these difficulties, which we have had and, beyond the reductions in time, I suggest no change.

It rests with the parties to make it work and produce settlements, and we will co-operate to the fullest extent.

The last thing involved in the conciliation procedure is the granting of power to the Minister to refuse to appoint a Board of Conciliation. This is not new. It was in previous legislation, but in 1950 we dropped it. We think it should be restored because each year some situations arise where to appoint a Board of Conciliation would be just a waste of time and money, and accomplishes nothing but delay. Of course, it would be necessary in the case where the Minister has refused a Board of Conciliation that the unions and management be notified within 7 days after the members refused a board that they are in a legal position

to take whatever action they may deem advisable.

Section 6 (2) of the Act is also amended to provide definitely that persons who are employed in a group with skilled craftsmen may also be represented on a craft unit basis by the union through which the skilled workmen bargain.

MR. SALSBERG: Is that new?

HON. MR. DALEY: Yes. There are groups of skilled people who may be possibly in one corner of an industry, for example, operating engineers, or who may be coal passers and probably not particularly skilled, but it is deemed advisable that those people should be included with the people with whom they work in their bargaining unit.

Some of these sections I have here simply deal with the question of the Trade Councils. A great many of the sections are necessary because of the change we are making in that regard, and I will not take up the time of the House at this point with them. These matters can be gone into very thoroughly during the committee stage.

The principal things are those which have been mentioned. I would say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that after a period of 11 years, we are revising this Act. A portion of that time was when the Labour Court was in existence. Then came the pressure of the Unions to change that Labour Court into a Labour Relations Board, where they would have a greater opportunity to express themselves. The court appeared at that time to be too judicial, and the government agreed with them and established the Labour Relations Board.

We have had 11 years' experience now, with amendments brought in from time to time, and I say, Mr. Speaker, in this great industrial province, with the ever-increasing activity of our people, the ever-increasing tempo of the organization of the workers, that our Act has worked extremely well. Had we gone in for these drastic changes which are mentioned, which we have not done, and upset the basic

principles, we have gone along on an even keel with it, improving it wherever it was deemed advisable to do so, and after these 11 years I suggested a revision of the Act which has taken us practically all winter, working with the people who have great knowledge in administering this sort of legislation. I would say probably my associates are as skilled as any body we could find, certainly in this country.

I deem these changes we have suggested here improve our Act, and do not in any way interrupt or interfere with the basic principles, namely that people be allowed to organize, that they be allowed to elect their bargaining representatives, that they be allowed to belong to a union without fear of discrimination, and that employers must, in the event of certification or organization of the workers, deal with them, that negotiations shall be proceeded with in an orderly manner and that we, as a Labour Department, provide the atmosphere for good relationship, a place to meet when things get to the point where negotiations have broken down.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if the House adopt these amendments I have suggested, it will bring about an improvement. It certainly will not be everything everybody would like to see written in; labour would like a great many more things in this. On the other hand, industry would like curtailment of labour's powers, but I say that is a healthy sign. If we were absolutely in agreement with either one of them, I would say there was something wrong with it.

The results which I indicated in the table of the strike position over the period of years, indicates to me that the Act is a good one and I appeal for the support of the hon. members.

MR. SALSBERG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it possible for an hon. member at this stage to speak on the technical side of the motion before the House, that is whether the bill should be read a second time, without touching upon the principle in the legislation contained in that bill?

I am very serious because I would like to speak on the technical aspect of the motion and not on the principle of the legislation contained therein, but I want to argue against the reading of the Act a second time now.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know what the hon. member means.

MR. SPEAKER: We have only one motion before the House, which is that the bill be read a second time. I think there is no question as to the legality of the motion in the ordinary procedure, that the principle of the motion is now under consideration.

I think there can be no other question except as to whether the bill will be read a second time. That is just an opinion, which I present. This is an entirely new question which never has been raised and my immediate opinion is: we have a motion and we can discuss it.

Whether there is a technicality as to whether we should have another motion is something which has never been raised before.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to discuss the technical aspects of the motion: that is, I want to argue that we should not read this bill a second time, without touching on the legislation.

HON. MR. FROST: Without what?

MR. SALSBERG: Without dealing with the legislation contained in the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: I beg your pardon, there is nothing unreasonable about it at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is perfectly in order and there is no question as to the technicalities involved. We have an ordinary motion which was made, that we now have second reading of the bill, and I do not think we are going to begin arguing the matter of the technical procedure of second reading. If we did, we would be here for many years to come, because if I allowed this

to go through every time we had second readings, and ruled it may be discussed technically, we would never get through. I think we must accept the principle that we have a motion for second reading and discuss that motion.

MR. SALSBERG: I did not intend to speak on the legislation and I am aware that the hon. Prime Minister indicated I would have an opportunity to speak on the principle of it in committee stage, but after listening to the introduction by the hon. Minister I have decided to speak on the technical aspects of the motion before us, which I think is quite in order.

In other words, I intend to speak as to whether the motion should carry, whether the bill before us should be read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: The member has a perfect right if he wants to speak on second reading, but that is not a technical matter at all.

MR. SALSBERG: I could move that it not be read a second time, could I?

MR. SPEAKER: If you have some hon. member second it.

MR. SALSBERG: Maybe someone will. I have a motion already written that it not be read a second time. Now, if someone is willing to second the motion—

Well, then, those who might second it, might want some time to consider. I will discuss it later.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to make it quite clear that if an attempt is going to be made to have one speech dealing with the technical aspects of the motion, and a second speech on the same subject dealing with the principle of the bill, the hon. member will be ruled out of order immediately. We know there is only one speech allowed on second reading. I hope that is not what the hon. member had in mind.

MR. SALSBERG: Frankly, the "hon. member" did have that in mind, but now that you disallow it. I will of

course abide by your ruling, and I want to speak on the bill in second reading now.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this action of the government as being in utter contempt of the trade union movement of this province. I have yet to see a more contemptuous approach to so large and so important a section of our population as is revealed by the action of the government in insisting that this bill, which is perhaps the most important labour legislation introduced by the government in the last 4 years, should be rushed through today and receive second reading.

It is all right for the hon. Minister of Labour to get up and read a prepared sermon on the great accomplishments of his department, and hope that this will mollify people and will be accepted as gospel insofar as this government's labour policies and accomplishments are concerned.

I say that in insisting on the course which this government is pursuing, it is not only cynical and contemptuous of the unions in refusing, first, that this legislation go to committee, so that the trade unions would have a chance to express an opinion on this legislation and make presentations, but the government goes a step further and insists that it be discussed even though the Opposition is not prepared to discuss it, and even though the government fully knows that the trade unions of this province did not have a chance to properly acquaint themselves with the bill which is now before the House.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, was this; the bill was introduced last Thursday, a week ago today. It did not come before this House in printed form before Tuesday afternoon, and late Tuesday afternoon at that. We found it when we came into the Chamber. We had a night session on Tuesday; we were all occupied as the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) has said since then, and I was not able to make copies available to some union leaders who were in touch with me about it until yesterday afternoon, when they were mailed. They may have received copies

of this bill today, but they have not had a chance to discuss it, digest it, or express their opinion even privately to hon. members or privately to the hon. Prime Minister, or privately to the hon. Minister of Labour.

Therefore, they are, on the one hand, denied the most elementary right granted every other group of the population when legislation affecting them is before the House, but they are now also denied the opportunity of making personal presentations either to government members or to private members.

HON. MR. DALEY: Fifty of them made presentations this morning to the government.

MR. SALSBERG: This amounts to an insult to the trade unions of this province, and they do not deserve that.

Mr. Speaker, in the House of Commons—

HON. MR. DALEY: Does the hon. member think this wins favour with the trade union movement for him? No trade union movement would have the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. PORTER: They are all against the hon. member. I do not know what he is getting all stirred up about.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Diefenbaker came out with an attack on the Liberal Government, on the way it treats the House of Commons, and Parliament generally. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Diefenbaker—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. member for St. Andrew, in no place in his lifetime has he received more indulgence and consideration than in this House.

MR. SALSBERG: What indulgence?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member asks to be placed on committees, and he is given that opportunity. He is given the opportunity to speak, and then he talks about "over-riding the rights of Parliament and the people."

May I point out that in no Legislature—and I include all the Parliaments of Canada and elsewhere—has there been more care taken to give the representatives of the people full opportunity to exercise the right to look into matters, than has been afforded here. I refer the hon. member to the extent of the committees' work in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that what he is saying is entirely incorrect.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I will never say anything that is incorrect, and I feel the hon. Prime Minister should accept my assurance, that I will never do that. I never do.

HON. MR. FROST: All right, Mr. Speaker; I accept what the hon. member says, but his actions do not lend colour to what he has asserted.

I think the hon. member should recognize this matter was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. This morning, the hon. Minister of Labour mentioned it to one of the important delegations here. There is no secret about it. The matter has been discussed and re-discussed. The delegation seemed to be familiar with it—

MR. SALSBERG: They are? Mr. Speaker, the interruption by the hon. Prime Minister is not unwelcome. I do not mind listening to him. I think he does not mind listening to me, unless when it hurts him. I will say that when it hurts him, it hurts me more. I do not like to say these things, but I say them because I think I must.

All I said was that Mr. Diefenbaker, in the House of Commons, experienced nothing compared to the procedure followed in this House, when he complained against the manner in which Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe handled certain matters.

A piece of legislation of this sort should be taken before the Labour Committee, and the trade union movement should not be contemptuously told, "We are not interested in your opinions." The hon. members in the Opposition

have not had the opportunity of looking at the bill. That is something of which I have never experienced since I have been here. I do not think the government should have taken any such stand in regard to the bill.

If the bill had dealt with cows or horses—

HON. MR. DALEY: The hon. member said that yesterday.

MR. SALSBERG: —or any other animal, the bill would have been sent to the proper committee, and notification been given to every association who had to do with the subject matter of the bill.

There was a bill introduced recently in regard to the dairy industry. Certain branches of the industry came and asked that the bill be held back, because they had only just received a copy of it. Of course, the government quite properly, and very agreeably, consented to hold back the bill. But, on this occasion, the government refuses to hold this bill back for second reading, even though the Opposition has said it has had no chance to study it. The reason is obvious. I do not think the labour movement deserves this contemptuous approach. The government could have waited for a few days. It knew it was going to introduce this legislation. It could have been presented earlier than a week ago. It is not proper, since this bill was only presented to us in this Chamber on Tuesday, at three o'clock, in printed form. Certainly, the least the hon. members on this side of the House are entitled to is sufficient time to study this bill and the trade union movement should have an opportunity of studying a matter which affects it so greatly.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is creating a man of straw. The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) raised the point that consideration of this bill should be left over. I pointed out to the hon. member the passage of time, and the fact we would like to proceed, and said that the very able explanation given by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) would assist all hon. members

of the House to understand the legislation. I should think the hon. member for St. Andrew, having heard that explanation, with his capacity to understand, by now should be thoroughly conversant with the principles of the bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. Prime Minister it was not an explanation of a bill; it was a hallelujah to the hon. Minister himself, and his department.

HON. MR. FROST: It is quite impossible not to give some rather eulogistic references to very able and good legislation. I said to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) and later to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that the explanation given by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) would probably clarify the situation, and then the hon. members would have full opportunity to discuss the whole matter again in committee.

I say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Cochrane South, the hon. member for St. Andrew, and to all other hon. members of the House, if they can show me a convincing and good reason for adding anything to the bill, the government is broad-minded enough to accept such additions when the time comes. I think that gives the hon. members the greatest possible latitude.

I cannot imagine the hon. member for St. Andrew being able to do that, but the hon. member for Cochrane South is a very able gentleman and he may have something to add to this bill when it is in committee. We will be only too glad to give it the fullest consideration.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon or evening, a dis-

cussion arose, originating with the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) and referred to by the hon. Minister of Health, in relation to the fluoridation of water.

I have noticed several articles in the press referring to the advisability of this water treatment. I know there were articles written in some papers, in support of fluoridation, and some against.

I realize the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) has pronounced views on this. He produced some references as to the effect on the teeth of people, which, I think, carries a good deal of weight. With the known shortage of dentists in Ontario, as was referred to in the budget, if we could do anything to save the teeth of people, we want to do it.

I have discussed this matter with the hon. Minister of Health. There is a serious question whether fluorine, if put into water, will not have some effect on the health of the people in other ways.

As the result of what has been said, we have decided to refer this matter to the University of Toronto, to the Department of Dentistry, and the Faculty of Medicine, and ask them to make a complete and thorough investigation, and report to the hon. Minister of Health in due course.

Of course, these things usually cost some money. We are prepared to pay the expenses of the university for obtaining, for us, a report on the whole subject, which, perhaps, will assist in clarifying the issue.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (Continued)

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) would like to repeat this question in regard to Vote 57.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Minister if he will wait for a moment as the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) would like to say a few words.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Certainly.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, when I spoke of the fluoridation experiment in Brantford, I was speaking of the actual results of the tests, while those opposed to it speak of something which might happen here, or might happen there.

We have had 8 years of this experiment in Brantford. The government is represented on our Fluorine Committee. We also have a representative from the Canadian Dental Association, and Dr. Brown, from the Federal Department of Health, is on the committee. This matter has been thoroughly investigated, and each year has shown an increase in the dental health of our children. We are speaking of results which have been obtained, not of what might be. In addition to that, we have not found in any way at all, according to our Medical Officer of Health, that it has been injurious to any of our people.

The opposition to fluoridation seems to speak of something in Africa, or some other place, and what might be happening here and there. We are speaking of what has actually happened, and the results which have been obtained.

I believe the money which has been paid by our city, and the government, will be fully repaid by the improvement insofar as the health of our children is concerned. Also, I am sure it will extend to the rest of Canada when people see the results we have obtained.

The Medical Officer of Health in Hamilton attended one of our meetings. At the conclusion, he said, "I am amazed when I see what you have accomplished. Why can we not get it started in Hamilton?"

It is only the pretenders who oppose it, those who do not know what will happen in the future.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I know that the government has been contributing to the experiment in Brantford, ever since its inception during the time the late hon. Mr. Kelley was Minister of Health, the predecessor of the present hon. Minister. I am aware there is provincial representation on the board.

The experiment is one which is of very great interest. The purpose of having the University of Toronto look into this matter is because the provincial members on the board feel there are matters of great interest in connection with this. As the hon. Minister of Health said yesterday, there has not been a determination on the part of Dr. Berry and others, in respect to this important work. Perhaps it is time to have the experiment viewed by some experts, who are outside of it altogether, who are independent, and can look at this problem, probably in a more objective way.

MR. OLIVER: Have there been examinations and reports made by the Dental Association and the Medical Association?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I do not know.

MR. OLIVER: Are they on file now?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. We have a file on it about 40 inches thick.

HON. MR. FROST: As big as the Trans-Canada file.

HON. MR. MACKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): As a matter of fact, it is a little larger.

The trouble is that there is a great mass of this evidence and its implications are not yet very clear. There are three factors involved. The first is oral hygiene, the second is the excess of carbohydrate intake; the third is the proportion of sodium chloride being added to the water. I was very glad to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say he might have the University of Toronto look into this and give us an unbiased report. I have approached them and asked: "Does this do good?" The answer was: "Yes. It increases the thickness of the enamel of the tooth, which means it is an aid in preventing decay." If I go further and ask them: "Does it do any harm to the system in any way?" the answer is: "We do not know. We doubt if we shall know before 1956 or 1957." I think we should

wait until the university has made a survey and reported to us.

MR. GRUMMETT: I wish to ask a question about Vote 57, item 4. That concerns the payment of the \$5 examination fee covering examinations of expectant mothers. The total amount set out in the Estimates is \$295,000. This would provide for 59,000 examinations. I wish to ask the hon. Minister whether he thinks this amount of money is being spent to the advantage of the people of the province, or whether it is being spent to the advantage of the members of the medical profession who receive the fees. How does this come into the general over-all picture? Is it to the benefit of the people of Ontario?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, the question asked by the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) has a great deal of merit. We have already given it careful consideration. This money was provided, in the first place, for two reasons—first, in order that expectant mothers might go to their doctors earlier in pregnancy, and, second, that it might help in the prevention of V.D.

We in the Department of Health feel that this should be carried on for another year or so, probably longer. We feel the provision has done a great deal of good. How long we must carry it on is problematic, but we think it would be a great error to stop at the present time. Nevertheless, we have certainly given much consideration to the question asked.

HON. MR. FROST: I would be interested to learn the reaction to this of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett). He mentioned the desirability of this provision. Has he any particular opinion on it?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) does not think that this money should go to the lawyers?

MR. GRUMMETT: Oh no, nor to the doctors. I am doubtful whether this means so much to the people. I am

doubtful whether it means anything in the way of prevention of disease. The hon. Minister has suggested that it might reveal the presence of venereal disease sooner. I doubt whether that is a fact. Those who have venereal disease and know it would go to their own doctor for examination or for treatment without taking advantage of this provision. I cannot see that the results produced justify the expenditure of the money we are spending from year to year on these examinations.

MR. NIXON: Does this \$300,000 come off the patients' bill from the doctor?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We have no control over doctors' bills, but it certainly did not come off my bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): One may question whether the single visit is satisfactory. The conclusion reached from that should be, I suggest, that the service needs extending so as to provide more than a single visit. I certainly do not think we should leave the matter suspended in mid-air with a suggestion, as far as I can gather, that the whole experiment may be done away with. In other provinces, much more is done for expectant mothers by the provincial health department than is done in Ontario, though I am not going to discuss this in detail at the moment. There may be a question as to whether one visit is enough. That does not prove the service should be done away with, but that it ought to be extended in the future.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I would say this, in response to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). I can assure him that it will not be held in mid-air. We shall give consideration either to continuing this service or to spending the money in a better way.

MR. SALSBERG: Not without notice?

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no.
Votes 57 and 58 agreed to.

MR. D. H. MORROW (Carleton): Under Vote 59, item 5, I note that \$115,000 is being provided to train nursing assistants. I think this is definitely a step in the right direction, providing that the graduates do not go beyond their training and infringe on the duties that should be performed by registered nurses.

What I want to ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) is this: does the sum of \$115,000 cover more than one training course? I understand that in the City of Ottawa there is such a course being set up for certified nursing assistants, and I was wondering whether there are similar courses to be set up in other parts of the province?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: When I became Minister of Health in August, 1950, we had about 38 per cent. shortage in the nursing field. Today, in spite of the increase in the population amounting to about 1 million, we have reduced that shortage by 10 per cent. until the shortage is now a little over 20 per cent. Last fall, we had at least 25 or 30 per cent. more qualified applicants wishing to enter our 60 training schools in Ontario and our general hospitals and other hospitals—more than the training facilities could take care of.

That applies to registered nurses. In all of these courses, after they graduate, they receive a bursary of \$1,025 per year in addition to money for books, and for transportation if they have to come from some distance away. In the last few years we have graduated about 50 students under the bursary scheme. There are, in addition, a few who are on their own. These have been absorbed. On the whole, we are just about keeping abreast of our population increase so far as public health nurses are concerned. We are very proud of what has been done. With regard to our nursing associations, the first class graduated in 1947. Since 1946 we have graduated 1,143 nursing assistants and we have 119 at present in training. Formerly, we had schools at Toronto, Fort William and Kingston. We are moving the Kingston school, at the request of the Kingston people, to Ottawa. We have a new

school at Hamilton, and we are contemplating a new school at Sudbury. So we shall have altogether, this fall, 5 schools operating for these nursing assistants instead of 3, a 40 per cent. increase, and these girls are doing a marvellous job.

MR. GRUMMETT: Can the hon. minister (Mr. Phillips) tell us whether many of these assistants go on to become registered nurses? Do many of them go on and take the ordinary nurse's course?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We are hoping in future to have 2 admission standards, although applicants will take the same course. Our present admission standards call for 2 years in high school. Now, after a girl has done 5 years, she may go on. But, as to the past, the answer is "No." They have not had the admission requirements to go on and train to be registered nurses.

MR. MORROW: I am pleased to hear there are more centres being established for these certified nursing assistants' courses, and that the department is giving help to more registered nurses to qualify for employment in public health work. It is generally recognized we have a great shortage of registered nurses in this province, and it is very difficult to attract more entrants to the profession. I have often felt that, perhaps, we should have some sort of incentive to attract our senior matriculation girls graduating from our high schools in order that they might have encouragement to take up nursing as a career.

To go through our Teachers' Colleges, and even at the University of Ottawa, those in need may apply for loans to help them through their year. I was thinking, perhaps, some sort of incentive could be given to our high school senior matriculant girls in order to outfit them and prepare them for a nursing career, because it is that first year which is difficult for them to get by financially, and they have to receive considerable aid from their parents. I was wondering if the department had ever given any

serious consideration to providing some incentive to attract more of our girls to the nursing profession as a career.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, in the first instance, 3 years ago we brought in capital grants for \$1,000 for each nurse's bed, and shortly after that the Federal Government—we thought they would match our \$1,000—"came across" with \$500 a bed. This has been of great help to provide proper nurses' residences for our nurses-in-training. Secondly, regarding paying these nurses, we had a surplus of 25 to 30 per cent. last fall. If we started paying a subsidy direct to the nurse, what about those going through for school teachers or any other course? There is a shortage in practically every profession.

If any increase were to be made in this direction in the future, it should be toward the training school itself, in order to provide better facilities. That was in the mind of the hon. Prime Minister and his government when we brought forward the first grants in Canada for nurses' residences, which was \$1,000 a bed.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, do I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) to say there was a surplus of nurses of 25 to 30 per cent. last fall?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: No, no; in the number of qualified applicants who wished to go into training as of September 1st, 1953.

MR. OLIVER: There was a surplus?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We had a 25 to 30 per cent. surplus—of those going in.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: You mean increase or surplus?

HON. MR. FROST: More than could be accommodated.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: A surplus, more than could be taken care of by our 64 training schools. I think 64 is exactly the right number.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, this raises a very important point, because if we had a surplus of that many who wanted to go in for training and could not find accommodation, and at the same time our hospitals are starved for nurses, then it is obvious we have to expand the training facilities. There are hospitals in the City of Toronto that are compelled to keep entire floors closed because of a shortage of nurses. If we have reached the stage where there are more applicants than training facilities, then for goodness sake let us provide the funds for the immediate and rapid expansion of those training facilities, so that the hospitals will have the nurses they need.

Votes 59 and 60 agreed to.

On Vote 61.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) like to describe the situation in the province in relation to Vote 61?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: What was the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question, please?

MR. OLIVER: Are we getting any control of that disease, or what is the picture?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Today the picture is certainly very much better than it was a few years ago. In 1944 we had 135 cases per 100,000. That was during one of the war years. Last year we had 15. With respect to gonorrhoea, 10 years ago, in 1944, we had 200 cases. In 1945 we had 205 cases. It then dropped and we had only 50 cases last year. That means a drop in the total number of venereal disease cases in the province from 335 in 1944 to 64 last year, and that is on a per 100,000 basis.

Vote 61 agreed to.

On Vote 62.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, on item No. 5 of Vote 62, what are the provisions of The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act in relation to payment? Is the patient required or expected to pay for treatment in these instances?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: As a matter of fact, for the last 2 years, 1952 and 1953, we paid for around 89 to 90 per cent. of all the patients in the hospital. Around 3 per cent. or 4 per cent. paid for themselves, and the rest were paid out of donations made from foundations which were built up, and the interest used. A few of those came from the Workmen's Compensation Board, and also the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Votes 62 to 66 inclusive, agreed to.

On Vote 67.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Chairman, with regard to item 9 of Vote 67, I think perhaps this is the appropriate time to mention the position with respect to the department with which the hon. Minister is dealing, in regulating and supervising health insurance contracts.

I think this then indicates a very definite increase in grants for hospital purposes, for beds and facilities of that sort, but I think I am correct in saying that there still is a very considerable shortage of hospital beds and services in some centres in the province at any given moment.

In relation to these health insurance contracts, and I am referring to them generally—the Blue Cross is the best known one—they do, in their selling, say that they supply hospital services for every type of disease, illness or injury. While I subscribe to such a service, and my family and my office staff are similarly covered, none of us—and I touch wood—have had to draw on it to any considerable extent, but it has been drawn to my attention that there have been serious cases where a wife or some member of a family covered by this sort of insurance badly needs hospitalization, but because of the shortage of accommodation, had been unable to get it.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in situations of that sort, these contracts should provide for some equivalent, whether it be in a convalescent hospital or even in the homes themselves, where some equivalent to the service could be supplied in such a manner, that where one cannot get actual hospitalization at

the time of the injury or the illness, the insurance contract should provide for some equivalent or some consideration for the cost that is involved. I should like to suggest to the hon. Minister that consideration be given to requiring the insurance contracts along these lines, where they are supervised, to make some provision of that sort.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Chairman, if I may just say a word in that connection, I would like to make it clear that a great majority of the contracts issued by private insurers, other than the Blue Cross, do include a provision whereby people can be taken care of at home as well as in the hospital. I should not like the hon. members to gain the impression that all contracts carry that clause; but the great majority of them do say you can stay either at home or in the hospital.

While I am on the subject, as has been said many times before—and the situation has not changed a great deal over the past year or two—one of the main reasons that at the present time, we are not in a position to institute a hospital plan, is because there just is not the accommodation in the hospitals to take care of the people, and if we were covered by a plan throughout the province, taking care of everybody, we would simply be offering a service we could not possibly supply, because hospitals have not been extended to take care of the additional need if that were the case.

I just wanted to bring out those points.

MR. SALSBERG: May I ask a question with respect to item 5, Vote 67, "Psychiatric Service in Local Communities or in Public Hospitals," for which there is \$25,000 provided. Last year the amount was smaller, and it was broken down. I am not concerned about the fact it is not broken down this year, but it seems the amount is rather small. If the hon. Minister is prepared to give some explanation, it would be appreciated. Does this mean payment for psychiatric service given by local psychiatrists, or does it mean

travelling psychiatrists in the department? Because the amount is small for out-of-town services.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: What we are actually doing is simply carrying the old load until these new psychiatric units in general hospitals are set up. Then we shall have to survey the overall programme and deal with it from there. But this is really the old programme, and it has nothing to do with the new psychiatric units in general hospitals.

Vote 67 agreed to.

On Vote 68.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would give me an explanation of item 4, Vote 68, "Workmen's Compensation Board; Awards and Costs for Mental Health Grants"? I just wondered how the Workmen's Compensation Board ties in with mental health. Does that cover injuries received by men which have resulted in a mental breakdown of some kind?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: No, it does not, Mr. Chairman. Most of our public hospitals carry workmen's compensation for their staff, and this item provides for accidents among our own staff.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Vote 68, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) a question? And may I preface it by saying I appreciate the statement he made in the House yesterday in which he indicated the increase in the number of beds in our mental hospitals in the province, although I confess that I should like to see, as I will, those remarks in print, so as to have a better idea of the numbers, but the question I am concerned with is this: We were told by the Ontario Health Survey Committee that we required 11,416 beds, in addition to what we had at that time, to relieve overcrowding; and, according to the same survey, after we shall have added 11,416 beds, we shall require 574 additional beds annually.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Is the hon. member talking about mental health beds only?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, I think that was the recommendation of the "Ontario Health Survey Report." Obviously, this is a very "tall" order, but that was considered to be the minimum required. Could the hon. Minister tell us whether the number of beds added since that report was presented meets these minimum requirements, and whether our annual additions are in accordance with the minimum annual objectives they set? It is the general impression, and I confess that I am sharing it, that despite the increases in bed accommodation—and there are increases, a number of hospitals are being constructed, some are being finished and others will be finished—that despite these increases we are falling behind rather than catching up with the minimum requirements set out.

I appreciate the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister may not have the comparative figures. If not, he could bring them in when he has them. I am not pressing for them if he has not got them at hand. But if he has the figures, I think it would help us to see the picture in its entirety rather than have a vague idea of the whole situation. When the hon. Minister mentions 1,000 beds, or 1,500, or 500, it does not mean much unless we compare it with what was presented to the province as the minimum requirements 4 years ago.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I will submit that later.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister has not those comparative figures now? All right, thank you.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, item 11, on Vote 68, "Printing and Stationery, \$70,000." I presume the greater part of that expenditure must have been for printing, not stationery. I find also with respect to printing there is the general expense item, then there is an item of \$40,000 Main Office, and Mental Health

\$20,000. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) tell us for what purpose those sums of money are being expended, on printing and stationery?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The hon. member must remember we have 17 mental hospitals, with about 18,000 patients within them. We have to buy stationery for all those hospitals, which includes charts for the nurses, and such items, which amount to a terrific figure. Most of that \$70,000 is for the 17 mental hospitals.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I know this is a very small item, item 8 of Vote 68, but I am puzzled as to what it covers. It says, "Clothing for Bailiffs Removing Patients."

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We have two bailiffs, one male and one female, and we provide them with a suit and a dress, and other clothing, at least once a year, as they do a great deal of travelling, mostly on the train, and they wear out their clothes. That practice has been carried on for years.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 68, could the hon. Minister tell us, before we get down to the separate hospitals, how he is coping with the problem of trained psychiatrists to handle the patients in the hospitals? We are aware that a few years ago we were hopelessly short of psychiatrists in our hospitals, and I think we are entitled to know what improvement has taken place, and if possible, to have the figures of the psychiatrists now employed as compared with those of 4 years ago.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We are making great progress in this field. We are getting a better class of psychiatrists, that is, with respect to the young men going into this field, because of the fact that we give substantial bursaries, which amount for single men to around \$200 per month plus books, tuition, and \$250 for married men.

MR. SALSBERG: How many bursaries have we given?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: There are 20 in all, and 12 of them are bursaries.

MR. SALSBERG: How many psychiatrists have we now, Mr. Chairman, in our mental hospitals?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I am not certain of the exact number, but about 20 in each year, and it takes 3 years, so we have 60 in training; we graduate 20 each year.

MR. SALSBERG: How many in service, actually employed in the hospitals?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I would say 75 to 80 certified psychiatrists, fully trained.

On Vote 68.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT: On 68, item 10, "Removal Expenses of Officials." What does that cover? Discharges, or dismissals, or what does it mean?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: This is an item which is rather uncontrollable. It refers to removals of members of our staff from time to time, for instance, from London to Hamilton, or to another hospital. It is in the interest of our over-all service, just the same as they move the provincial police, bank managers, ministers—or politicians.

MR. GRUMMETT: You pay the cost of moving their furniture, or part of it?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We pay all their moving costs. If we ask one to move from London to Hamilton, we pay his expenses.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, can the hon. Minister tell the House what amount of money has been collected by the province from the patients in our mental institutions, during this last year?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The total cost of our mental hospitals will amount to approximately \$20 million. Last year, we collected \$3,052,000 or approximately one-seventh.

MR. OLIVER: How much of that was collected from patients or inmates, and what amount from the municipalities? Has the hon. Minister the breakdown of that?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: There was nothing from the municipalities, except approximately \$70,000 which has been collected for the Epileptic Division at Woodstock. After the legislation we are putting through this year, that will be out of business.

MR. OLIVER: Is the hon. Minister saying there is no billing on the municipalities for mental cases?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: That is correct, from now on, none. Previous to this year, it was for the Epileptic Division only.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, can the hon. Minister tell us what, if any, plans have been prepared for the establishment of a hospital for mentally-ill children, as differentiated from the hospitals for retarded children?

I might say, Mr. Chairman, this necessity was pointed up very strongly by the tragic event which took place recently in Orillia, where an Indian boy, after a skirmish with a guard, died. The evidence seems to indicate this boy was not an ordinary mentally-retarded child, but was mentally disturbed, and there is a difference. He is only one of hundreds of children, who are mentally disturbed, and who need special treatment and attention.

At the present time, such children are committed to the hospitals for mentally-retarded children, and are not really helped to recover, as is the case with patients in mental hospitals. They are forced of necessity to fit into the mode of these institutions. At times, these institutions have not the trained personnel which is required for the particular mentally-sick young children, and we had this shocking revelation as a result.

I am not underestimating the difficulties of the task of the staff in Orillia, or in any hospital of that nature. Their

task is a very difficult one, as is the position of the doctors in charge, and their entire staff. But having said that I must also say it is shocking to find that what preceded this fatal scuffle, I am quoting from the *Telegram* of February 10th, which I think should be brought to the attention of the House:

Thirty-five-year-old guard relates that Albert Morrison entered the dining room of his cottage at the hospital, the morning he died. The youth had his coat and trousers over his night attire. Moreover, Morrison was being punished for running away the previous Saturday night. Morrison's punishment was to wear his night-gown for four days.

Then it goes on:

I told him he would have to go upstairs and take off his clothes, but he said he wanted his breakfast first. I took him by the elbow. I did not apply any force upon him. Albert suddenly made a grab for my groin, and I grabbed both his elbows.

That is a very, very serious thing. The punishment handed out for running away is positively grotesque. Imagine punishing him by compelling him to wear his night attire for 4 days. This boy was not mentally retarded, but mentally disturbed. But he was clear enough not to want to come out to the dining room for breakfast in his night-shirt, so he put on his coat and trousers, and a scuffle developed, and as a result, he died.

What does that indicate? That the hospital is not prepared to treat that type of patient.

I want to emphasize the necessity of establishing a mental hospital for mentally-disturbed children, where they would be given the type of treatment, which would enable them to come out and take their places in society, rather than meeting such a tragedy as was the case in Orillia.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the monologue, or the question—I am not sure which one it

was—may I say, the punishment of having to wear a nightgown was very light.

The orders are that there shall be no punishment in any mental hospital or any mentally-defective hospital in Ontario. We do not consider this as punishment. Any loving father or mother might carry out this same sort of punishment, if you want to call it that, perhaps a great deal worse.

The hon. members will remember we are warning our staff every day, that is the attendants; the nurses, do not need to be warned on account of their training—that they must not in any way hand out any form of punishment, as they are dealing with mentally-ill and mentally-defective people.

Regarding the mentally-ill children. We are providing sufficient beds for them. There are not many mentally-ill children, but we have a great number who are mentally defective. We are providing for them in the new building on Queen Street, about which I spoke yesterday.

The determination of the “mentally-retarded” depends entirely on the I.Q., which is an educational matter as well as of health, and I want to compliment the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) for bringing forward last year, legislation to provide \$200,000 to start a pilot project, to look after these mentally-retarded children, between the auxiliary in our public schools, for the I.Q.’s between 50 and 70, and those who should be in the institutions, with an I.Q. of less than 50.

I can assure the hon. members that no mental patient, as long as I am Minister, will receive any punishment.

MR. SALSBERG: You do not think that is punishment? I am obliged to

say that any loving father who took a mentally-disturbed boy, and punished him in this way, would himself be qualified as a patient for mental treatment.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: All right. If that is the worst punishment anybody gets—

MR. SALSBERG: He just died, that is all.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: That is not what killed him.

HON. MR. FROST moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply reports that it has come to certain resolutions, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: May I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that it is 6 o'clock.

MR. OLIVER: What are we proceeding with this evening?

HON. MR. FROST: The Budget Debate, and Estimates.

MR. OLIVER: Which Estimates do you intend taking up tonight?

HON. MR. FROST: Department of Highways.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the Chair.

The House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, March 25, 1954

Evening Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 25, 1954.

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Doucett	809
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost	838
Homes of the Friendless and Infants Homes, bill respecting, reported	838
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, reported	838
Royal Botanical Gardens, bill respecting, reported	838
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, reported	838
City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, reported	838
St. Michael's College, bill respecting, reported	838
Town of Fort Erie, bill respecting, reported	838
Department of Education Act, 1954, reported	838
Mining Act, bill to amend, reported	838
Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, reported	838
Bees Act, 1954, reported	840
Agricultural Societies Act, bill to amend, reported	840
Plant Diseases Act, 1954, reported	841
Livestock and Livestock Products Act, bill to amend, reported	841
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	841

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1954.

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed.

ESTIMATES—DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate this evening, I should like to say that before coming to the House I was reminded by a friend of mine of the anniversary of my maiden speech in the House. The only difference is that I am starting out tonight at 8 o'clock instead of 5 minutes after midnight. I remember that occasion very well. I sat in the back row beside the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Kerr).

Tonight I am going to give hon. members an account of the Department of Highways over the period of years during which I have had the honour of administering it.

However, before I do so, I would like to draw the attention of hon. members of this House to the comparatively short time which has elapsed since this country prepared Estimates and provided money for the building of highways. In fact, I was very much interested recently to get information about the first road built under contract in this province. The wording itself, I am sure, would take us back to those early days and provide a period of reflection on the great progress Ontario has had over the past 150 years.

Here is a photostatic copy of, as far as I can learn, the first contract, made in the Town of York, Province of Upper Canada with the Council:

for to make a certain piece of road from the Town of York to the Humber River Witnesseth that I Joseph Burton Doath agree to take Roderick McDonal George Storing and Jacob Clock in joint partnership with me in doing and finishing said Road and we do bind each of us separately to do an equal part of the work and to bare an equal share of all the expence to finish said Road so that it will bare inspection and we do agree to **commence** working on said road on the 21 of this instant and to continue until said road is completed and then we are to have 32 \$ pr mile only that part that is cut over that we are to have 9 \$ pr mile and the crops waying 12/- pr Rod and we to divide said money equally among us fore—to all which we do agree and bind ourselves in the panel sum of five hundred dollars currant money of this province for the true preformance hereof as witnefs our hand and seal this eighteenth day of March one thousand and eight hundred and five.

Witness present
Jno Stout signed
Misner Donaldson
signed

Signed	Joseph Burton (LS)
Signed	Roderick McDonald (LS)
Signed	his mark George Storing (LS)
Signed	Jacob Clock x his mark (LS)

When we think of how young this province is, and the progress that has been made during that period, we realize that in the life of a man, great things can happen, but that is a comparatively short time in the life of a province such as ours.

At the beginning of 1953, Ontario's road mileage totalled 81,281 linear miles, more than 3 times the length of

this earth's equator. That huge total subdivides as follows: King's Highways in the provincial system, 7,871 miles of which 1,112 miles are paved with concrete; 3,913 miles with bituminous asphalt; 835 miles with bituminous surfacing; and 2,010 miles surfaced with gravel and crushed stone preparatory to paving. The provincial system of secondary roads extends for 2,709 miles. Total mileage of the King's Highway system is 10,580 miles. Remainder of the 81,281 miles is made up of municipal roads in county and township road systems, unorganized township roads; and 3 systems of urban municipalities.

Adhering to policy laid down when I took office, which was that all new work done should be calculated to benefit Ontario's people generally as well as those in particular localities, the Ontario Department of Highways accomplished a major amount of construction work in 1953.

During the past year, preliminary figures show, we constructed 604 miles of pavement in the course of modernizing existing main highways. This reconstruction has been going on since 1946, the first full year following the Second World War when all highway work in Ontario, including maintenance, was kept to an absolute minimum. The work done in 1953, included laying 292 miles of bituminous hot mix pavement, ordinarily 22 feet wide and 3 inches thick. In addition, 140 miles of bituminous hot mix was applied in the course of resurfacing pavement. Finally, 172 miles of bituminous road mix pavement, generally known as "mulch pavement" was applied.

On entirely new jobs, the Department laid 52 miles of bituminous hot mix pavement on new highway mileage.

Great results are not obtained without great effort and, in this age, huge expenditure of money. Early figures indicate that close to \$137,500,000 was expended on provincial highways and the municipal roads systems of Ontario in 1953. Of that total, about \$28,046,353 went to municipal road authorities as subsidies for the \$54,590,300 of work undertaken in 1953 by those elected bodies.

There was, also, 137 miles of grading work on existing King's Highways, required in modernizing and improving older sections; and 165 miles of new highways were graded. This work, of course, was largely in connection with Ontario's 1,404 miles of the Trans-Canada Highway which is now well advanced, or on major traffic congestion relief projects near larger urban communities.

Now we turn from statistics involving miles and dollars and cents to discuss the services rendered. As I try to emphasize constantly, the purpose of the Department of Highways is to render service to the people of Ontario. In serving them, we serve our country as a whole.

One of the most striking services rendered by the Ontario Department of Highways is in keeping open all of the 10,000 miles forming the provincial system throughout each winter for free and unhampered movement of traffic. This great winter maintenance job means that weather bars no workers from their jobs; no farmers from markets situated on King's Highways or secondary roads; and no transport of materials on the highways.

Backing up our winter maintenance service is a Road Information and Weather Reporting Service which keeps motorists advised about weather conditions in winter for 24 hours each day, 7 days a week. Much of the information about conditions comes directly from operators of huge snow plows and sanding vehicles equipped with two-way radio telephones.

Year-round maintenance of our highways, which includes keeping them open in winter, keeps commerce moving in all seasons. This creates a vast new reservoir of wealth, real wealth, for our province and for Canada as a whole.

In the way of creating wealth, the Ontario Department of Highways is very much interested in our growing tourist business and does all that it properly can to encourage it. No one can deny that the tourist industry is one of our leaders. During 1953, some 5,786,386 cars entered Ontario for various periods.

Of that total 1,503,191 came to Ontario to stay 48 hours or more. Since statistics show that each motor vehicle entering Ontario brings $3\frac{1}{2}$ people, on the average, our visitors in 1953 amounted to 20,252,351!

For the benefit of our people, the Department of Highways maintains 70 roadside parks, ranging in size from 1 to 390 acres. In most of them, Ontario citizens may camp for periods up to 2 weeks; visitors from the United States and other provinces may camp up to 3 weeks in those where camping is permitted.

In addition to this system of People's Parks, entirely free, and with many located where there are good fishing and bathing facilities, the Department of Highways maintains 2,200 picnic tables at pleasant and often beautiful sites along our highways.

While these amenities are subject to abuse, I am very happy to say that the roadside parks and picnic tables are truly and widely appreciated. Numberless voluntary letters of appreciation have been received and I can tell you that such kind messages are warmly welcomed.

Ontario's highways system also may boast of its direction and warning signs, zone painting, and other safety features. Night driving is made such safer because of the wide use of reflection markings on signs and railings.

From 1946 through 1953, motor vehicle registration in Ontario increased 96.0 per cent. from 711,000 to 1,400,000.

I am, therefore, appealing to you gentlemen for direct and responsible assistance in our campaign to make driving on our highways and streets safer for all who use them. With proper exercise of plain common sense along with a decent regard for the rights of others, our terrible annual total of traffic death, injuries and property loss could be cut in half immediately. Will you help this cause? Give it thought and see what you can do towards solving this ghastly problem.

During the 1953 calendar year there was a registration of 1,404,084 motor

vehicles, an increase of 8.9 per cent. over the previous year. Drivers' licences totalled 1,653,086, an increase of 6.4 per cent. We now have about 1 motor vehicle for each $3\frac{1}{2}$ members of our population. All the people of Ontario could at one time be carried in our motor vehicles with ample room left over. I might add that there was an increase of about 12.5 per cent. in the number of tourist vehicles entering Ontario last year.

It is sad, indeed shocking, to speak of the death toll arising from traffic accidents. In 1952, there were 1,010 such deaths. For 1953, the early figures indicate 1,082 such deaths. That most of these deaths were readily preventable is a truism which needs no repetition.

For 1952, the injury toll was 23,634 and for 1953 it was 24,353 according to our early figures. I scarcely need add that many of these injuries were of a serious type.

The property damage toll is placed at about \$25 million for each of the years I have mentioned.

We carry on an educational campaign in the interests of highway traffic safety. This must be a permanent, a continuing campaign. It is waged through the press, through the schools, by radio, and through many local and municipal bodies. We aim at instilling the principles of safety into the minds of pedestrians, especially children, as well as motorists.

We aim at an adequate examination of all applicants for drivers' licences, but I should like to stress this point. The driver taking a test is on his good behaviour. He is anxious to prove his ability to operate a motor car. The test will determine whether he is familiar with the rules of the road and whether he *can* and I stress the word *can*, operate a motor vehicle with safety. But no test can determine whether he *will* operate a motor car in a safe and proper manner.

Each year, we take about 20,000 drivers off the roads for one reason or another and for varying periods. Our researchers indicate that about 90 per

cent. of all traffic accidents result from the human factor.

Why a driver should be a gentleman in the living room and a cad on the highway is something beyond my comprehension—but the fact remains in all too many instances. Safe driving implies ordinary, decent, every-day good citizenship. It implies the exercise of care, courtesy and common sense. However, as there are nearly 1½ million licenced motor vehicles on the road and 1,600,000 drivers, we simply cannot have enough police to watch them all.

I trust the legislation now before the House will, if and when enacted, be helpful to our enforcement officers.

I have recommended increased penalties as to hit-run drivers. I think we shall have to devise some means of dealing more effectively with the road hogs who monopolize our passing lanes mile after mile. Possibly we may be able to devise ways and means of getting this type of road hog off the road temporarily or permanently. However, the real cure lies in the universal acceptance of the rules of good citizenship on the highways as elsewhere.

I remember several years ago, Mr. Speaker, making a speech in this House in which I pleaded with hon. members of this Legislature to render every possible help they could to this very worthy cause, and I was very interested the other day to listen to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko), the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Connell) and the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) who devoted the major part of their time to this very important subject. And when I look around this Legislature and think of all those years that have passed, I have every confidence that each member of this honourable body is anxious to play his part in curtailing this needless slaughter on the highways and in saving lives. Because I happen to know something of the statutory requirements of membership, I reflect that the 90 odd members of this House, in being nominated for candidature, must have 100 citizens to sign nomination papers. I say to hon. members: "If you can go

home to your constituencies and can enlist 100 or more people in your communities to come out and back the job we are endeavouring to do, there will, I am sure, be a decided reduction in the loss of life through traffic accidents."

Hon. members found on their desks, the day the hon. member from Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) was making his speech, a manual entitled "Speak of Safety," in which they will find, I am sure, many suggestions for addresses in their communities.

In Eastern Ontario, the Department of Highways operates Old Fort Henry, one of the most romantic of all this continent's fortresses. In summer it is manned by university students uniformed as guardsmen of the period when the Kingston fortress was first occupied. Since it was re-opened in 1948, more than 500,000 people have paid the small fee required to finance service of guides in touring the old fortifications and its important museum.

Members of this House are, of course, much interested in levels of government that come closest to those living in rural areas—the counties and townships.

The road systems of the counties and townships of Ontario have long been a special concern of the municipal roads branch of the Ontario Department of Highways. This branch and its work have been greatly expanded since I took office as Minister of Highways, but it still serves municipal governmental bodies in an advisory capacity because, as we see it, that is in the best interests of democratic government and the principle of local responsibility.

In 1943, about 600 municipal units were entitled to provincial subsidies for road improvement. In 1953, there were 1,387 municipal units entitled to subsidies, made up as follows: 37 counties; 572 townships; 28 Indian reserves; 2 provincial parks; 16 improvement districts; 29 cities; 8 separated towns; 143 towns; 157 villages; 155 statute labour boards; and 240 unorganized townships.

In 1946, legislation authorized funds for improvement of unserviceable roads where municipal bodies were unable to

finance needed construction. Where improvement of such roads would likely prove of material benefit to the public in general as well as local users, their designation as development roads was permitted. As a result, development-roads aid through the Municipal Roads Branch has been the means of providing many previously isolated communities with good access routes to the main provincial network. Some 1,400 miles of such roads have been built at a cost of over \$11 million.

In 1947, for the benefit of municipalities which could not justify purchase of costlier machinery, the Department of Highways set up equipment pools. These equipment pools are becoming more and more appreciated. Rate charge for rental of pool equipment is the prevailing equipment rental rate for the division in which a municipality is located, discounted 30 per cent.

Ontario's Municipal Roads Equipment Pools have 99 power graders, 16 pull graders, 55 tractors, 18 compressors, 17 trucks, which together represent an investment of \$8,195,064.

In 1953, counties purchased 98 items and townships bought 189 items of road machinery at a total cost of \$1,446,433.

It may interest you to know that in the years since I assumed office as Minister of Highways, municipal roads authorities in Ontario have expended a total sum of \$387,806,401.19. They have received provincial subsidies on that expenditure for improvement and construction of road and street systems amounting to \$182,302,016.16.

In the 10-year period 1943-53, the Department of Highways expended \$6,465,232.53 for road improvement in unorganized townships and statute labour areas of Ontario, chiefly in Northern Ontario.

I should point out that the municipalities are under heavy expense in relation to snow removal—an acknowledged necessity in relation to the universal use of motor transport. Winter maintenance naturally now demands care and close calculation in building grades and structures and in making provision for ade-

quate right-of-way. To some extent and in the light of their resources a good many municipal governments are adding from time to time sections of permanent pavement. The time is no doubt far in the future, but I hope we may eventually see some type of permanent road surface on every main municipal road in Ontario.

Before leaving the subject of our municipal relations I should mention recent amendments to the Highway Improvement Act which have the effect of allowing the municipalities some leeway in making expenditures outside their own boundaries in relation to bridge construction. I might mention a specific case involving the Town of Wallaceburg. Here the town, the county and the province were able to come to agreement in building a large swing bridge costing about \$1 million. Again, in the same district a bridge was required on the line between Dover and Raleigh Townships, actually to relieve a trying traffic situation in the City of Chatham. Here, Chatham pays the share which otherwise would have been a municipal charge. The 80 per cent. provincial subsidy applies in both instances.

While on the subject of bridges, I should mention that in 1953 we completed 43 bridges on provincial highways at a cost of \$4,331,000. In the past 10 years we have built 443 bridges at a total cost of about \$40 million. Here, I wish to say a special word about the man behind our bridge programme.

Mr. Arthur Sedgwick, our Chief Bridge Engineer, has been an employee of this province for 45 years. I hope he will be with us for some time yet to come. What I have to say about him may be regarded as a token of my feelings toward a great number of employees. Mr. Sedgwick has approved the design and supervised the construction of thousands of bridges for the department and for the municipalities. Not one of these bridges has failed through faulty design. I do not think any civil servant has compiled a more honourable and efficient record. Mr. Sedgwick's period of service embraces

not only the whole period of the department's existence, but goes back to the days when roads and bridges were entirely a municipal responsibility for all practical purposes. His career is a credit to himself and a symbol of the careers of many of his colleagues.

We talk proudly, and properly so, of our great endowment of natural resources. But without adequate transportation, they will avail us nothing. Without transportation, our resources cannot be developed. Our waterways, our roads, our highways and, finally, our air transport push back our frontiers. They open new avenues of wealth, of production and of employment. They help establish new farms, new forest industries and new homes. These, in turn, lead to the establishment of new industries and new commercial enterprises. And transportation remains a vital factor in the whole equation of development.

As I said, the Northern Development road building activities were transferred to the Department of Highways. I do not need to tell you that road building in the north poses many special problems. There are vast stretches of rugged, rocky country, often with hills 700 or 800 feet in height, interspersed with deep valleys. There is a relatively sparse population. An impressive part of our budget must be spent in relation to the north. Our people there demand and deserve reasonable consideration. On the economic side, our resources of land and forest and mine, and of lake and stream cannot be developed without adequate transportation.

There are scores or perhaps hundreds of centres of population within our borders no longer served by rail at all, or else served in rudimentary fashion. Whole industries, whole commercial enterprises, whole communities are now served by rubber-tired vehicles.

Today, in this province our frontiers are being pushed back by highways development. The Manitowadge area, a new mining field of vast importance, it would seem, will reach its potential only with the advent of road transportation. In our planning we have to consider

new developments related to our resources. We have to consider the enormous motor traffic in areas such as those surrounding Toronto and Hamilton. Here we have heavy traffic in congested areas. Up north we have relatively light traffic with great distances involved. We try to plan with efficiency. We endeavour to look ahead. If we are to make the most of what we have in the way of human and natural resources, we must anticipate our problems rather than having them overwhelm us at a later date.

In the period 1933 to 1944, the total expenditures of the Department of Highways were about \$246,947,575. For the next 10 years they amounted to approximately \$769 million.

It is, of course, not the amount spent but rather the value received which counts. Of this, I shall speak briefly later on. Here, let me outline something of what we accomplished last year, 1953. We placed bituminous, hot mix pavement on 230 miles of King's Highways. This, for purposes of comparison, exceeds the distance from Toronto to Montreal. Resurfacing with the same type of material was accomplished on 175 miles of King's Highways. This exceeds the distance from Toronto to Kingston.

Grading, preparatory to paving, was completed on 302 miles. This is almost exactly the distance from Toronto to the Quebec border. These items, I might add, account for 989 miles, equal to the distance from Toronto to Nipigon with another 120 miles added. A little thought will help you to realize what work of this magnitude means in terms of men, machines and money.

In Ontario today we have about 10,580 miles of King's Highways along with secondary roads maintained by the department. We have 289 miles of controlled access highways. Of this, 235 miles consists of the dual-lane type and 54 miles of the standard type. Some 29 miles of service roads were built for local use alongside various sections of controlled access highways.

The controlled access highway is a type which is here to stay. The most competent engineering authorities on the

continent declare that highways designed to carry through traffic at high speeds cannot also serve the purpose of giving access to adjacent land. We cannot afford in this or any other province to construct through highways at a cost of \$400,000 a mile and the immediately defeat their main objective by allowing unlimited access. The railways from their very inception recognized this principle. We all know how zealously they protect their rights-of-way from any but the most necessary encroachments of any kind whatsoever.

Here in Ontario we have a very great traffic movement over the Windsor-Quebec border route. The highway between Oshawa and Toronto is rated, for example, as the heaviest travelled in Canada. Our No. 2 Highway from Toronto to Windsor, 542 miles in length, has been resurfaced with respect to 450 miles. In many parts it has been reconstructed. The developments of the St. Lawrence waterway and power scheme will mean, very shortly, I expect, a major programme of re-routing and complete reconstruction. First we must know what is determined as to Ottawa, as to Washington, as to Hydro and as to the New York State Power Authority.

Then and then only can we plan here with certainty. Then and then only can we bargain as to division of costs. Just now, I can say only this. The easterly section of No. 2 Highway will in the foreseeable future be an adequate link in the dual-lane route from Windsor to the Quebec border. It will be something of which Ontario will be proud. It will help to provide a new stimulus to all Eastern Ontario.

We have already completed 24 miles of grading easterly from Windsor, this on the new dual-lane route. An important link in this new route is the 38-mile London-Woodstock by-pass, on which we have graded 31.3 miles. In part, we have completed the Toronto by-pass or interceptor road swinging well to the north of the city. The portion of this dual-lane highway connecting Yonge Street with the Barrie Highway is already in use. Work here is being

pushed forward, and the by-pass will presently connect with dual Highway No. 401 near the Rouge River east of Toronto.

It appears that most of the traffic approaching Toronto is destined to enter the city. However, much heavy traffic will use the interceptor road without adding to the congestion in the city streets. More than this, the interceptor road will tend to route traffic fairly directly toward that particular part of the city which it is destined ultimately to reach.

During 1953, grading contracts were let to carry Highway No. 401 eventually around Belleville, Trenton and Kingston. You will thus see that from the west we are bringing the new dual-lane route to connect with the Queen Elizabeth Way near Hamilton. This dual-lane route will then carry around Toronto join Highway No. 401 at the Rouge River. Traffic will then move over the existing dual-lane route to Newcastle. The dual-lane route will then be extended for the time being to Port Hope, and for the future will be continued to the east.

Highway No. 400 from Toronto to Barrie has been completed and is in full use, including the $4\frac{1}{2}$ -mile Barrie by-pass.

To those of us fortunate enough to live in Eastern Ontario I should say a word about Highway No. 17, a most important artery especially for those of us making our homes in the Ottawa Valley. This highway runs from the Quebec border, through the Ottawa Valley, through Ottawa, Arnprior, Pembroke, North Bay and Sudbury. Thence it goes to the Soo and up to Montreal River. I have already said that paving will be completed this summer on the North Shore section. Otherwise the highway is paved, but most important revisions are being made east of Ottawa.

Ontario's share of the Trans-Canada Highway involves a distance of about 1,404 miles—say, about 3 days' driving, just for purposes of comparison. As of the end of December last grading had been completed on 349 miles, along with 203 miles of paving. Fortunately, many miles of existing highways are being

incorporated into this project. However, much of this mileage has required or will require revision to meet Trans-Canada standards. We are making good progress on the new short-cut from the Gravenhurst - Bracebridge area to Sudbury. Heavy grading has been carried out on 61 miles north of Britt and work is proceeding on the remaining 16 miles. Completion of this project will give a direct Toronto - Sudbury - Sault Ste. Marie route, and, of course, should open up a new and impressive area for our thriving tourist trade.

I might mention scores of other projects. A short time ago I mentioned, and I think correctly, that one could drive through any of the 37 counties of Western, Central or Eastern Ontario without ever being more than 10 miles away from a highways construction job of some magnitude.

One of our major and persisting problems is in relation to Canada's No. 1 traffic bottleneck, a nuisance at the best of times, a nightmare at the height of the summer season. I refer to the Burlington bottleneck, familiar I am sure to most of us.

Hamilton is a great industrial city, an industrial empire in the making. Its harbour is a good one, an inland lake, one might call it, entered only by a very narrow ship channel. This channel is spanned by two structures. One is a railway bridge of the swing type. The other is, or was, a bridge of the bascule type. Here, the Queen Elizabeth Way narrows down to a standard pavement, finds its way across a narrow spit of land about 4 miles along, a few hundred yards wide in many places, and then resumes its regular dual-lane form en route to the Niagara Frontier.

Matters were not helped here when an incoming steamer destroyed one-half of the bascule bridge. This section was replaced by a fixed deck bridge so that shipping is now confined to but one narrow channel instead of two.

Navigational rights are something which we must respect as a province. They are within the federal jurisdiction. In this day and age we cannot any longer contemplate the use of moveable bridges,

as witness the fixed structures at Ivy Lea or connecting the Island of Orleans with the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Hamilton Harbour is going to be a busy place when the St. Lawrence waterway is built. We must look ahead. We must build a structure here on the Burlington cut-off high enough to allow ships to pass under it. I will be something like 120 feet above water level where it crosses the ship channel. This means a huge structure of steel and concrete; it likewise means approaches of very great length.

Certain measures we have taken, but first, let me say this. The cut-off is very narrow, and along the lake side is a railway line occupying what might be called the most logical route. Therefore, we have to follow, substantially, the existing route of the highway.

We have acquired the land necessary for the revisions involved and to put the necessary structure in place. We have made the necessary engineering studies. We have negotiated with Ottawa to ascertain their views as to what is required in the light of their interests as to navigation. Indeed, if there were no question related to a ship channel, there would be no great problem and not too much cost.

Provision for navigation involves the federal authority. Provision for navigation means the expenditure of very many millions of additional dollars. We cannot clean up this situation without the concurrence of Ottawa in our plans.

More than this, it is, I think, quite obvious that there is a very real financial obligation on the part of the Federal Treasury. Just as soon as we can arrive at some agreement with the Government of Canada we are prepared to get on with this job. I am ready, and I think the hon. the Prime Minister, is ready, to sit down with our engineers and our financial experts around the conference table, and to decide as we have on other matters, as to just what are our respective duties in this matter. There is no insuperable problem here, and so far as I am concerned, the sooner mutual agreement can be reached, the better for all of us. This government is ready, willing,

and indeed, anxious to bring its resources to bear on this problem which already is too long outstanding.

February 15th, 1954.

DEAR MR. WINTERS:

As promised during recent discussions regarding the Burlington Bridge, under separate cover is being forwarded to your Deputy, Mr. H. A. Young, a print showing the proposals of the department for a project to construct a high level bridge and approaches across the Burlington Canal.

Urging that joint participation in this project be undertaken by the Province of Ontario and the Federal Government, it is pointed out that traffic counts indicate an average daily traffic in the summer months of more than 21,000 vehicles, of which 12,000 are American visitors. It can be assumed that with the completion of the New York State Thruway which terminates at the City of Buffalo on the Niagara border, traffic may be expected to double in the next few years. Since the tourist industry is one in which both the Federal Government and the province share, it is in the interest of both governments to participate in essential highway improvements involving international traffic. It is felt by this department that through traffic is the traffic that has to be accommodated by the new structure and for this reason it is suggested that the two governments share equally in the cost of the project.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE H. DOUCETT
Minister of Highways.

Machinery pools established by the department and attached to various divisions enable municipalities to use heavy machinery which otherwise would not be available to them. They are required to pay operating charges only.

The research branch of the department is a necessary and valuable organization though its activities are not as well known as they should be. Last year more than 7,000 soil samples were subjected to examination. There was a 90 per cent. increase in the work of testing materials of various types. As an example there were 2,640 tests of concrete cylinders to ensure the strength of various concrete structures. Our technicians test bituminous materials, paints, salt, aggregates—in fact almost every component used in our projects. Much new testing equipment has been evolved resulting in new, less costly and faster procedures.

I should say a word as to the heavy maintenance programme in relation to our King's Highways. At the end of 1953, the Maintenance Engineer's Branch employed about 4,000 workers, nearly all with experience, perhaps a majority of them with some specialized skills. Necessarily, in this mechanical age our divisions maintain well-equipped garages and machine shops. Our equipment list is a long one and includes 600 snowplows, 11 of them being huge snowblowers, 1,031 trucks, 300 power graders, 431 tractors, 30 weed sprayers, 173 asphalt distributors, 20 low bed trailers, 50 rollers, 46 weigh-scale installations, 120 hydraulic sand spreaders and innumerable items of miscellaneous equipment.

We maintain 70 free camping parks for the use of tourists and for our own citizens. In area they range from 1 to 390 acres. Many are splendidly equipped. In addition there are 200 small roadside parks freely used by picnic parties. Many command views of exceptional beauty. Along the main highways are 1,070 small turnoff points equipped with 1,612 bench-attached picnic tables. In the parks formerly mentioned we maintain 2,323 bench-attached tables for camp and picnic meals.

We maintain about 140,000 highway identification and direction signs. About 80 per cent. of them embody the reflector principle. It has been said, I think truly, that any stranger, sticking to King's Highways, can find his way to any point in Ontario without asking a question as to direction.

Zone painting was applied in 1953 to 6,250 miles of highway. Paint was used to the extent of 61,000 gallons of which 54,000 gallons was of the reflector type.

Numerous traffic interchange points have been supplied with lighting, while 118 traffic signals are maintained by the department.

Trees, shrubs and seedlings to the number of 326,465 were planted in 1953, all but 56,000 coming from departmental nurseries.

At the close of 1953, 25 grade separations were under way involving an

expenditure of about \$5 million. Needless to say, negotiations are proceeding with a view to getting grade separation put on a more realistic basis. Both the Federal Government and the railways must be consenting and participating parties to clean up a long-standing and monumental hazard.

Our winter problems continue to have the unremitting attention of our maintenance division. Our organization here very seldom fails to keep open our more than 10,000 miles of King's Highways and secondary roads. As a project it is both huge and costly. But it is necessary; our increasing dependence on motor transportation demands that our highways be kept open and in as good condition as possible as to driving surface.

As of July 1st, 1947, we launched the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, a piece of legislation which has proved its worth and which is being adopted in certain other jurisdictions. Since the legislation became operative a total of \$4,621,553.02 has been paid out to 2,891 victims of traffic accidents who otherwise would have been without redress. In 237 cases the beneficiaries were victims of hit-run drivers. Last year's amendments provided certain leeway for the Minister to make out-of-court settlements in actions defended by a party failing subsequently to enter an appearance. In the interim settlements have been effected in 150 instances.

In the United States the State of New Jersey has enacted legislation similar to ours which becomes effective in 1955. Other states are introducing similar legislation. My attention was recently directed to a pamphlet prepared and distributed by a public-spirited American citizen. In this pamphlet he accords warm praise to our unsatisfied judgment legislation.

Turning to the current year, 1954, and always subject to whatever financial limitations may be imposed by the House, I anticipate a normal programme of construction, reconstruction and renovation. I have already made some mention of the new dual-lane route extending easterly from Windsor. The present

season will see further substantial progress on this important addition to our system. Likewise, I have made mention of important revisions on No. 17 Highway east from Ottawa.

We hope to achieve substantial progress on our share of the Trans-Canada Highway. The short cut to Sudbury will be brought much nearer completion. As I have intimated, the most vigorous efforts will be made to place us in a position where we can eliminate the Burlington bottle-neck.

I have suggested that claims of municipal governments on the Provincial Treasury will follow the prudent customs of former years. These municipal governments, let me say, are one of the surest bulwarks of democracy. I have the utmost respect for the men and the women who constitute their membership. They render sterling and unselfish public service of the highest order, and their chief reward is the consciousness of an important task well performed.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to certain charges related to the Department of Highways which in recent months have been the subject of discussion both within and without this House. For more than one reason it is not my privilege to deal with these charges at this time and in this place.

At some length I have already spoken of what has been accomplished by the department during the tenure of office of this Administration. We have spent more than \$3¼ billion in the last 10 years. We have spent this great sum of money for a number of sound and basic reasons. As I think I have made clear, neither this nor any other country can have a smoothly functioning economy without adequate transportation. Transportation—adequate, modern transportation—is one of the most important elements in building up our strength and productive capacity in peace. And as Europeans well know, it is a vital element of attack and of defence in time of war. I do not need to labour the point.

Our commerce and our industry both demand adequate highways. As the ownership of an automobile has become

a commonplace with almost every family, our people demand highway facilities reasonably commensurate with the growth of rubber-tired transportation. Again, I do not need to labour the point.

The demands made upon the department during the last few years have been of a magnitude never before experienced in the history of Ontario. We have endeavoured to meet them; in the main we have been able to meet them. These demands have thrown a monumental load of work on our staff, a staff which, quite frankly, we should have liked to have increased materially had more technical help been available.

Now in government administration as in private enterprise, emergencies—extraordinary demands—extraordinary pressures of work—these create extraordinary conditions. In the present instance, and in brief, here is what happened.

Our officials—the responsible officials of the Department of Highways—discovered certain irregularities in one of the divisional offices. These they proceeded to investigate with vigour, with thoroughness and with all the resources at their command.

The Provincial Auditor is an official of this Legislature. His services were enlisted to further our own investigations; perhaps I should put it another way—to launch and press forward his own investigation in the light of his wide statutory powers and the resources of his office.

Still later we engaged the services of J. D. Woods, Gordon & Company Limited, Management & Consultants, with blanket authority to review the matters at issue and generally to survey and report on departmental policies and practices.

The hon. the Prime Minister has moved for the appointment of a Select Committee of this House, and as the hon. members are aware, this committee will receive sufficient scope to enable it to determine the matters at issue.

As the hon. members of this House are aware, it has been deemed necessary to place a number of the members of

the departmental staff on their defence. My esteemed colleague, the hon. the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has retained a distinguished and able counsel, Mr. C. L. Dubin, to present the case for the Crown.

From this brief presentation of the course we have followed, I think any fair-minded member of this House will agree that we have put into operation sufficient machinery to accomplish the following ends:

- (1) To discover what offences may have been committed and to force offenders to give an accounting for any misdeeds which have been committed;

- (2) To get at the causes related to misdoing and to devise safeguards for the future;

- (3) To assist, if required, in a revision of departmental procedure in the interests of efficiency and economy.

In a broad and general way I suggest that this represents what should be, and I should add—will be accomplished.

Here, let me interject this note. There is no thought of condoning wrongdoing. However, I point out this. In the enormous enterprises conducted by governments and by corporations things sometimes go wrong. This situation usually is by no means general. It is usually shown, when the facts come to light, that only a few individuals or components of a system are at fault. In the matters presently under review, please do not misunderstand me. Any serious dereliction of duty is, has been, and will continue to be regarded by me and by my colleagues as a serious matter. I do not need to stress the point.

But let me repeat this. Honesty is characteristic in the make-up of all but a small fraction of the men and women of this country. Were it not so the wheels of trade and commerce and industry and of government would shortly grind to a standstill. These statements apply to the people of this province, to the employees of this government, and to the employees of the Department of Highways.

Right here I suggest this. The immensity of the job accomplished by our executives, by our engineers, by those

who build our highways and the intricate structures embodied in them, is not going to be obscured by the derelictions of a few if within my power to prevent. I return now to what I said before. I do not propose to deal with charges which have been so freely made here and elsewhere.

As an outgrowth of certain circumstances on which I shall not elaborate, judicial decisions are pending.

I now quote from Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, page 104, paragraph 246, Third Edition, 1943:

... it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking must not: (c) refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending.

And again I quote from the same authority, page 180, paragraph 490:

On the 30th March, 1933, when the Committee of Supply was considering the Estimates of the Department of Justice, a member endeavoured to discuss the findings of a Royal Commission appointed to investigate charges against a County Court Judge. The Chairman ruled that the report not having been brought down, the matter was still sub-judice and the discussion could not take place. On an appeal to the House, the Chairman's ruling was confirmed without a dissenting voice.

I have quoted the outstanding Canadian authority in such matters. But I shall go further.

A number of people have been placed on their defence. They are still before the courts. I do not need to add that they are deemed innocent until they are proven guilty before a court of competent jurisdiction. I shall say nothing within the shelter of the walls of this House which may prejudice the possibility of fair trials. I shall not be a party to any discussion here or elsewhere which might in the slightest degree prejudice the cases of the accused.

I say this. The irregularities which have arisen will be much less important

items than the accomplishments related to furnishing this great province with one of the finest highway networks in all North America. I say without hesitation that when the various investigations and proceedings which I have outlined have been concluded, a vast majority of our thousands of department employees will have emerged with honour from a trying, a distressing episode. They will buckle down to their respective tasks with a new pride in their efforts and with a new consciousness of a great service which they are rendering in their respective fields.

I think I have made it clear that neither I nor my colleagues will be parties to violating the established principles related to the British system of administering justice. In this decision I think I have the support of this honourable House.

I do say this. Far into the future such great public works as the Barrie Highway, to mention just one of them, will stand as enduring monuments marking one of the greatest eras of development in the history of Ontario.

In conclusion let me say there must be no concealment. Where it is found, wrongdoing will be exposed and dealt with in a full, fair and impartial manner.

The final judgment will be delivered by the people of Ontario in the best traditions of British democracy.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

Vote 69 agreed to.

On Vote No. 70.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, last year, there was an item of \$3 million for renovating and

surfacing private roads. There is no item for that this year. Would the hon. Minister care to comment on that?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That is included in the item above, of \$34,585,000.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister if the declaration he has just made in regard to matters being sub judice is a declaration of the government's policy in respect to the whole highway matter?

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): No, it is not, Mr. Chairman. As I said, it was a statement from which I was reading, from Beauchesne, who is an authority on Parliamentary procedure.

Like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am not a lawyer, and I merely quoted that for the information of the House.

MR. OLIVER: On this point, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister very definitely was speaking for the government, and was making a speech in regard to the Department of Highways. Certain aspects of that department are presently under investigation, and he quite definitely left the impression with the House that matters which were before the courts, concerning people, whose cases have not yet been heard, should not be discussed in this Legislature.

If they cannot be discussed in the Legislature, then it follows, as night follows day, they cannot and should not be discussed before the Select Committee of the House.

Before we go any further, I think we should have the government's decision in respect to this matter. Was the hon. Minister of Highways speaking for the government in this respect?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): What the hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Doucett) said in relation to the authorities he quoted is, I think, correct. On the other hand I stated quite clearly, the hon. Leader of

the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) was here, and I think he can hear quite well, my previous remarks were that Parliament is supreme. My feeling is that Parliament is supreme with the only reservation, as I said in this House before, that of common sense and fair play. Even if Parliament is supreme, and this is a People's Court, it should do nothing, in the name of fair play and common sense, that would hurt anybody or prejudice their position. I think this: that the committee provides plenty of opportunity to discuss matters and provides the place where the people's representatives could be given the facts of the case as they are revealed by the reports of our committees, by the reports of the investigating officers or by proceedings in the courts.

On the other hand, I will repeat that I think the Select Committee is just as supreme as this Legislature, because it is a direct emanation of this Legislature.

MR. OLIVER: I am not finished on this point yet. The hon. Minister of Highways quoted from two eminent authorities to support his contention that he should not discuss in this House matters that are at present before the courts and which affect people who are presently before the courts of this province. If that is the view of the hon. Minister of Highways, then the committee itself can do nothing at all. The hon. Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) may smile if he likes. But here we have the leading Minister of the government, apart from the hon. Prime Minister himself, saying to the House that he is not going to discuss these cases. They are, in his judgment, sub judice, and he quotes, in support, two eminent authorities to back up that view.

HON. MR. FROST: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) stand here now and say he wants to discuss the cases of men who are before the courts and accused of crimes?

MR. OLIVER: That is not the point I raised.

HON. MR. FROST: If you want to discuss this, say what you want to, and I will tell you. What is the use of dealing with technicalities?

MR. OLIVER: I am not dealing with technicalities at all. The hon. Prime Minister knows that quite well. He knows that the hon. Minister of Highways, who is a leading Minister of the Crown, said these matters should not be discussed.

HON. MR. FROST: Do you think they should be?

MR. OLIVER: I want to know the official opinion of the government.

HON. MR. FROST: I stated that, in my opinion, Parliament is supreme and that these matters could be discussed here. But I repeat: the only other consideration is the question of fair play, justice and common sense. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition think it is common sense if he had the right—assume it is given to him now—to discuss the case of somebody who is before the courts? Would he discuss it, or would he say that in the interests of fair play the trial of that man should not be prejudiced? I sincerely believe that course is the correct course. We should not do anything here which would prejudice the fair trial of people who are accused or who will be accused in this matter.

I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the purpose of setting up a Select Committee, which this House will discuss in a few days, is to provide the proper place and means to give to the people of this province the fullest information when it is, in the opinion of the committee, the right time to disclose that information. All these matters are before the courts, and there will be other matters before the courts. There they will be dealt with, I am sure, according to the best British and Canadian traditions. The other thing—a matter which the hon. Minister of Highways mentioned here—is the organization of the department to meet the stress and strain of these days. If there are weaknesses in the department that are dis-

closed, we shall bring them right out into the open, we shall show the people where they are. We shall show the hon. Leader of the Opposition where they are.

MR. OLIVER: And we shall help the hon. Prime Minister to do that.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has not done much up to now. Some of the hon. members opposite let the Estimates of the Department of Highways go through in 12 minutes. They were not doing much to help by that.

MR. OLIVER: They are not going through in 12 minutes tonight.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, that is all right. We can sit here until 5 o'clock if the hon. members like.

I will finish my statement by saying this: it will be our object to provide for the people of Ontario the very best possible system in the Department of Highways. Not only to provide for the spending of monies that are here voted; but even if we are called upon to meet an emergency in this country. Today I met two deputations, one of them a deputation of unemployed from the Niagara Peninsula, and the other from the very important American Federation of Labour Unions to discuss the matter of unemployment. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if Old Man Ontario has to roll up his sleeves and spend \$250 million, we shall have the organization which can do that properly and efficiently.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): One of the important aspects of this whole question which the hon. Minister of Highways and the hon. Prime Minister avoided—

HON. MR. FROST: I have not avoided any issue yet.

MR. WREN: I would like the hon. Minister of Highways to answer this question and not the hon. Prime Minister. Why will the hon. Minister not discuss matters which do not affect the

trial of the accused? Can he explain the high-level policy of the department? Let us not keep discussing people who are accused before the courts. Can there be no discussion of high-level policy?

HON. MR. FROST: Go ahead and discuss it. Bring up anything you want to.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: What is your question?

MR. WREN: Will the hon. Minister explain to this House the precise steps that are taken from the moment an advertisement or tender is placed in a newspaper until the final payment is made?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: As I tried to intimate, there is nothing in the Highways Department that is not an open book. To go into all details of how contracts are made: the first procedure, I think—and, of course, after all this is a long standing practice in the Department of Highways—is that the survey gang from head office go out and make certain surveys. Then they send their plan to a certain place. That, I think, is the practice in the department, though I cannot follow every move. Then that is sent to the division engineer, and he, with his men, make certain alterations, if they find the terrain requires it. They make a certain check and I think that is then returned to the head office.

Then the division engineer sends in an Estimate; in other words, so many yards of rock, so many yards of dirt, so many yards of concrete, so many thousand feet of the creosoted timber etc. necessary for bridging and so on. The different unit prices of all these things are rechecked at head office and from this information the contract form is drawn up. The unit prices are estimated, and advertisements are inserted in sufficient time for those concerned to be given due notice.

The form of tender prescribes that the contractor must go on to the ground to check the information as given, and certify that he has done so. And when the tender is awarded there are certain

further checks for accuracy. The contractor must file with the department before he starts to work, either 50 per cent. in collateral of a 100 per cent. performance bond.

I cannot go into all the details, and I do not think hon. members would want me to do so. But the form of contract is drawn up in great detail. I am happy to inform hon. members that we had a corporation lawyer some time ago who looked over our form and commented that it was the finest he had ever seen. When this form is completed, and the successful applicant is awarded the contract, a copy is forwarded to the division engineer, who is responsible for seeing that the work is carried out. He periodically makes out his certificates, giving an Estimate of the work done.

That is sent to the office and checked for accuracy of figures. It is passed by our own accounts department, and the contractor is paid 85 per cent. of the recommended progress Estimate.

MR. WREN: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on that score now. Will the hon. Minister of Highways recommend or approve the granting of a contract for an amount less than his engineers tell him it can be done for?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, that is quite a question.

MR. WREN: It certainly is.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: We certainly will grant contracts for less money than our engineers estimate. I have tried to explain to this House, Mr. Chairman, that an engineer sends in an Estimate. We are most interested in quantities. He certainly sends an Estimate, which is not shown to anyone, but I must say engineers are not contractors. They cannot tell exactly what it costs to take out rock or dirt. They send in approximate Estimates, and on many occasions contracts are let for less money.

Why not? We are doing a job for the Province of Ontario. A contractor must go out on the job. He signs a final declaration, and it says: "I am prepared

to do this job." He puts up a cheque for 15 per cent. when he puts his tender in. Then he puts up a 100 per cent. performance bond which he must get from a reputable bond house in this country, or 50 per cent. in cash, so he must be assured he can complete the job, or he would not bid the price.

MR. WREN: How close would the hon. Minister of Highways suggest a competent engineer, or a contractor, for that matter, should be able to estimate a job? Should he be within 10 per cent., 20 per cent., 50 per cent., or what?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: How stupid can one get?

MR. WREN: That is just the trouble, Mr. Chairman, the contractors have been determining how much these jobs are worth.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: The hon. member is the one who could not answer any questions yesterday.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Can the hon. member tell me how close he came in estimating the waterworks, sewers, etc., in Sioux Lookout, compared to the finished article? Why did he come back time after time to the Municipal Board asking for \$50,000, \$70,000, and more, if his Estimate was correct? Why did he stop acting as clerk-treasurer of Sioux Lookout last year? Did he "run out" on them, or did they fire him? I have papers in my office which show a \$24,600 deficit.

MR. WREN: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs does not know what he is talking about.

MR. DUNBAR: I am speaking. The hon. member should sit down.

MR. WREN: First of all, we are discussing highways.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: In a little town like Sioux Lookout there is a deficit of \$24,600, and the clerk-treasurer walks out. We have all heard

of leaving ships when they are going down. If that wasn't "leaving the ship," I do not know what it was.

MR. WREN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is deliberately misinforming you, as I will be pleased to discuss on any platform, and on any occasion.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Discuss it now.

MR. WREN: We are talking about highways now, and we should stick to highways. If we want to discuss municipal affairs, that is fine.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We are talking about contracts.

MR. WREN: The same sewer and waterworks contracts, about which the hon. Minister is talking, in each particular section of the work, the engineering Estimates were never more than 12 per cent. out. An eminent firm of consulting engineers in the City of Toronto did this work, and the hon. Minister can check with them.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member was clerk-treasurer at the time. He came to the Municipal Board and said, there was dirt to be removed. Later, he said it was not ordinary ground but it was rock 6 inches below the ground, but in his Estimates he stated it was dirt to be removed in order to get the Municipal Board to consent.

HON. MR. FOOTE: He should know dirt.

MR. WREN: That is a positive and deliberate mis-statement. Any statements made to the Municipal Board about that work were made by professional engineers.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That is why Sioux Lookout is in the "mess" it is today.

MR. WREN: Getting back to highways, I want the hon. Minister of Highways to answer my question. How close does he think an engineer should be?

What is the maximum leeway a professional engineer should have in estimating a job?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I have one case which I will give through you to this House to show that there are often some very close Estimates. These were taken off the figures recently of jobs which were let in 1952 and finalized this year.

There were 45 contracts which cost between \$7 and \$8 million, and the estimate was within 10 per cent., which beats the hon. member in the sewer job by 2 per cent.

MR. WREN: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the hon. Minister of Highways make that statement. Then, why were so many jobs in final cost 100, 200 and 300 per cent. over the original tender?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, there is another explanation I would like to make to this House. I have had distributed to the desks of each hon. member a copy of the work that is under way which contains some 340 contracts. Those are the contracts which carried over from 1953, and a few let in 1954, which gives you an idea of what is going on.

The one thing I want to mention to this House, so that there will be no misunderstanding, is that some of these jobs which were let in the north country in the Thunder Bay District were changed in complexion and character. Some of them were called: I might say, for a minor re-surfacing or very light renovation; and when the contract was signed for the Trans-Canada Highway with the Federal Government, those jobs were converted, with the approval, of course, of all concerned, into Trans-Canada specifications, which changed the character and complexion entirely.

Naturally, there would be very huge overruns which were estimated at the time. There is nothing to hide in that. It was understood by all of us.

MR. OLIVER: Would that account for the variation in these two contracts

I have in mind? One contract was awarded for \$443,000, and finalized at \$1,282,000. Another one was awarded for \$600,000.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: What contract was that?

MR. OLIVER: I really cannot tell you.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I am not sure unless I know the contracts, but I would say, off-hand, that would likely be one of them.

MR. OLIVER: The one is 6 miles west of Marathon.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, that is Trans-Canada.

MR. OLIVER: What is the explanation of that, please?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is in a very rugged part of the Province of Ontario, as most of you know. There are huge rock hills and the alignment and grades and standards were changed. In other words, our standards are quite a bit different than the Trans-Canada standards.

HON. MR. FROST: It became Trans-Canada afterwards.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): May I make a few remarks, due to the fact that the discussion over the past few weeks has concerned itself chiefly with the district which I represent, and all sorts of slurs and other things have been thrown around?

Tonight, I picked up the *Telegram* and read:

McCarthy Methods Used by Doucett
Highways Minister

George H. Doucett was accused today of using McCarthy tactics in treatment of employees during investigation of his department. The charge was made by Albert Wren, Liberal.

I am getting sick and tired of this constant "ballyhoo" and "guess work" in

connection with the highways investigation. Of course, it is belaboured because it is the first time the Opposition has had a chance to criticize the Frost administration. Is that not so?

The hon. Minister Highways, in the marvellous speech he made tonight, told us the Provincial Auditor and other investigating firms will report to the Minister and to the Cabinet when the report is complete. Then, the hon. Minister and Cabinet will report to this House, and the people. Anything the hon. Minister might say now would be merely guesswork, the same as the statements of the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) and others who would prejudge the cases of those charged with irregularities, men whom I know. That is not justice.

I am not much interested in the method of letting contracts at the moment. If our methods can be improved, this can easily be corrected. That is a departmental matter and one for decision by the Cabinet. What I am chiefly interested in, and what we are all interested in, is that the people of Ontario get value for the money spent, that they get roads at a fair price, and that the roads are built according to specifications. That would be a credit to the people of this province.

That to my mind is the crux of this question. That is what I want to know, before I speak of new ways of letting contracts by a Highways Commission to handle highways in the future.

I note with interest in the remarks of the hon. member for Kenora that he opens the way for positions for more people in all these things he suggests. In his remarks outside the House, the amounts involved in irregularities varied from \$100,000 to \$17½ million in a period of 3 weeks.

You can imagine what a contest—

MR. WREN: Where?

MR. WARDROPE: In the press. You can imagine what a contest would occur and what astronomical figures would be tossed about if the hon. member for Kenora and Walter Thompson were contesting the Liberal leadership.

The only thing which would stop them, would be lack of education to count any higher.

The hon. member for Kenora's suggestion of a Highways Commission, of an engineer with 20 years' experience at its head, with the Minister of the government as vice-chairman and a member of the Opposition, if you please, with the same salary as the Minister, that to my mind is just too ridiculous.

We have many fine engineers, as the hon. Minister of Highways has told us, tonight, in the department with over 20 years' experience now. Where could you get better ones with as much experience?

Mr. Chairman, our Minister of Highways has never had a finger pointed at his honesty, and his ability to get roads built has been acclaimed throughout this province. So the only new suggestion the hon. member for Kenora makes is for the putting on the Highways Commission a member of the Opposition, at the same salary as the Minister. You see, Mr. Chairman, that is a clever suggestion on the part of the hon. member for Kenora, and there is no doubt he would accept the position himself at the same salary as the hon. Minister. That is what you would label "implied consent."

Mr. Chairman, I was surprised and shocked to learn that anyone would use the word "brainwashing" in this country in connection with our investigation. It smacks of deplorable tactics used in foreign countries, and I believe it is unfair for anyone to use this phrase, and make this accusation when, to my knowledge, it is not true. I will just say this, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) produces 1 witness before this committee who admits he was subjected to "brainwashing," I will bring 3 witnesses who will state during their investigation they were treated courteously, and allowed to answer questions put to them as desired, without compulsion or coercion of any kind. For every 1 he brings to us to say he was "brainwashed," I will bring 3 to testify to the contrary.

Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, the highways investigation was started by

this government. No one else had to tell them to start it. As soon as they discovered irregularities, they took swift, decisive action. Since the commencement of the investigation, 5 employees have been arrested, 20 or more have been suspended, a firm of nationally-known accountants have been examining all accounts and books of contracting firms which had any road contracts with this government, and, in addition, a well-known firm of engineers is checking all road work done for the government. These firms have full power to examine everything, and question everyone. All this has been done to see whether or not the people of Ontario have had an honest job done for their money.

I do not see where anything more could be done.

Certainly a Select Committee of this House cannot do better, or as well. Give these examining firms an opportunity to bring in their report, and let that be done with as little delay as possible, because in every part of the province this investigation and these lurid statements in the press are creating a great hardship on our people. No road contractor in our district has been paid any money since the investigation started last October, and these contractors owe a lot of money to businesses in our cities. We would like to see the whole matter settled, so that we can get back to normalcy, Mr. Chairman.

Tremendously exaggerated statements made regarding the whole investigation are hurting our end of the province. In my opinion, we now have more roads and the best roads we have ever had in our area in its history, and I firmly believe we have received value for every dollar spent.

I would suggest we cut out all this political circumlocution which is hindering the investigation, get the results and the findings of the investigating firms as soon as possible, and if irregularities or dishonesty are discovered, punish the offenders, but let us get on with our highway work.

Our people are not responsible for highway irregularities, neither should they be made to suffer for them. We

need roads built and maintained in our area, so let us cut out putting all our efforts into holding up this work for the political aggrandizement of certain Parties, and get on with the road work we need so badly. All these irresponsible charges and innuendoes are holding up highway construction and progress in my district. We have given the job of investigation to experts. Let them bring in their reports, and let us get on with the business of this great province. I know the people of this province have full confidence that the Frost Government will handle this investigation fairly, impartially and honestly.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, it may be that the hon. member (Mr. Wardrope) has somewhat more confidence in the administration than I have, but I want to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) about this other contract which was awarded for \$615,000, and finalized at \$1,300,000. Does he say that the same explanation applies to this one? It is the Little Pic contract.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: As far as I know, yes. There would be changes from the original in grades and standards in that job.

MR. OLIVER: How does that come about, because it is mostly rock; 90 per cent. of it is rock? Grading would not make any difference to that.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: After all, if you make a 5 per cent. grade and lower it to 3 per cent. you would take out much more rock, would you not? If you widened your road to a 22-foot surface instead of a 20-foot one, and put a 12-foot shoulder or a 10-foot shoulder instead of an 8, you would take out more rock.

MR. OLIVER: And that accounts for the variation?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Well, I think that will account for some of it.

MR. OLIVER: "Some of it?" What would account for the rest of it? I want

to be fair to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), but I want to find out some of these things.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, this may be one of the contracts which is under audit and investigation. I am not sure, but if not, there might be some swamps, or sink holes, or muskeg, such as we run into in the north. That would be an answer to it all, and I might say to this House, Mr. Chairman, that in the case of every one of those contracts, when the committee meets, the facts will be before the committee, because as I said, there is no closed book in the Department of Highways. The information is for you to see.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, just a word or two. I am not trying to make the highway issue a political football, nor am I going to use "circumlocution" of any kind, I can assure you. In fact, I am one member of the House whose Party does not expect to replace the Party in power at the next election on this issue, or any other.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never?

MR. SALSBERG: I said—"next election." So I can be very objective. Furthermore, I am one of the members in the House who, from my place, stated I consider the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) an honest man, and I still hold that opinion. I want to say, however, a few words, because there is the danger of going to extremes either way, and of forgetting that, regardless of loyalties that hon. members have towards their Party and government, or for those of the Opposition group, there are certain obligations which we, as members of the House, on all sides have in a matter of this sort.

On general principle, I agree with the position taken by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) on this question, and as agreed to by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), that, insofar as this matter, or any matter, is concerned, the House is supreme, and can, if it so

desires discuss any aspect of this case, or any other case.

Having said that, I am prepared to say that there could be certain instances when it would not be in the best interests of the investigation, to discuss every detail. That is true. An investigation by one committee or another might be harmed by bringing out certain facts here.

However, I have felt all along that a mistake was made by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in not speaking earlier. I said so to all and sundry who wanted to listen to me that, for his own sake, I thought he should have spoken, and spoken earlier, and presented to the House such information as he thought proper. He has not done so, and I am obliged to say that tonight I think he did not go quite far enough.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I can give you another hour if you like. Would you like another hour?

MR. SALSBERG: No, I will ask a few questions, because if we accept the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) concluding remarks, then we would hardly even consider the Estimates, except in a very perfunctory fashion, because we could not ask in the Estimates those questions which are pertinent, and without asking them, we just could not properly vote on many items. I think that would be wrong. We must remember that regardless of how, when, or where, or by whom this thing started and developed; the fact is, and we must face the fact that this province is concerned with—the recent development in this department. Whether you approve of one headline or another, this is a public issue. In fact, I as one member of the House—and I said so here, and I say so outside—am trying to raise other issues which, in my opinion, are far more important than this. I have said so in this House and at all my public meetings outside, since the beginning of the session. My point is that, while this is a serious business and we must get to the bottom of it, there are far more

important questions, such as unemployment, loss of trade, the foreign situation, housing, and so on, and we must not allow this to over-shadow everything else. I think that is a sound position to take.

However, it is a major issue, and this is the first time this Legislature is discussing it, and that being the case, I am obliged to say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that he stopped, in my opinion, too soon.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) a question?

MR. SALSBERG: Of course.

MR. COWLING: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) remarked in his talk just now that he was making public statements about general affairs. I noticed in the paper this morning that the LPP are meeting here in the city, and that meeting is not open to the public or to the press. Would the hon. member like to comment on that?

MR. SALSBERG: What has that got to do with this? It has nothing to do with it, and I will discuss it with the hon. member (Mr. Cowling) privately. However, this is the first evening we are discussing this matter, and without going into detail, the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) can, and I think should, make clear a few things: for instance, the questions raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) on a number of concrete cases, touch on the heart of the problem, and this can be dealt with even under the circumstances. That is the story being circulated, and that is a question people want answered. Is it true that it has been a practice—that is a point—for certain contracting firms to deliberately tender low, knowing that they can later be recompensed?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that that is absolutely untrue, as far as I know, and as far as any person knows who has anything to do with me. It is ridiculous.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Chairman, in an isolated instance there could be an explanation. I do not know these cases. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) mentioned one case where the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) said the road was widened, and when we get down to brass tacks we may find it is exactly so. The big question though, to which everyone wants an answer, is the one I have raised, namely, whether it is a practice, and if that practice has reached such proportions, as has been said, that legitimate, large-scale contracting firms did not even want to tender because they knew they could not meet the low tendering that certain firms resorted to because the latter were able to collect additional amounts later? The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has already given a reply. If he wants to elaborate on it, now may be the time to do so. Personally if I were he, I would elaborate on it, and speak of the trends of experience over a long period of time.

Then there is another thing. We know that the chief engineer has been suspended. Now I am not standing here as a judge to determine whether or not he should have been suspended, or what his position should be at the moment, but I suggest we should be told if there has been any change there? Is the man still out of the country? Is he coming back? Do you want him to come back? Is he now co-operating? And so on. In other words, a whole list of these questions which are being written about and talked about, and about which people are asking. I think a great deal of enlightenment could be given the House by the hon. Minister of Highways. And this is just by way of an introduction.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 70—if you want to get back to items again, it may be a terrific come-down for the gallery to discuss this—but you are voting from Highway Reserve Account \$23 million.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is right.

MR. NIXON: And on the next page there is a statutory vote of \$35 million.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): That is already there.

MR. NIXON: \$58 million. How much does that leave?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think I might explain that to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

The situation is there will be left in the Highway Reserve Fund, from the amount voted a year ago, about \$17,500,000. There was \$17,500,000 voted in the Supplementary Estimates a few days ago. That makes the \$35 million. That was, as it were, in the bank at the beginning of the year. There will be added to that, from the Votes here, another \$23 million, which will make \$58 million in the Highway Reserve Account.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the money being voted here totals \$121,525,000, which is the amount of the Vote asked for in these Estimates. There is already \$35 million in the Highway account.

Vote No. 70 agreed to.

On Vote No. 71.

MR. ALBERT WREN (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell me what salaries are paid to the division engineers and if he thinks they are adequate? What is the normal salary for a division engineer?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I regret, Mr. Chairman, I have not the list of salaries with me tonight, but we will be happy to give the hon. member the figures. They are on a sliding scale. It is a matter of the time the engineer has worked with the department, and they are also zoned, according to divisions.

MR. WREN: What is the highest salary?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I would say, roughly—but I think it will be very close—that the top salary for a division engineer would be about \$7,500.

MR. OLIVER: Who are the acting division engineers at Huntsville and Fort William at the present time?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cache, who was Assistant in the Ottawa Division, and then went to Cochrane for a short time, has now been transferred to Fort William. Mr. Walker is at Huntsville.

MR. OLIVER: They are both in the capacity of acting engineers, at the moment?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No, Mr. Cache is a division engineer.

MR. OLIVER: Is that in Fort William?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: He was division engineer at Cochrane, and was moved to Fort William.

MR. OLIVER: Was his appointment confirmed at Fort William?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: Is that the practice, when a division engineer is suspended?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Cache has not been suspended. He was a division engineer before being transferred to Fort William. He took over the division at Fort William.

MR. OLIVER: Is he acting or has he been permanently appointed?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: His appointment has been confirmed. It was necessary to have a man to carry on at Fort William at once, and he was transferred there.

MR. OLIVER: But at Huntsville, the present incumbent is acting?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Oh yes, definitely.

Votes 71 and 72 agreed to.

On Vote 73.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 73, item 1: last year, the salaries for that department were \$290,000 and this year they have increased to \$695,000. Would the hon. Minister care to comment on that?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I might explain that change. As the hon. Prime Minister explained the other day, when speaking about the change in the Department of Highways, when we changed our Act, we formerly had our casual staff, which we took from other departments for the rush seasons, and they were really charged into the Highways Department. We now find casuals, when taken from one section to another, are charged to that section, and in that amount is included the change-over. The cost of living taken into the salaries has increased the amount considerably.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): On item 5, "Registration of Plates." Just in a lighter vein, I think I should bring to the attention of the hon. Minister that at our meeting of the Committee on Travel and Publicity the other day, there was some discussion, and congratulations were tendered to the hon. Minister for his fine licence plates. The thought was expressed there that there might be some sort of a slogan for the Province of Ontario, to be placed on the bottom of the licence plates. In many of the States in the Union, for instance, Wisconsin, "The Country's Dairy Land," and the State of Maine, "Vacation Land," and Florida, "The Sunshine State," and so forth, appear on their licence plates, and I was wondering if possibly some consideration might be given to putting a nice slogan at the bottom, such as "Canada's Vacation Land"—

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glen-garry): "A Tourist Paradise."

MR. COWLING: There is no other province, to my knowledge, which does that, and as Ontario always leads the way. I wonder if the hon. Minister would take under advisement, such a matter, or would he care to comment upon it?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member (Mr. Cowling); sometime ago, we made an announcement that we have standardized our plates with a majority of the States

of the United States, and in order to keep the figures on the plate, there would not be room for anything else, unless we took off the Crown, and far be it from me to ever recommend that we remove the Crown from the plates of the Province of Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: This may not be very important, Mr. Chairman, but what do you pay for the licence plates manufactured at Guelph?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I am not just positive, Mr. Chairman, but I will take a guess—between 13c. and 16c.

MR. SALSBERG: And what do you get for them?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: We get a slight profit.

MR. SALSBERG: You are profiteering.

Vote 73 agreed to.

On Vote 74.

MR. OLIVER: On Vote 74, Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister tell the House how much money the government is holding back in respect to the 9 contractors whose books have been seized? I think that is a fair question. I would like the hon. Minister to tell the House just how much money is being held back.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry I have not those figures here, and it would be difficult to give that information, without going into some detail. Until a job is finalized, under the contract, we hold 15 per cent., and I think on one or two of those jobs, we have paid very nearly all of that.

MR. OLIVER: That would still run into the millions.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Oh no.

MR. OLIVER: How much?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: My Finance Comptroller said he would not even guess without consulting the books, but

if it is your desire, we can give the figure to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. OLIVER: It certainly is my desire.

MR. WREN: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell us the policy they have in the division office with regard to snowplowing on roads other than the King's Highways? Can we have a clear outline of that policy?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, this is the policy: Writing in a letter addressed to Mr. Albert Wren, M.L.A., Sioux Lookout, Ontario, Mr. M. M. McEwen, the division engineer at Kenora, has forwarded this information regarding snowplowing during the coming winter.

The instructions given to our division engineer are there will be no snowplowing for private purposes. For plowing done for other governmental departments, including the federal departments, the cost has been set at a flat rate of \$200 per mile, or portion thereof. For organized and unorganized townships, improvement districts, and so forth, plowing will be done this winter at the net cost to this department.

The municipalities have been advised that due to the tremendous number of requests which have been made for snowplowing, the department will not be able in succeeding winters to carry out this plowing.

The subsidy by the department will, of course, continue to be paid to any municipality, improvement district, or statute labour board which will do its own plowing.

MR. OLIVER: What is the date of that letter?

MR. WREN: Yes, would the hon. Minister tell us on what date that letter was written?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: November 2nd, 1953. We have had many requests. Many of the municipalities and un-

organized districts thought the rate we were asking was a little high. We do not want to interfere with private enterprise, and we have said to the municipalities, we would be very happy if they would make arrangements for the winter of 1954 now, and we will subsidize them by whatever subsidy is given to each municipality on other work. Most of them have agreed that was a very agreeable arrangement.

MR. WREN: Mr. Chairman, on December 31st—I recall the letter the hon. Minister has just read, or a copy of it—but on December 31st I received a subsequent letter from the Deputy Minister of Highways which did not quite follow that line of thinking. I would ask the hon. Minister this question: As I said in my address to the House the other day, on January 9th, 1954, the defeated Conservative candidate in the last provincial election inserted in the paper, a notice—after these letters by the hon. Minister and the Deputy Minister—saying:

The Minister of Highways informs me that private road plowing will be carried out immediately, as in the past.

This letter of January 9th refutes what the hon. Minister said to me in a letter, and what the Deputy had said. In other words, he is using the hon. Minister's name to impute that the hon. Minister has reversed his decision, and that snowplowing will be carried on in the future, as it has been in the past. Which is correct? That is what I want to know, and what the statute labour board and others want to know.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I read the letter which is similar to the one I sent out; in fact, it is almost identically word for word.

Any person who writes a letter to me asking for my policy, if I have time, I reply immediately, and if not, I do so at the first opportunity. I do not know what was in the paper, but no doubt the gentleman wrote me a letter, and I answered. He wanted information for his community, and we are always

anxious to tell the communities what we are prepared to do, and, as I have stated, we were prepared to plow any of the roads for the municipalities, or the Federal Government, and so forth, and they would be subsidized for whatever their bill was.

MR. WREN: Perhaps I have not made my question clear. I thoroughly understand the policy you sent to me in November, and I understood the Deputy's letter on December 31st, and I conveyed that information to people in my constituency, who were interested, but on January 9th, some weeks after those letters were written, this man said:

The Minister of Highways informs me that private road plowing will be carried out immediately, as in the past.

Which is correct?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: The hon. Minister of Highways did not make that promise.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: We are not plowing private roads.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No. We are not plowing private parties' roads. We are doing it for municipalities.

MR. WREN: Then this statement is not correct?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I do not know anything about that statement.

MR. WREN: The hon. Minister did not make it?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I very likely wrote a letter to the gentleman. I write to any gentleman who requires information from the department. We are anxious to give to the public any information we have regarding what we are doing for the public. We extend all co-operation possible. But he could just as well have enquired of the municipality. They have a municipal engineer there who could have given the information required.

MR. WREN: This is not a municipal problem. The municipalities are not

complaining about snow plow arrangements. This refers to the ploughing of roads other than municipal roads. The hon. Minister and Mr. Millar, the Deputy, made a statement and then this man refutes it in the newspapers.

HON. MR. FROST: Who is the man who refutes it?

MR. WREN: The president of the Conservative Association in the Kenora District.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I must again say I am not responsible for advertisements which appear in the papers. If I was, I would certainly be responsible for a lot of things I might be ashamed of. Nevertheless, for what was stated in the letter, I cannot be responsible.

MR. WREN: Then this is all "bosh." That is all I want to know.

MR. OLIVER: I just want to ask the hon. Minister with regard to Vote 74, whether he would outline to the House the programme for this year in a broad way. Or in as minute detail as he likes.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought I had imposed considerable work on the Department of Highways in asking them to prepare the book which was placed on the desk of each hon. member, and I think that goes into great detail. There is a spread sheet which sets out the disposal of many thousands of dollars as well as 300 or more contracts.

Some of the other works I mentioned in my speech. I can tell the House about some of the things we anticipate doing, but I must preface my remarks by saying this: there are great possibilities, but a great deal depends on the engineering we can get done. In the last few years the engineering preparation required has been much more extensive, and I do not think I need tell hon. members, Mr. Chairman, how difficult it is to get the services of technical men. If hon. members ever read the *New York Times* they will see there is a full

page of advertisements every weekend for engineers. We have tried to supplement our staff with additional trained men, but they are most difficult to find. As the hon. Prime Minister said tonight, if conditions warrant it, and if we can have the staff to do it, we shall certainly go forward with many of the roads that we have planned.

One of these, as I stated tonight, is the continuation of the highway to Windsor. No doubt we shall in the coming year do very considerable work on the development from Cornwall west. There are numerous other jobs in prospect. We might even consider the renewing and surfacing of roads in the hon. member for Grey's own county. If we are short of engineering staff we might be able to resurface some roads which need a minimum of engineering. But it is unnecessary for me to say that, with all construction work, there is a very extensive engineering programme involved.

MR. OLIVER: May I inquire about the routing of the road along the St. Lawrence River? Is it reasonably well established as to where it will be?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Reasonably so. I think the Hydro have their location selected, but it depends somewhat on where the railway track runs.

MR. OLIVER: What mileage is involved?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: It might run to 40 miles.

MR. P. MANLEY (Stormont): With regard to Vote 75, and the amount set out for development roads, I see there is quite a reduction. Is it the intention of the department to cut down on this item each year?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I would not say there is any intention to cut down on the development roads. This year we hope to carry on a programme about the same in extent as last year. The reason for cutting this sum this year is that last year we did not spend the amount we put in the Estimates.

MR. WREN: With regard to item 75, No. 2—roads in unincorporated townships in Northern Ontario. I see this amounts to \$200,000. Can the hon. Minister give me a break-down? Where will that money be spent?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, as I stated in my address this afternoon, we have between 100 and 200 unincorporated townships, and 155 statutory labour boards. It would not be possible for me to give the hon. member (Mr. Wren) a detailed break-down. It would be a long process. But I may say it is done according to the subsidy, or according to the work provided. In many of these cases we pay money in lieu of work done.

MR. MANLEY: Then all this is for statutory labour boards?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No. Not all of it. There are the unincorporated townships.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us what yardstick he uses when granting subsidies? I know of some municipalities which have appealed to the department and been turned down.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: It is a very difficult thing to give any hon. member an exact explanation. I can tell him how we did it last year. We had a little less in the budget than we have this year, but last year, in speaking to the Municipal Association when they had some 1,800 representatives in the city, I recommended to them they should act along certain lines and I would recommend to this Legislature the amount of some \$28 million to meet their requirements, or the amount which they received in the previous year. But, as I remember them, the figures of their Estimates were in excess of double that amount, running between \$80 million and \$90 million. It was such a huge sum of money that we could not begin to provide for its expenditure. We had to figure a yardstick by which to judge these requirements, and the Estimate which we used was that we brought the

majority back to the 1952 level. I said if there should be any cases of emergency, we would be happy to consider it. And we did consider very many such cases and in every case, I am very happy to say, extra money was granted. And I may say to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) who raised this question, that his own community came forward and got something like \$150,000 or more because they were doing some work of an emergency nature. That is what we did in pretty nearly every case and we ended up satisfactorily, spending, I think, all the money they wanted to spend, but very little more than the amount we had provided in the Estimates.

MR. THOMAS: While we are on Vote 75, I would like to mention a service road which was built in the City of Oshawa in 1952 and 1953. This particular road is about $1\frac{7}{8}$ miles long and it passes through approximately 1 mile of city property. The work was begun in October or November of 1952, and completed some time in 1953 and the local council there did not know who had given the Department of Highways authority to build it. Various questions were asked in the council. But no one seemed to have the answer. It was raised in the City Council, in February or March of last year and it was discussed for some time. The affair was tabled, and then brought up again in June, and a committee of two members of the Council, Alderman Down and Alderman Dyer, were appointed to investigate and find out how this road and bridge were built. They made some inquiries and eventually ended up in the Department of Highways, where they met the Deputy Minister. They asked him who had given permission, and he told them that the local council had consented to the building of this road, but he could not remember the names of the individual council members. There the matter rested for some time.

At the election in December the question was raised again and was an issue in the local municipal election, and when the election was over 3 new faces appeared on the council. Whether that

was the result of the road investigation or not, I do not know, but at the first meeting in January a committee was again appointed to investigate the building of this service road and the bridge.

Three members of council were appointed and they asked me if I would assist in an advisory capacity. I said I would be very happy to do so.

The committee could not be called political, for there were 2 Conservatives, 1 Liberal, and myself. We made some investigations locally and none of the local councillors seemed to know anything about it. No confirmation by motion or resolution appeared in the minute book; no record was there at all and we eventually ended up in the Department of Highways in consultation with the hon. Minister and the Deputy Minister.

To me it seemed quite obvious that the hon. Minister was not too well acquainted with the situation; in fact he mentioned that it was mainly departmental, and the Deputy Minister had taken charge of that particular project. During the course of the discussion, Mr. Millar, I think, only remembered 2 names of the delegation, but agreed that it was a verbal arrangement between these 3 or 4 men in the delegation, and no written agreement had been moved or approved by the local council. It meant a minority of 3 men on that council had committed a 12-man council to something they did not know anything at all about.

The building of the road and bridge, I must admit, was an economy for the Province of Ontario. They were quite within their right in doing that, because it meant a bridge and a road costing about \$94,000 was a much better alternative to building a bridge across the dual-lane highway and the two railways, which might have cost \$400,000 or \$500,000.

The important point about it was this, Mr. Chairman, that when the committee was appointed, at the first meeting in January on Monday evening, the following day the Deputy Minister made a statement in the *Oshawa Times Gazette* that the City Council had requested the

building of this road and had completely approved of the arrangement. That, I suggest, was a mis-statement, because no such agreement had been approved of by the City Council of Oshawa.

However, this is the point I want to make: the Department of Highways had gone in there on private municipal property. They had not expropriated the 1 mile of road, and had spent \$94-95,000, and when we questioned the Deputy Minister and asked him if it was customary for the Department of Highways to go in and spend that amount of money on a verbal consent of a minority of councillors, he had this to say: "Yes, it is quite common practice. We sometimes do that and spend millions of dollars."

Mr. Chairman, perhaps that might be the reason for some of the things which are happening on the highways today. I would like the hon. Minister to comment on the situation down there.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I think I gave the hon. member an explanation, as well as I could, at the time he was in to see me, but I have had a little light thrown on the matter since. I happened to be in the capital city last Saturday and met, accidentally, in the hotel one of the members who was with the deputation which waited on the Deputy Minister. At the time it was explained to the hon. member that this was a road which we had anticipated in lieu of—or to prevent—the building of a very costly overhead over double tracks, which would cost several times the amount of the road.

As I understand it, it was a verbal explanation and arrangement and as he states, they requested to see the Deputy Minister. They did not come to see me on this particular matter, as I understand it, but when they were there they said, "Why not go ahead and build this road?" They were quite anxious to have it done. It was not going to cost them anything. As I understand it—and it is only my understanding—they volunteered the part of the right-of-way which they had expropriated, or were going to expropriate, I do not know which.

However, the road was built at no cost to the city. Since that time they have annexed this area and, any person to whom I have spoken feels it is going to be of considerable service to the town.

I saw in an Oshawa paper the other day that this was a "tempest in a teapot." But what was wrong? According to him, he criticized the members of the former council for not coming forward and telling the facts to the present council.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): That is right. If I might ask one question, I will finish. The hon. Minister of Highways said he was speaking to someone in Ottawa last week-end.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is right.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I imagine it would be our local Conservative member, Mr. Starr.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I want to put the hon. member straight on that now. I assure you it was not Mr. Starr, your local federal member.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): It was not?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No, it was another gentleman, and you can take another guess. I happened to meet him in the hotel and, in fact, I do not mind saying I had lunch with him, and he paid for it. We discussed this amongst many other things.

HON. MR. FROST: The road is no longer lost? Is that it?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): No, the road is no longer lost. I think it was good business on the part of the government. It was saving them money. But it was the procedure which was adopted that I argue with.

Vote 75 agreed to.

On Vote 76.

MR. MANLEY (Stormont): On Vote 76, "Payments out of The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund," as I recall the

hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) made some very definite charges in the House that the people in the legal profession were getting more out of this fund than the people involved in accidents. I would like the hon. Minister to explain to us how that fund is holding out, and if those irregularities, which the hon. member alleged, have been corrected.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I might say during my acquaintanceship with the hon. member for Kingston, I have found he is pretty capable of taking care of himself on all occasions, and any statements he made, the hon. member for Stormont can discuss with him.

However, I mentioned in my address tonight that we had made one amendment which permitted us to make certain settlements. 150 of those, I think, have been settled and at considerable saving. I could not tell you how much.

As far as the fund is concerned, I am very happy to report to the House, Mr. Chairman, that it is in a very good condition. Last year we borrowed some \$600,000 from the hon. Provincial Treasurer. He loaned it on a promissory note and we have been paying that off.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): What interest did he charge?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: A very nominal fee.

MR. SALSBERG: How much?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I could not tell you how much, I would have to check on that. I might say that has been liquidated and unless something unforeseen occurs this year, while we have an item in here of \$200,000, we will be able to carry on without using that amount, but it is there in case of an emergency.

MR. MANLEY: May I ask another question: if it is possible, would you consider dropping the 50 cents for the drivers' licences in another year?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: If we accumulate a certain amount of money,

But I do not want to go back for another loan this year. I want to keep my credit good, and probably we will go along for 2 years and will have an idea of just what we can do. I assure the hon. member if we accumulate a sum of money which will permit it, we will certainly give it back to the public by reducing that fee.

MR. SALSBERG: Before we dispose of the final Vote here, I would like to remind the hon. Minister that one of the very few questions I asked tonight was not answered, and I would like to ask him whether he would answer it now.

The question was, in case he forgot, whether the chief engineer is still out of the city, or out of the country: whether he is still suspended, whether he has been summoned to return and co-operate, and what his attitude is?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I might say, first of all, the chief engineer is suspended. I do not know where he is, but I hope he will return, and soon.

MR. SALSBERG: Am I to conclude that the government is desirous of getting him back?

HON. MR. FROST: Very much so.

MR. SALSBERG: But he has not shown up and his whereabouts are not known?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is true.

MR. SALSBERG: Is that true?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is correct.

MR. GRUMMETT: In connection with the hon. Minister's statement that you might take steps to bring him back, what can you do unless you charge him with an extraditable offence?

HON. MR. FROST: That is correct, you are quite right.

Vote 76 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

HOMES OF THE FRIENDLESS AND INFANTS HOMES

House in Committee on Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting the Homes of the Friendless and Infants Homes."

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 7 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

House in Committee on Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting the Township of Toronto."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 9 reported.

ROYAL BOTANICAL GARDENS

House in Committee on Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting the Royal Botanical Gardens."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 12 reported.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

House in Committee on Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 13 reported.

CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

House in Committee on Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines."

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 16 reported.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE

House in Committee on Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting St. Michael's College."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 20 reported.

TOWN OF FORT ERIE

House in Committee on Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie."

Sections 1 to 3 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 30 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I say that if there are any of these bills hon. members would like held, we shall be glad to hold it, but we will go ahead with the ones which are non-contentious.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 33, "The Department of Education Act, 1954."

Sections 1 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 33 reported.

THE MINING ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 53, "An Act to amend the Mining Act."

Sections 1 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 53 reported.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 55, "An Act to amend the Department of Municipal Affairs Act."

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment to move to Bill No. 55. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) enquired regarding the final words in 10a(1) of section 1, where it says, "as it deems advisable," and asked me to delete that. I am putting in instead:

"Relative to provincial grants and municipal tax levies." That is the information I would ask for.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): On this bill, and on this section, Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment, and I shall explain it before doing so. I assure you I shall be very brief.

I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is not very reasonable. What you are trying to do in it is to oblige municipalities to state in the tax bill, how much they receive from the province—is that right? I do not think it should be done, because it could be considered a political move to get political "kudos" for the government which happens to be in power. I am very good humoured now, and I am not suspecting this government of having such intentions or thoughts, but it could be construed as having such a meaning, and I was going to suggest that, in order that we be very fair and above-board, if we intend to proceed with this bill—which I would rather not—then let us amend it so that in the tax bill, while mentioning the amount received from the province, we also require them to state what percentage of the provincial grant comes from the Federal Government. I believe hon. members know what I mean. But in case the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) does not quite "get it," I will explain it a little further.

What I have in mind is this, that on the basis of the tax agreement with Ottawa, this province received at this time about one-third of the total income—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I see the point the hon. member is making.

MR. SALSBERG: It is a very interesting point.

HON. MR. FROST: It may be put this way: we are renting to Ottawa, very profitable tax fields for \$140 million, nearly every cent of which goes to the municipalities.

MR. SALSBERG: And the municipalities also had certain tax fields which were taken away by the province, and in lieu certain grants were given. The city could say, if it wanted to—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: What was taken away?

MR. SALSBERG: The corporation income tax.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, and they were given a one mill subsidy in lieu of that.

MR. SALSBERG: I said they took away certain fields, and in turn, gave them a grant.

HON. MR. FROST: Who took them away?

MR. SALSBERG: The provincial government of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: What day?

HON. MR. PORTER: Perhaps the provincial government of the night.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, night like this.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It was good legislation.

MR. SALSBERG: The point I make is that they took away the right of the municipalities to certain taxes, and in lieu thereof, they are giving them a grant. This government is doing the same thing, and I think in all fairness, the taxpayers should be told on their tax bills, "This city is receiving from the province, \$1 million, \$500,000 of

which is in a grant from the Federal Government to the province." Then you would be eminently just and fair. Anything else will cause people to suspect you are putting through this legislation in order to get some political kudos.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member always suspects us of that.

MR. OLIVER: You might gain some votes by it, but you would lose some the other way.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The people are complaining in the province—in fact, I have listened to radio broadcasts, where it was said that the poor municipalities were being left out in the cold. We are not ashamed of what we are doing for the municipalities. We want it on the tax bill, so that the taxpayers will know what this province is doing.

MR. SALSBERG: And why you are doing that. Tell them that almost one-half of it comes from a federal grant, therefore, your percentage of the money you give them is from the Provincial Treasury.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. member that the money we receive from the Federal Government is for valuable consideration; what we give to the municipalities is for natural love and affection—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: And right on the top of the table.

MR. OLIVER: I would like to say one word to the hon. Minister. I am not a bit alarmed about this. But I think he should put a "X" at the bottom, and suggest to the taxpayers that they have paid the whole thing in the first place, and this just partial reimbursement.

HON. MR. PORTER: We do not need to tell them that; they know it.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: They are very intelligent people.

MR. OLIVER: I think they are. I do not think they will be moved much by this.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 55 reported.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That is the best pieces of legislation we have ever passed through this House.

THE BEES ACT, 1954

The House in Committee on Bill No. 59, "The Bees Act, 1954."

Section 1 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

On section 22.

MR. SALSBERG: Just to break the monotony. I am sure it is not for the old bees, because this is a long bill.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I do not see the hon. member for Kenora. He has bees up in the north country.

MR. SALSBERG: Was the Society of Beekeepers consulted about this bill, and have they approved of it?

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Do you not want this to go to the Labour Committee?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, the answer is "yes"; they were all consulted, except some of the bees. They were not consulted.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like the hon. Minister of Labour to hear that. He knows what I mean.

Sections 22 to 29 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 59 reported.

THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 60, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 60 reported.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT, 1954

House in Committee on Bill No. 61,
"The Plant Diseases Act, 1954."

Sections 1 to 13 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 61 reported.

THE LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 62,
"An Act to amend the Livestock and
Livestock Products Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 62 reported.

HON. MR. FROST moves the com-
mittee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in
the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr.
Speaker, the Committee of the Whole
House begs to report 13 bills without
amendment, and one bill with amend-
ment.

Report concurred in.

HON. MR. FROST moves the
adjournment of the House.

He said: Tomorrow afternoon, we
will consider the Estimates of the
Department of Labour. I understand
the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.
Salsberg) will be out of town.

MR. SALSBERG: Not this year.

HON. MR. FROST: Following that,
any committee work we can do. As the
hon. members know, the House will
meet at 2 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 of the
clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, March 26, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, March 26, 1954.

Third Report, Standing Committee on Municipal Law, Mr. Parry	845
Ninth Report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Stewart	845
Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto Act, 1954, introduced by Mr. Dunlop, first reading	845
Election Act, 1951, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	846
Voters List Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	846
Controverted Elections Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading	846
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to	847
Estimates, Provincial Auditor, Mr. Frost	847
Estimates, Department of Labour, Mr. Daley	851
Home of the Friendless and Infants Home, bill respecting, third reading	868
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, third reading	868
Royal Botanical Gardens, bill respecting, third reading	868
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, third reading	868
City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, third reading	868
St. Michael's College, bill respecting, third reading	868
Town of Fort Erie, bill respecting, third reading	868
Department of Education Act, 1954, third reading	868
Mining Act, bill to amend, third reading	868
Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, third reading	868
Bees Act, 1954, third reading	868
Agricultural Societies Act, bill to amend, third reading	868
Plant Diseases Act, 1954, third reading	868
Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act, bill to amend, third reading	868
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	869

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1954.

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Today, we have as our guests, pupils from the Burlington Public Schools in Burlington. We are very happy to have you with us, I am sure, and we sincerely trust that our deliberations will be of interest to and an education for you.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. GEORGE PARRY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Beckett, I beg leave to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Beckett, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, submits the following as its Third Report.

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Public Parks Act."

Motion agreed to.

MR. W. J. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Ninth Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Stewart, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presents the following as its Ninth Report.

Your committee begs to present the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ROYAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC OF TORONTO ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, "The Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, for a good many years, there has been in the University of Toronto, a Faculty of Music, instruction in which has been given, for the most part, in The Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto.

That institution—The Royal Conservatory of Music—has been managed all these years by a Board of Directors, upon which board the university has had representation from its Board of Governors. After there has been for so many years such close connection between the two, so that the Conservatory has practically been a part of the university, it is now proposed that the union be consummated, and The Royal Conservatory of Music become definitely and—shall I say—absolutely a part in every way of the University of Toronto, operated, as are other faculties, by the Board of Governors of the University.

The Board of Directors are most anxious this shall be done, and the Board of Governors is also perfectly willing that it be done.

THE ELECTION ACT, 1951

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General) moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Election Act, 1951."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill follows in large part, the recommendations of the Committee on the Election Act, which presented its report earlier in the session.

There are one or two changes. One is the recommendation as to a deposit of \$200 has not been incorporated in this bill.

Secondly, the provision with respect to Returning Officers has been somewhat amended. Rather than having a permanent appointment, it is provided by this bill that a Returning Officer may be appointed at any time prior to an election, and shall hold the office until he completes his duties with respect to the next following general election. His duties are then terminated, and it is open to have another appointment made, if it is considered advisable.

But it did preserve the principle of one of the main reasons, I think, for the recommendation of the committee, and that is that a Returning Officer may be appointed prior to an election, and thus will be enabled to do a great deal of preliminary work, instead of having it left for the very last moment.

In some cases, it might not be convenient to appoint a Returning Officer at an earlier date, while in others it may be more convenient to appoint one later. There is a certain amount of flexibility in that respect.

Thirdly, there is a section repealing the present section as to the use of automobiles. That recommendation has not been accepted. I think those are the three main diversions from the report of the committee.

THE VOTERS LIST ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Voters List Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This bill, Mr. Speaker, is complementary to the Election Act, and follows in substance the recommendations of the committee. I do not think there are any changes. However, I will check that before the time the bill comes forward later.

THE CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Controverted Elections Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill simply is supplementary to the other two bills, in one point only; it strikes out the words "Clerk of the Court in Chancery" as used in the present Act, and replaces those words with the words, "Chief Election Officer."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege; are congratulations due to the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope)? I see he has at last "made it" to the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, may I say just a word on behalf of the appeal presently being made to our people, not only in Ontario, but across Canada, on behalf of the Canadian Cancer Society.

In Ontario, we have the Ontario Division, with Mr. Heinzman as chairman. He is a young man with great ability. Assisting him is a great band of men and women who are very interested and active in fighting this great scourge of Canada.

Their appeal is for \$500,000, to help carry out the work of the Canadian Cancer Society, the Ontario Institute, and assist in the formation of cancer institutes from Windsor, around the shores of the lakes to the Lakehead.

It is our very great wish and desire that the Cancer Society, with its great membership, should be active allies and supporters of that project.

As was mentioned in the budget, we are, shall I say, investing a great sum of money in the fight against that disease.

The Cancer Society has been active for many years, and has had very close association with thousands of people in this province. They are doing magnificent work, and with the completion of the Cancer Institute in Toronto, will be able to devote more and more of their energies to the furtherance of research. Part of their activities will be devoted to the stimulation of public interest in that very great feature of cancer prevention. Indeed, we hope, ultimately research will lead to a complete cancer cure.

The work some of these people are doing is indeed very wonderful. I would like particularly to mention their work in connection with the "Little Red Door", a project which is adjacent to some of the great hospitals, where people who are afflicted may go for counsel and advice.

Some of the people associated with the Cancer Society are those who have suffered and recovered from that dread disease, and they give their experiences to other people who are afflicted, which gives the people confidence that their ailment is not necessarily fatal, and, if treated in time, is curable. I cannot speak too highly of the work of this society. The chairman of the Ontario Division is a member of the Ontario Research Foundation, Mr. Heinzman. There are others who are very closely connected with the work. There is in effect a partnership between the government, the medical practitioners, the research scientists and the hospital staff. The Cancer Foundation and the Cancer Society draw together all the known

resources in the fight against this disease. I want today, Mr. Speaker, to commend their appeal to the people of the province.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the House consent to taking up at this time the Estimates for the Office of the Provincial Auditor. Last night, I said we would call, first of all, the Estimates for the Department of Labour. The departure I am making may appear comparatively slight, although, in effect, it is very great.

In ordinary course, the Department of the Provincial Auditor has been dealt with and passed over more or less as a matter of routine. I do not recall in my time any questions being asked relating to it.

However, Mr. Chairman, in view of the present situation, I would like to make some references to remarks which were made in the House last night in regard to the Auditor's Department, and this afternoon might be the time to spend a few minutes to say something about that section.

I think perhaps, in the past, I have been rather remiss in not saying something more fully to the hon. members of the House in connection with the Provincial Auditor's Department. Some 3 or 4 years ago, there was a revision of the Statute which governs that department, and which made the Auditor as he always has been—but which clarified the situation—the servant of this House and of the people, not of the government.

The Provincial Auditor, his Deputy and his staff have, over the years, been self-effacing individuals, whose work

has never been spectacular, but, nevertheless, has been of the utmost value to our province.

This morning, I mentioned this matter to my good friend, the Comptroller of Finance, Doctor Walters. I am indebted to Dr. Walters for showing me a letter written some 16 years ago by the then Provincial Auditor, who had served his province for some 40 years, the late Gordon Brown.

At that time, Mr. Brown was dying of cancer, and passed away shortly afterwards.

Doctor Walters gave me this letter, and on it is the handwriting of my predecessor, hon. Mitchell Hepburn, which makes this an interesting document, from a historical point of view. This letter was written on the 14th of February, 1938, addressed to the hon. M. F. Hepburn, Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer, Parliament Buildings, and it reads:

DEAR MR. HEPBURN:

I have been discussing with Mr. Walters the question of my resigning my position because of the condition of my health, and being greatly concerned as to the future of the department with which I have been connected for over forty years, I take the liberty of writing you with regard to my successor.

I wish to bring to your attention my assistant Mr. H. A. Cotnam, who is a Chartered Accountant and a Bachelor of Commerce, and who has qualifications beyond these academic ornaments; he is zealous for the Service and above all he is loyal to his position and to those in authority over him. The staff respects him and serves him cheerfully; and I respect him and am grateful to him for the way he has supported me. He is in every way eminently fitted for the position of Provincial Auditor, and as one of the severing acts of my forty years of service I write this letter recommending him for appointment to the position which I shall shortly vacate.

I have discussed this matter with your Comptroller of Finances, Mr. C. S. Walters, who will support and add to my recommendation.

Assuring you of my true personal regard and my very best wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

(signed) G. A. BROWN,
Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Chairman, I will table this letter, and if any hon. member would like to see it, they will have an opportunity so

to do, after which I will ask the Clerk of the House to hand the letter back to Doctor Walters, from whose files it came.

In reading you this appraisal of our Provincial Auditor, Mr. Harvey Cotnam, I am reading you the verdict of one who died shortly after, a man with 40 years of service to our province. It is indeed a voice from the past, and it is more eloquent than anything I can say about the capabilities of Mr. Cotnam. It has been borne out by the experience of the 16 years which have elapsed, during 11 of which I have been Treasurer of Ontario.

During that period he has not been the servant of the government. He has been by Statute the servant of this Legislature. In his independent position he represents this Legislature and the people. Indeed he stands over the government. In this period of 11 years, the longest and in many ways the most trying and challenging period in which any Treasurer has been served, may I acknowledge the correctness of the late Mr. Brown's appraisal, and of the hon. Mr. Hepburn's acceptance of it.

May I add my own experience. I have found an unswerving loyalty to truth, a faithfulness to duty transcending any other association, and a justice and impartiality which is a tribute not only to the man, but to the people of this province whom he serves.

Mr. Cotnam has been a sound adviser to my predecessor. I am sure that all whom he served as Provincial Auditor will agree with me that Mr. Cotnam has been a great servant of this province. He has been a sound adviser to me, one who never hesitates to disagree with my judgment, when he finds it necessary.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) may say to me "What judgment has he disagreed with?" I would reply that I try to keep my judgment so sound, that it is difficult for me to remember an instance. I would certainly give any which occur to me to the hon. Leader of the Opposition when I have time to think it over. But I would assure hon. members that Mr. Cotnam

has never hesitated to give me his advice, and to tell me what he thought of the fiscal position of the province, about what we are doing and the way in which we are doing it. He will do that for those who will come after me, because he is still a young man, and he will be a great adviser to those who succeed to this position and to the portfolio which I hold as Treasurer of this province.

Mr. Cotnam is a man of great ability, which is recognized in government circles in other governments in Canada, and by those associated with business and industry outside of government. When he has been offered other appointments—and this, I can assure hon. members, has been the case—he has always said in his modest way that he prefers to be a good Provincial Auditor. May I say this afternoon that no auditor of any province or of any government in Canada can surpass him. I think I can say, quite truthfully and quite quite properly, that he is the best Provincial Auditor.

May I associate with him, his very able Deputy and Assistant Provincial Auditor, Mr. George Spence, and also all of those to whom I should like to refer personally, but time will not permit, who are associated in this great work which is being carried on continuously, I could almost say, in the interests of the government, and people of this province.

I am very happy indeed to make this acknowledgment of the work of Mr. Cotnam and Mr. Spence, and their very fine staff, and to state that I should repeat that every year. So often it is the case that we take as an accepted fact the good work of people, and we let it pass by, because other matters are more spectacular and more pressing.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that no work in Canada is more important than the work of the auditors, whose duty it is, as in the case of Mr. Cotnam, to see that the interests of the people always prevail.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): It is refreshing at times to be able to agree with the hon.

Prime Minister in remarks he makes in the House, and certainly on this occasion I can say that my colleagues and I agree with what he has said. We have in the present Provincial Auditor a man of very high calibre, in whom we have confidence, and in whom, I think, the people of Ontario have confidence also. He is an outstanding man and we are fortunate to have him as Provincial Auditor.

Having said that, I want to say this to the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost), that I think there is a great deficiency in the audit department, a deficiency arising from the fact that we are spending in Ontario some \$600 million a year, and we are asking the Provincial Auditor to audit all these accounts and keep a tight rein on expenditures, while allowing the audit office the sum of only \$250,000. I suggest in all seriousness to the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon that it is humanly impossible for the Provincial Auditor to do the job that he is trying to do, and that he is fully qualified to do, on this meagre allowance, and I think at this session of the Legislature, we should very greatly enlarge this amount. If we did, we have a man at the head of the department whom we know would spend that money wisely, and get it back many times over for the people of the Province of Ontario.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that I have reviewed this matter, and have asked Mr. Cotnam, in effect, to "write his own ticket." I know something of the work he has done himself over the past month, working on Saturdays and Sundays as well as other days. And here and now I offer to him, on behalf of the government and of this Legislature, every facility and every resource. As a matter of fact I have asked him not to work so hard himself. I have asked him to retain assistants if necessary. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition will realize that extension of staff is always fraught with a certain amount of difficulty, but it is within Mr. Cotnam's power to go outside the government to

secure staff to assist him. If he finds he requires such assistance, he is enabled to take this course, and I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that if this Estimate—which is Mr. Cotnam's own—is inadequate in any way, we shall certainly extend the financial resources he requires, and report that to the House next year. I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that in our auditing services we should not be niggardly. With a budget of \$350 million, enormous work is involved. We want to give the Provincial Auditor the resources he needs; we want him to keep his health. He is entitled to his leisure, and his home life the same as the rest of us, and I do not want his ever faithfulness to duty to prevent his doing the things he ought to do for the good of his own health. This applies also to his very faithful staff. I may say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I am in entire agreement with what he says, and if there should be requirements over and above the Estimate which has been submitted, I will certainly do as I have said, and report to the House afterwards.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I think it is very fitting indeed that the hon. Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition should have referred this afternoon to the work of the Provincial Auditor. I can recollect when I first came into the House, I was here for 2 or 3 years before I realized that there was such a man as a Provincial Auditor. His Estimates went through without any question, and no attention whatsoever was paid to this very important position. I am pleased, therefore, that the hon. Prime Minister took this opportunity this afternoon to refer to an office which is of such great importance in the administration of the affairs of this province.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I need hardly say that I, with, I am sure, every other hon. member, agree with everything which has been said. I am, of course, no authority on this, and I have had no personal experience with the auditor, except that he is a very

pleasant person to encounter, and that it is good to see him when we are in session. Everyone speaks well of him, and what more could be asked than that?

What I want to say on this item is this: it seems to me that it is not enough for us to tell the Provincial Auditor that we will make the necessary money available to him to enlarge his staff. I think we should, perhaps, make arrangements for the Provincial Auditor to have power to examine and to audit the books of branches of provincial activities, which are now outside his jurisdiction. I refer to this now because this is as appropriate a place as any other at which to do so. Last year I spoke on Hydro. I am aware that there is a private auditing firm at work there—and undoubtedly a very highly reputable firm—auditing the books. But I feel that even in the case of Hydro the Provincial Auditor should have the over-all responsibility for the auditing. I recognize that the auditing of so gigantic a commission as Hydro, with the enormous amount of money expended at this time, would require a big staff, and perhaps the Provincial Auditor would have to engage some private auditing firm to do part or most of the work for him.

I am suggesting that the responsibility for the auditing of Hydro and all other commissions should be that of the Provincial Auditor so that an hon. member of this Legislature could discuss with him matters affecting the operation of the commissions set up by the government on behalf of the people of Ontario. As matters stand, this is not possible. We can discuss with the Auditor any item we care to, affecting the government directly, but we cannot discuss with him matters affecting Hydro. I think that also applies to the Ontario Northland Railway, and even to the Liquor Board. I have felt for a long while that although the assumption of this additional responsibility would probably make it necessary for the Provincial Auditor to engage the services of private firm, final responsibility must

be in the hands of the Provincial Auditor.

I think that is a necessary step. I think it would result in better administration and also make possible the avoidance of many happenings, since every hon. member of this Legislature would have the opportunity of discussing matters with which he was concerned, and the Auditor could supply him with information with regard to said government agency or Commission.

I am not insisting that we have a full-dress discussion of this today, but I do think it is a constructive idea, and I would urge the hon. Prime Minister, who is also our Treasurer, to make a statement now, or at least to take it into serious consideration.

HON. MR. FROST: I will be very glad to discuss this matter with the Provincial Auditor. As a matter of fact, I have already discussed the matter with him at various times, as well as with such bodies as the Ontario Northland Railway, the Liquor Control Board, and The Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission. The Auditors are there continually. They conduct a running audit, and are housed right on the premises, and their reports are made partly to the organization's office, but they go as well to the Provincial Auditor. I think it will be agreed that there may be some difference of opinion as to whether the whole organization should be centred entirely upon the Provincial Auditor, or whether the present system of having these continuously—conducted audits, and reports to the Provincial Auditor, should be continued.

I will be very glad to discuss the point again with the Provincial Auditor. I think it has been felt by this government, and by the Auditor himself, and by governments in the past, that perhaps the present arrangement has advantages. However, the point is well taken, and I shall certainly give it consideration.

Vote 123 agreed to.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Before I proceed with the remarks I have to make in connection with the budget, I would draw the attention of hon. members to a resolution by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that there be laid before this House a return showing all correspondence between the Department of Labour and the Dominion Glass Company. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think the step taken by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was entirely unnecessary, and could have been avoided if the hon. member had asked me for this correspondence. He need not have gone through this official propaganda to get it this way. I have brought the correspondence with me, and I will lay it on the table.

MR. SALSBERG: May I reply to that?

HON. MR. DALEY: Not just now. I would like to get on with my remarks.

In introducing these Estimates, Mr. Chairman, there are two factors which I would like to bring to the attention of the House. The first is we must not forget that today industry is fighting in an ever increasing competitive market, both at home and abroad, for its very existence. These are trying times. We hear a great deal about the increasing unemployment situation, and I say that industry has a great responsibility, particularly in times like these, when markets are slowing down. Consumer demand is, to say the least, hesitant. If hon. members read the advertisements in the newspapers they will see that merchants all over the country are cutting their prices extensively, vying with each other for the consumer dollars, to the point of practically extinguishing the normal profit. Hon. members can see this on every side. So I say that industry has a greater responsibility than ever to give employment to every man it possibly can. I believe that industry is conscientiously trying to do this.

Now I know that our textile industry is at a low ebb at the present time,

because, it is claimed, of unfair outside competition, and other reasons upon which I shall not try to elaborate here. Our farm implements business is quietening for various reasons, one of which is the inability of our own, and other countries' farmers to purchase at present prices, and also, in the case of farmers from other countries, inability to secure the necessary dollars. Many small industries—implements industries particularly—are going through rather a quiet time because of competition from such countries as Germany and Japan. I see tenders submitted by big industries for contracts on a competitive basis, and the local firms are unable to compete on a strictly price basis, but in spite of this, I do not see any indication of serious trouble.

I say right now we are having what might be considered a serious "levelling-off."

In all my dealings with management and labour, I have endeavoured to "squeeze" every penny possible for the worker. I believe he is entitled to a fair share of the fruits of his labour. I have been accused of "browbeating industry," forcing them to give more money, shorter hours, more holidays, and better medical and pension plans than they felt they could afford.

Quite a bit of discussion in this House has centred around the mining situation, which gave us a great deal of concern for such a long period of time. It would appear, from the discussions here, there was nothing in the picture but "union security." Of course, "union security" was a prominent feature in the negotiations, but money was in there too. These people cannot eat union security. What they wanted was more money, and I say, frankly and honestly, that my effort in that whole scheme was to try to get more money than had been offered by the mining companies to the workers. When we succeeded in doing that, by no stretch of the imagination can it be considered that what we were able to get satisfied them to the fullest extent, but it did satisfy them to the point where they are prepared to make an agreement.

Be that as it may—I say this with the exception of course, of isolated cases—our standard of living is good. Our wages are higher than in most places, with some exceptions in the United States, where a tremendous population creates a home market which enables them to produce vast quantities cheaper than we can have where our market is limited. I am being very frank and I think honest, when I say I think we should consolidate our gains.

If an army advances and finds it is running into ever-increasing resistance, does it continue? I say no; it consolidates so that its new position will not become untenable. Resistance is not by employers but consumers.

So it is on the home front. Resistance is growing, after the gains we have made and the things we have accomplished over the last 10 years. I do not mean we should stagnate as there is still need for adjustments here and there, but the general picture to me indicates the policy should be, for the time being, to consolidate, and mark time, till the dawn comes so we can see more clearly where we are going.

How can we help ourselves? Industry employs every person possible. Increase their quest for export business, seek new fields. Canadians, to the greatest extent possible, should buy Canadian-made goods and Canadian farm products, and buy what they think they can afford, and can actually afford. Buy normally. Buy the best you can, but buy.

Now why do I say these things? I am not psychic and therefore cannot make definite predictions, but I do have, in the position I hold as Minister of Labour an opportunity which is not available to many other people, to size up the situation.

I continually examine with labour and management, the problems of production, wages, conditions of employment, pension plans, medical aid, etc., everything that has to do with labour relations, and I say by co-operation and mutual understanding, great progress has been made which has resulted in a fine standard of living, which I am sure we are all anxious to preserve.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what exactly is the position of industry, and what are the possibilities for the future?

We have had a great influx of people from other countries into our province.

The hon. Prime Minister has said a new city of 15,000 has been created each month in this province. This creates in itself the necessity of an accelerated housing scheme.

What are the prospects for housing in the coming year? I have it from the Department of Planning and Development that it is estimated for 1954 that 106,244 homes or housing accommodation will be constructed this year, which, with all the appliances, facilities and conveniences, will open a huge market for our industries to produce.

Think of the lumber, cement, steel for refrigerators, stoves and appliances, which will be required to furnish these homes.

According to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) \$30 million will be spent in creating new educational facilities, new classrooms, etc. Hospitals, both new and extensions, will run into millions of dollars and create a great deal of employment. I know of one city where they are planning now a \$3 million hospital. It is already on the drawing board.

Plans for industry—which I discussed yesterday—I will not go into in detail today, other than to submit to *Hansard* a list of what has been done and what has been submitted to the Department of Labour for inspection of industrial and office buildings—and I reiterate are continuing to come in at a very high level—which indicates no lack of faith on the part of industry in the future of this province. (See table, page 854). In our Estimates you will see on the revenue side \$119,420 for this work which is new and requires the people who use those services to pay for them, with the demand we have placed on the examination of plans as of last year.

The pipe line contemplated from Alberta is estimated to cost \$300 million and with all the necessary extensions to carry the gas to the consumer will

certainly require the expenditure of many millions more.

The proposed gas line from Niagara to Toronto for the Consumers Gas with all the extensions, etc., conversion from artificial to natural gas will also mean much employment and millions of dollars.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development is one that should not be delayed. We have the resources and engineering ability to do this job and we should no longer be waiting for another country to make up its mind. This would result in the expenditure of millions of dollars and create thousands of jobs. This, of course, is my personal opinion.

The automotive industry looks to the future with optimism. Mr. Rhys Sale has expressed his opinion in the press with which I am sure you are all familiar, and I have had discussions with other important people in the industry and certainly this industry is looking to the future with confidence. While some phases of the hydro development at Niagara Falls are drawing to a close, yet there is still much to be done and with the large remedial programme soon to be started will mean the expenditure of large sums of money and create much employment for some years to come.

The huge highway development plans and public works programme were never as great as they are today and, as the Prime Minister has said, this province is financially able to accentuate this if deemed advisable.

On the other hand, we do have a measure of unemployment but without actual statistics it appears to me there are as many jobs available, and as many people working now, as there were this time last year, but we do have a great many more people here, so naturally there seems to be more people out of work because of seasonal employment, due to changing of jobs, and many other reasons.

Soon the great transportation systems on the Great Lakes, including the opening of the canals, will add greatly to the possibilities of employment.

FEBRUARY REPORT OF EXAMINER OF PLANS

In February, there were 107 plans approved for additions, alterations or new factories, shops and office buildings having a total estimated cost of \$10,132,100.

The following projects will each cost \$100,000 or more,—

Crosley Radio & TV., Weston	\$ 400,000
Canadian Name Plate Co. Ltd., Midland	171,000
Canadian Sirocco Co. Ltd., Windsor	150,000
The Canadian Bank of Commerce, Hamilton	1,750,000
Industrial Leaseholds of Toronto, Etobicoke	117,000
Imperial Oil Ltd., Sarnia	600,000
Murray Printing Company, North York	1,360,500
Bell Telephone Company, Oshawa	130,000
National Slag Limited, Hamilton	121,000
Fisher Bearings Manufacturing Ltd., Stratford	227,000
Salvation Army, Toronto	150,000
Kelvinator of Canada Ltd., Etobicoke Township	250,000
Toronto Harbour Commissioners, Toronto	800,000
Algoma Steel Corp. Ltd., Sault Ste. Marie	275,000
Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, Merivale	150,000
Napanee Iron Works, Napanee	100,000
The Steel Co. of Canada Ltd., Swansea	122,900
Pepsi-Cola Company of Canada, Toronto	415,000
Maple Leaf Milling Co., Toronto	346,000
Leon Holdings Limited, Welland	210,000
Provincial Paper Limited, Toronto	250,000

The following is a comparison of plan approval statistics for the last and the current fiscal year:

<i>Period</i>	NO. OF PLANS		VALUE OF PROJECTS	
	1952-53	1953-54	1952-53	1953-54
April to January	1,299	1,359	\$123,922,300	\$109,946,500
February	131	107	11,495,500	10,132,100
Totals	<u>1,430</u>	<u>1,466</u>	<u>\$135,417,800</u>	<u>\$120,078,600</u>

The revenue corresponding to the value of the buildings approved during the fiscal year is as follows:

April to January	\$109,075
February	10,345
Fees from Approved Drawings	<u>\$119,420</u>

Increased tempo on the farms and in the canning companies, etc., will provide many jobs for men and women, and there are hundreds of new industries in the course of organization which soon will require personnel to manage.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I see a good year ahead of us in fact, many of them, and reasonable prosperity can be ours if we are willing to work side by side in mutual understanding and good will. Let us look into the future with confidence.

I pay tribute to my staff for a difficult contentious job well done. This year the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) complimented me on the fact that the Department of Labour Estimates were so close to the actual moneys voted in this House. I pass the credit for this on to my deputy, the accountant and the heads of all the various departments.

These Estimates have gone up progressively in keeping with our increasing industrial expansion which require

more services, annual wage increases and special wage increases, all of which we are happy to grant in recognition of good service.

In dealing with the Estimates of the Labour Department there are a few more observations which I should like to make which I think will be helpful to the hon. members in considering and approving them.

All of us can see before our eyes the evidence that industrial Ontario has been growing at an amazing pace in the past few years. As this development has taken place, it has been necessary for the Department of Labour to increase its staff to take care of the additional load of inspection work which has to be done.

The work of the department is divided into 6 main types. The first involves health, safety and working conditions in industrial plants, including inspection of elevators. Second—there are operating conditions of power plants, the rating of such plants, and the examination of engineers who will attend such plants. Third—the administration of social legislation such as hours of work, vacations with pay, industrial standards and minimum wages. Fourth—conciliation, anti-discrimination, equal pay, all of which are handled by the conciliation service. Fifth—apprenticeship training which involves the promotion and encouragement of young people to learn the trades which are so necessary to the future advancement and well-being of this province. Sixth—the work of the Ontario Labour Relations Board which regulates the right of trade unions to bargain on behalf of their members.

Just as the province has grown in the past 11 years, so also has the Department of Labour grown. Where we had 145 employees in 1943 to handle the work, now we have 266. Most of the additions have been to the outside or inspection staff.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Minister care to give those figures again, please?

HON. MR. DALEY: We had 145 employees in 1943, and we have 266 at

the present time. Most of the additions have been to the outside or inspection staff.

As to the administrative group of employees who are located in the Parliament Buildings; we have endeavoured through, improvements in methods and realignment of the flow of work, to keep our expansion within reasonable and necessary limits.

At the last session of the Legislature, The Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953, was passed, and in the intervening months we have been busy assembling and training a staff to inspect elevators and lifts. We now have 5 inspectors in this field and expect to add more. This branch is now ready to commence full operations as a matter of fact they are doing full operations, and that I feel will be a satisfactory job in the question of inspecting elevators in this province. This is a new departure in Ontario and we have taken our time in getting this branch under way.

Last year we had our busiest year in the factory and boiler inspections, and we increased the staff of this branch by 7 inspectors.

As you remember, we amended the Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, to permit us to charge fees for our examinations, which netted us \$119,500 as I mentioned earlier.

In the field of vacations-with-pay legislation; we find now that the amount in the form of stamps has risen to an all high of \$11 million. The book and stamp system which we started in Ontario in 1944, has been generally accepted in 7 or 8 of the other provinces.

We have also worked out with the other provinces, a reciprocal arrangement whereby the stamps of Ontario and the other provinces are in the same book, and either Ontario or the other provinces will cash the stamps on their due date, and bill the other province for its share of the stamps. In this way, the workers promptly receive the credit when it becomes due, even though the stamps are held jointly by the two provinces.

I would like to point out that we have enlarged our facilities in Windsor,

London and Hamilton, where we zone our inspectors, and they work from those various points. It saves a great deal of travelling, and I think it has worked out greatly to the benefit of industry and the workers in this province.

In the field of apprenticeship, I would like to say there is a great opportunity in Ontario for young men willing to devote themselves to learning one of the skilled trades, and I would draw to the attention of the many young men in the province, that while they may like a position which is a little more remunerative, into which to go immediately upon leaving school, if they would concentrate on learning a trade, they would find it very easy to carry it through life, and no doubt have the effect of fitting them for gainful and satisfactory employment throughout the years.

Mr. Chairman, I now submit the Estimates of the Department of Labour for the approval of the House.

On Vote 78.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, what I have to say about the Workmen's Compensation Board's activities, I imagine, comes properly in the consideration of the present item.

But, before doing so, I want to thank the hon. Minister for sending over the correspondence between his department and the Dominion Glass Company, and I want to tell—since he raised it formally on the floor—that I did not desire it in this way, but I did it only because of another experience a few days earlier.

What happened, Mr. Chairman, was that I wanted to get a copy of a letter sent by one of the branches of the Labour Department to a certain group of women who had complained about not receiving equal pay. I was told I could not see the copy of the letter sent by the department—let me be a little more correct; I did not ask to look at it; I wanted a copy. I was told I could not get one. I very good humouredly said, "Well, I will get it by making it an order for return." The official said, "Yes, I suppose you had better do that,"

so having done that in one case, I automatically did it in the other. Otherwise, I would have proceeded directly to the department, and I am glad the hon. Minister feels I can do so.

In connection with the Workmen's Compensation Board, I would like to make a few remarks, but I want to preface them by stating that the Workmen's Compensation Board is, of course, an institution of which we are all very proud.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I understand he is going to speak on the budget, and I would suggest that is the place where these remarks should be made. There is nothing in the Estimates in regard to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know about that. It is true the hon. Minister should be given leeway, and the hon. Minister of Labour certainly gave us a survey of the economics of the province, and so on, which I think was perfectly legitimate.

I think it has always been customary for the hon. members of the House to discuss Workmen's Compensation under the Estimates, because it affords the only opportunity we have, outside of the general debate. I think it should be discussed at this time, because it enables the hon. Minister to reply, and we are not as formal as, of necessity, we have to be, in the debate on the budget.

If my memory serves me right, we have done that for a great many years, under this item.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, we are very proud of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and we recognize the fact that it is superior to many other compensation boards and agencies elsewhere in this country, and in the United States. To that extent, we are satisfied. But there is need for great improvement, and on every occasion these needs should be stressed.

There is a continuing demand by the workers of this province for the compensation to be increased to 100 per cent.

of the earnings. While there are arguments against this proposal, none is convincing, in the face of the fact that because of the 75 per cent. compensation, the family of a working man is now compelled to suffer, to be denied the essentials of life during the period of incapacity of the breadwinner, as the result of an industrial accident. That fact towers above and overshadows any argument which may be advanced against this universal demand by the workers.

Another comment I want to make on Workmen's Compensation is regarding the need for increasing the compensation to workers who were injured permanently many years ago. I recognize, Mr. Chairman, this is not a new idea or a new demand, but it will have to be pressed and continued year after year until it will be remedied. I noticed the deputation of the trade union movement which visited the government recently, stressed this important matter.

We have quite a number of working-class families who are suffering privations, because the breadwinner was incapacitated in an industrial accident during the period when wage rates and compensation were low, some when we paid only 55 per cent., and some when we were paying 66 per cent. of the earnings. Under those circumstances, it is generally acknowledged the Compensation Board should be assisted to increase the compensation, to bring it in line with present-day compensation. While there might be arguments as to whether industry today should be taxed for accidents which occurred before its time—in fact, many firms may no longer exist—that argument can be overcome by agreeing that the necessary funds should be provided out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the province, whatever that may amount to, in the years which lie ahead.

Concluding these two remarks in regard to the Workmen's Compensation issue, I want to touch upon one more problem, which is a very serious one, which is also not new, and by no means better because it is not new. In fact, it is more aggravated than it was. I refer

to the Industrial Accident-Prevention work.

Mr. Chairman, there are issues raised by Labour and by hon. members of the Opposition, that the government rejects questions, or belittles them, because they consider they emanate from sectional groups, or from an Opposition group which is perhaps interested in making political capital out of a deficiency in the service.

This problem, however, has already been dealt with by a Royal Commission, which came to very definite conclusions, and has made very specific recommendations to the government, which recommendations, in the main, coincide with what the workers of this province have been asking for, for a long time. It is, therefore, in my opinion, most unreasonable for the government to continue to resist the demands of the workers and the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

The workers have advanced the argument that their lives, their limbs and their health are involved in the accident-prevention work carried on. The funds for this work come from the Workmen's Compensation Board, and the amounts expended are not small. I imagine by now it is around \$500,000 a year, and yet the people most vitally affected—the working men in the factories—have no places in the whole accident-prevention setup. Management is, in the main, operating the accident-prevention associations. The payments though come from the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Workmen, therefore, in my opinion, have very reasonably asked, for a long time, that they become an integral part—indeed, the major element—in the carrying on of accident prevention, and I have yet to hear a logical or convincing argument why that should not be so.

I am glad to say that the Royal Commission which studied all phases of Workmen's Compensation in the province—the Commissioner was the hon. Mr. Justice Roach—came to the general conclusion to which trade unions had come years before. In his report,

Justice Roach states—and I am quoting from the official report of the Royal Commission :

In my respectful opinion the present provisions of the Act dealing with accident prevention are not adequate and need revision.

Since accident prevention is of common interest to both employers and workmen it would seem logical that they should both actively participate in any organized system the purpose of which is to lessen industrial accidents. As between the two groups, it seems to me that the workmen are much more vitally interested than the employers. If a workman is maimed in an industry, the employer has to pay the compensation but no monetary allowance can ever adequately compensate a workman who has to go through the balance of his life minus an eye, or a hand or some other member.

My first criticism of the present system is that it does not provide any means which will ensure the active participation of labour in the work of accident prevention.

My second criticism is that the relationship between the board and the associations is much too remote. and so on.

That is very clear, and everyone in the labour movement expected the implementation of these recommendations by the government.

Mr. Chairman, I know I may be repeating some things I said a year ago on this subject, but I cannot help that. We have to repeat them, so long as the government repeats its refusal to implement this just and fair recommendation.

HON. MR. DALEY: We have not rejected it; we are studying it.

MR. SALSBERG: The government refused to implement it.

HON. MR. DALEY: We have been working on it.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, the department has been working on it since 1950,

with what result? When I speak about this problem, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking about human lives, about limbs of the working men, about their hands and their legs and other things. It is not a small matter.

I am sure the hon. members will recall the recent and very tragic experience in the Massey-Harris plant in Toronto, where a workman was involved in a fatal accident a few months ago. He was killed while moving a vehicle loaded with lumber.

On investigation it became clear that the workers in that department were well aware and had been for a long time of the danger existing in that particular operation, and they had gone to the management on many occasions complaining about it. Furthermore it was found that there had been a number of lesser accidents there before. I think that in one case a limb was lost in the same operation. Yet nothing was done until a man was killed at work.

I suggest that fatal accident and the loss of a limb by another workman, might have been avoided if the workers of Massey-Harris and their union had been given an active responsible and authoritative role in accident-prevention work. I cannot say the accidents would have been avoided, but they might have been. The branch of accident prevention which looks after that plant was not unaware of the serious risk in that operation. I have reason to know they were pretty well alarmed, and that they notified their firm that a fatal accident might occur on that job. The result was a fatal accident, and there may be many more like it.

Finally, I may say with regard to this case, that the firm was found guilty at the inquest. The jury found the company guilty. It was found negligent in the matter of a man's death. I say that we do not have to wait any longer. I think we have no moral right to continue as we are doing now, if it means the loss of a single hand or a single limb of one workman, let alone a life, as was the case in the Massey-Harris organization.

I cannot explain the blind spot which occurs in the government's eye when

facing this question. How often must a Royal Commission demand a relatively simple and logical change of this sort before the change is made?

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says he is studying the question. He says he is considering it, and that he has not rejected it. Well, he has rejected it, if he has not implemented it. He cannot have it both ways.

I say that the hon. Minister is not alone responsible for this situation. I suggest it is a matter of policy, and I want to appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to place this matter on the order of business of the Cabinet. It affects the lives of people. It affects the happiness and the well being of families. It does not call for the expenditure of money by this government. It calls for the implementation of a Royal Commission's recommendation, and it calls for the implementation of a recommendation for which the workers have for years been pleading. I appeal to the government to take immediate steps for the establishment of an accident-prevention system which will give the workers and their organizations direct responsibility and an authoritative role.

HON. MR. DALEY: I would like to make a few remarks on that subject. I assure the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) I am going to be brief, because my purpose here is to get the Estimates of the Department of Labour approved. But I do not want the hon. member, whom I believe—I am not mincing matters—to be sincere on this point—to think that I am not equally concerned with this matter. And I should not like the impression to be given that we have no accident-prevention system. We have thousands of voluntary workers in accident prevention right at this moment. I was at a dinner meeting the other day in the Royal York Hotel, where there were approximately 650 people in one class only, for a 2-day conference on accident prevention. It has always been recognized there are such people as employers and that they are responsible for the health and wel-

fare of their workers. It is their responsibility and they are paying for it. In addition it is a fact they do pay for the measure of accident prevention we have at the present time. They pay millions of dollars, which are not in their assessment. Interested factory owners are anxious to limit, to the fullest extent humanly possible, the number of accidents which take place. Nobody wants accidents. Mr. Justice Roach's report just stated that he thought accident prevention should be under the control of the Workmen's Compensation Board. We have a measure of it now.

MR. SALSBERG: That is not all he said.

HON. MR. DALEY: We have set up in this province today thousands of voluntary accident-prevention workers, men who will take time off to go and study at a conference. And I believe, after all, this work is to a great extent educational. It is not difficult to dramatize an individual accident. I feel just as sorry for those unfortunate people who get hurt in industry as does the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) but the point is that only about 10 per cent. of accidents in industry are preventable, by taking steps to put guards on machinery and that sort of action. A larger proportion of accidents are caused because men are careless. They forget things. I recall one case where a man was working on one of those big cranes. He got down, and told the crane man that he was finished with his work. Then he remembered that he had left a screw driver up where he had been working. The crane man did not know. He started the crane, and the man was killed. What could have prevented an accident of that kind?

MR. SALSBERG: Massey-Harris could have.

HON. MR. DALEY: The Massey-Harris incident was very unfortunate. I am not going into all the details, but I have all the reports on it from our inspectors. We have a great system of accident prevention in this province,

paid for through assessment by employers, and millions of extra dollars are spent in their own plants to prevent accidents. And I am still not satisfied either that there is, or that there is not, a better way to do it. The hon. member may ask: How am I going about finding out? I have had meetings with organized labour, I have had meetings with representatives of industry, and with people engaged in accident-prevention work. I have had them all meet together, and I am going to continue to have them meet together, until we can devise a better way of preventing accidents if it is possible to find one. But I cannot put my finger on a way which is better than the way in which we are doing it now, and I say here definitely that I am as interested as any hon. member—perhaps more so because I am closer to the problem—in the prevention of accidents this province. But I am not going to throw aside these things which we already have, and the people who are voluntarily doing accident-prevention work. I am not going to say: "All this goes out of the window. But where do we start from here?"

Members of unions, labour associations and similar organizations have each year put in their brief. I have had many discussions with them. There is not one of them can tell me exactly what they want me to do or how these plans will function, and I say again I am not going to discard something which I know is good. And I say it is good, because the accident reports for this province are better than those of any other province in Canada. That is a fact, and it can be proven. I have not the details here now, but I know it to be true. There are places where they have in operation the type of accident-prevention system asked for by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and where they do not have anything like the industry that we have in Ontario, yet our results, as shown by the figures, are much better than those of any other province in the Dominion, with regard to accident prevention. I am not going to discontinue something which over the years has been the responsibility of

the employer. I am not going to relieve him of his responsibility. I am not protecting the employer. I am making him do what he is required to do, and I am not going to change that. Do not think because I say this, it is because there is some desire to protect employers. There is none. I am saying to the employer: "You have the responsibility. You do it." If there is a better way of doing it, and we can find it, we shall be interested in a change.

MR. SALSBERG: There is no need for hon. members to bang their desks to indicate approval or disapproval—in this case it is approval; I have not finished with this question. I am not going to accuse the government of being indifferent to industrial accidents. I am simply saying that they are proceeding at a snail's pace in a matter which requires at least a normal human gait. But they decline to move faster. I am prepared to say to this House that in the accident which resulted in the death of an employee of Massey-Harris, the company knew those wagons were dangerous and should have been renewed. But they were desirous of getting every last ounce out of them. Eventually they replaced them, but in the meantime, the men were allowed to load them up.

When I say this, I do not suggest that employers want their workers to be injured. Of course not. Only ghouls want such things to happen. But I do suggest that the government's policy up to now is obviously not the best one. It would be very sad if a change was not made because our record is better than that of some other provinces. I suggest the fact that we have the highest percentage of trade union organizations, may have something to do with our safety record, though some good work is, of course, carried on by the Accident Prevention Association. I am not saying their work is all negative, but if the hon. Minister (Hon. Mr. Daley) were to ask me what is best to do, I should advise him to follow the recommendation of the Royal Commission.

HON. MR. DALEY: It told us nothing.

MR. SALSBERG: In fact, for about two days nothing else but this one particular problem was discussed before the commission. Everyone had a chance to appear and put forward their arguments, which were heard with great patience. Hon. Mr. Justice Roach came to a very judicial conclusion and said we should change the system. Certainly, I suggest, the government should accept his opinion and I also suggest that they should accept the opinion of the organized workers.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, may I read what was said on this subject in a brief by the Ontario Federation of Labour (CCL) to the hon. Prime Minister and other hon. Ministers of the government:

We also urge the government to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act to permit the establishment by organized labour of an Industrial Accident Prevention Association for the purpose of conducting an educational programme on safety and accident prevention and of encouraging the formation of joint labour-management accident prevention committees. Such a step would materially assist in reducing present high accident rates.

The present Accident Prevention Association have done some work on safety and accident prevention. However last year workers who have little or no say in accident prevention programmes reported some 219,000 work injuries to the Workmen's Compensation Board. Certainly this situation should be rectified by an appropriate amendment to the Act opening the way to a trade union organized Accident Prevention Association.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the way to do it. All that is necessary now is to decide that the time has come when it should be done, and then to put it into practice.

MR. H. F. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine): I do not think this has very much to do with the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, but a good deal of latitude has been allowed this afternoon to some

hon. members. We were talking today about cancer and cancer prevention. I had my car washed today, and during that operation the manager told me that his men wanted to give a day's free labour to the Cancer Fund. I said: "What about the bosses?" And he replied: "Yes, we are prepared to do our part." They wanted me to get the Mayor and members of Parliament over to the car wash to join in and work for the day. We would like this voluntary act to be contagious, and be adopted by businesses in all Ontario so that workers everywhere might give one day's free labour to the Cancer Fund. The earnings of a shoe repairer would be as important as the day's earnings of the man who sells Cadillacs, and operates a large garage. I think it would be a very fine thing if all workers, owners and bosses could be persuaded to join in this good deed for one day. The total raised would amount to a great deal of money for the Cancer Fund.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us whether some consideration might not be given to people receiving Workmen's Compensations at rates of 50 per cent. and 66⅔ per cent. fixed at a time when wage rates were low? I hope the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Daley) is prepared to say something on this question. A few days ago we voted a Supplementary Estimate to provide \$1 million for the Teachers' Superannuation Fund, and \$1 million for the Civil Service Pension Fund. We supported that. I think hon. members will remember that last year, and the year before, we voted additional sums of \$1 million each year for these purposes, making \$3 million in all.

I have a case in my own riding of a man who lost his hand in 1920 and who is getting a pension of \$20 a month.

Mr. Chairman, if we can make these grants to the Teachers' Superannuation Fund and to the Civil Servants Pension Fund, and if we can spend \$50 million on the highways last year, and finish up with the record surplus now indicated, surely we can do something for these people? Even if we have to take money

out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, let us do something for them. I appeal to the hon. Minister (Hon. Mr. Daley) to give consideration to the plight of these people who really need our attention.

HON. MR. DALEY: There is really very little left for me to say on matters of this kind. I have considerable sympathy for these people. I know that in the early days, wages were low, and the percentage fixed was correspondingly low. But the amount paid is based on the assessment of the industry for a particular year. It is impossible to go back to industry and say: "You owe us so much money because the cost of living has gone up, and the amount that is being paid to these people is now insufficient to enable them to survive."

Each and every industry is rated a percentage as per \$100 worth, and certain types of industry pay that, and they are to all intents and purposes free. We did, some 3 years ago, increase the widows' amounts and we charged it in there, simply because we just took a chance.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Why not take another one?

HON. MR. DALEY: I put it in and it amounted to somewhere between \$3 million and \$4 million, but I cannot do that again. If the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)—not the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas)—is so concerned about the Roach Report, it definitely says we have no right to charge it there.

MR. SALSBERG: It says you can take it from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

HON. MR. DALEY: We can. The administration of the Consolidated Revenue Fund is government policy, if further relief is to be granted in this issue. I have no power to say it will be.

Vote 77 agreed to.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): On Vote 78, I may say it was pleasing to the hon. members of the Legislature to hear the

hon. Minister pay eloquent tribute to his staff, and I think we would all agree with that because in the Department of Labour there are some very fine men and women.

He mentioned they were so good they actually came close to the Estimates voted last year.

I want to refer to item 5, "Conciliation Boards, Commissioners, etc." There is an item there for \$60,000. Last year the same item appeared, "\$60,000."

Looking through the Public Accounts this morning for the year ending 1953, I find, conciliation boards, commissioners, etc., had expended \$99,125.76.

I think he will agree that the Estimate of \$60,000 is a little out there, or perhaps he has an explanation for it.

HON. MR. DALEY: Of course, the hon. member understands that conciliation costs, to a great extent are only imaginary. You and I cannot tell whether there is going to be 1 conciliation case or 1,000.

Last year we spent far more than the hon. member said. We spent \$100,000-odd, but we were able, by economy and good management, to increase the amount in conciliation and save it somewhere else. That is what we did, and, in the final analysis, we come very close to our Estimate. I would not try to convince the hon. members that we had every item within the right amount, but conciliation is a very difficult thing to judge.

It was getting to be very costly, and that is one reason which I might as well tell you now that I want this permissive power under the Labour Relations Act, to refuse to grant conciliation, because of the tremendous cost, for one thing.

I would not let the cost bother me if any of this accomplished what we wanted, but sometimes it is best used as a means of getting into a legal-strike position. I am the sort of man who, when I am convinced that is what they want, puts them in that position quicker, and cut out some of the conciliation, not indiscriminately, but after weighing the evidence submitted, and if I realize there is no possible chance of clearing it up

with a Conciliation Board, I will advise them they are on their own, and I hope that will prevent difficulties. I do know that today it is the experience that a great many people rely on it to put themselves in a different position. In addition to that, I think it would save us some money.

Votes 78 and 79 agreed to.

On Vote 80.

MR. SALSBERG: On Vote 80: Some very important work is being done in the Apprenticeship Branch, and it is too bad we have not the time to hear a full report. I think it would be very valuable and instructive, because I think it is one branch which is doing a great deal of good work.

I want to raise one point and ask one question of the hon. Minister. Experiencing, as we do now, rising unemployment, we fear the young worker will be the first to be laid off. On the basis of seniority, the young lads are the first ones to go. I wonder whether we could not make arrangements with the Ottawa Government to have them pay Unemployment Insurance to the hundreds of young men and women who have had no training for a trade, who may have gone in for general labour of one type or another, and who now find themselves laid off and compelled to draw Unemployment Insurance—maybe inadequate insurance but, nevertheless, drawing it.

I wonder why we could not arrange for these young people to be given some training for some trade during the period of unemployment instead of having them waste their time? They could be taken over by the Apprenticeship Branch and given some training so they could qualify for better jobs; otherwise, they may exhaust their Unemployment Insurance and learn nothing and they will be no better equipped to face the future than at the time they were fired.

HON. MR. DALEY: Of course, there is no use attempting to train people on a temporary basis. They must make up their minds it is going to be their source of livelihood. It would depend

upon our ability, to have facilities and teachers to train these people. Our costs have gone up and I have been advised apprenticeship training amounts to a very large sum of money this year, and I cannot give any hope of accomplishing what the hon. member suggests. It would be very nice if we could pay everybody who gets out of work, young or old.

MR. SALSBERG: The department would not have to do the paying, the Unemployment Insurance Commission is paying Unemployment Insurance to those young men and women who are unemployed at the moment, but what I suggest is that we take it up officially.

HON. MR. DALEY: I am afraid we could not do that in our apprenticeship training.

MR. SALSBERG: I think it would be very constructive.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): With respect to the Apprenticeship Branch, I agree with the hon. member for St. Andrew that with increasing unemployment those services may be greatly taken advantage of, and I was therefore rather surprised to see in the Apprenticeship Training Branch, item 6, that there is a reduction of \$39,000 from last year. Last year, the Estimate was for \$340,000, and this year it is for \$301,000. Why should there be any cut when there is a possibility of a larger number of people taking advantage of the service?

HON. MR. DALEY: We spent about \$280,000 last year, and we increased it by about \$50,000.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, it definitely states in item 6, Apprenticeship Training Special Classes, \$340,000, and in this Estimate for exactly the same item, \$301,000. There is a difference of \$39,000 there.

MR. KERR: They only spent \$280,000 last year.

HON. MR. DALEY: Apprenticeship training is like some other things. You cannot actually tell what your expenses

will be. That necessarily was not all spent and if we need more, we will ask for it.

MR. THOMAS: I might mention in passing I think that it is unfortunate. Here we are passing Estimates for the coming year, and if we only had some idea of what was in the public accounts for the previous year, we would have a better knowledge of the whole thing.

Votes 80 and 81 agreed to.

On Vote 82.

MR. SALSBERG: Here again my complaint is the inadequacy of the service. The Inspection Branch has a tremendous role to play, and upon the ability of this staff depends the well-being of a great many people, hundreds of thousands of people. I find this is an understaffed and hopelessly inadequate staff for the task assigned to it.

HON. MR. DALEY: How does the hon. member find all this out? What would he know about it?

MR. SALSBERG: It is true that up until 1943 the hon. Minister of Labour knew all about it.

HON. MR. DALEY: By 1943, I did not know anything about it, but I have had 11 years' experience since then.

MR. SALSBERG: I have also been here 11 years and I know more about it. I knew more about it in 1943, than the hon. Minister did.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is what the hon. member says.

MR. SALSBERG: I have been trying to keep this on a proper level and if you are going to upset it, I am willing, but I advise you, you are the one who started it.

I knew about it because I grew up in factories, as a young worker, and as an older worker, and I have been interested in trade unions for many years and, therefore, I know. I hope that is satisfactory.

But without that knowledge, I would have no difficulty in knowing that with

a staff of 49, as you report, you cannot expect them to do the job required. The last report on page 15 says:

During the fiscal year 1951-52, the inspection staff was greatly increased. March 31st, 1953, there was a total of 49 inspectors, as follows . . .

then are listed "chief inspectors and so on."

These 49 inspectors included chief inspectors and every one else, and they are asked to inspect all new industrial and office construction and have a multitude of other responsibilities. For instance, in addition to the inspection of industrial construction, these 49 look after grain elevators, tunnel construction, hydro works, jails — which have been added — Niagara Parks Commission has been added, the enforcement of the child labour laws, control of overtime, and so on and on and on.

That is a task which cannot possibly be done by 49 people in this vast province which is scattered from the Minnesota border to the borders of New York, Quebec and the North Pole. How could they possibly do a thorough job? How could they follow through? They could not.

The hon. Minister spoke of the great industrial expansion in new construction work. We are very glad it has taken place but it has put an extra burden on his staff. They inspect the plans, they inspect the construction and during the process of construction.

HON. MR. DALEY: The engineers do that.

MR. SALSBERG: But it is part of the hon. Minister's staff. This is the task of 49 people, all in all. I am not criticizing the department for spending too much money, but rather for not spending more in this very essential work.

That is not only my complaint, but it is the complaint which is coming from the unions continuously. The hon. Minister shakes his head. He knows that is true, and every brief presented to him contains this criticism.

I certainly want to plead with the government—and you will notice I am very mild this afternoon, I am pleading—for you to do something about it, to transform the factory inspection branch into an up-to-date, sufficiently staffed, well-trained, well-paid force which will do the job of protecting the public and the welfare of the masses of people who depend, in a very large measure, upon their good work.

HON. MR. DALEY: Of course, we are doing that continuously, Mr. Speaker. We have on two occasions since I have been occupying this office re-organized and re-zoned. We found that some inspectors have too much work, while others not enough, we have cut the zones and made definite areas for them to take care of.

MR. SALSBERG: We have 31 zones, have we not?

HON. MR. DALEY: Yes, 31 zones.

MR. SALSBERG: For 49 people.

HON. MR. DALEY: When the hon. member says we ought to get a competent staff, I do not agree. I think we have about as competent people and as well trained people as there are. If a new employee comes in—

MR. SALSBERG: I did not criticize them.

HON. MR. DALEY: We bring new employees in and school them with the older inspectors. I am very proud of my staff. I do not accept the implication that we are not competent in any department, but if the hon. member thinks there should be more inspectors—well, we are checking that all the time.

I have no hesitation in saying I would like to employ a great many more people right now, while more people need employment, but I cannot bring myself to put people on in order to spend more money. When I have someone come in, I want him to be qualified, and to know his job, to be prepared to do a good job and I try to pay him commensurate with

his duties. I certainly do not admit our staff is not competent, nor do I admit at this point, that we are understaffed.

MR. SALSBERG: Let me just correct the hon. Minister. I did not criticize the staff. I did not charge them with incompetence, but I did say he should increase his staff. I did suggest he should do so, and I hope he does so soon, with competent and an adequate number of inspectors. That does not cast any reflection on the staff.

HON. MR. DALEY: I will accept that.

MR. SALSBERG: And I disagree with his last edict that he does not need more staff. I cannot see how 49 people in 31 divisions from the grain elevators at the Head of the Lakes to the tunnel, which we will be building down in the Eastern Townships, is sufficient. It is beyond my ken.

Votes 82, 83 and 84 agreed to.

On Vote 85.

MR. SALSBERG: What Vote, Mr. Minister, would enable us to speak on equal pay for equal work? Would that come under "Minimum Wage"?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is carried now.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not carried.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: It is carried.

MR. SALSBERG: I think it comes under the Labour Relations Act.

HON. MR. DALEY: "Fair Employment."

Votes 85 and 86 agreed to.

On Vote 87.

MR. SALSBERG: I have to put aside all other "stuff" because it is too much for one afternoon. It would require more than one afternoon to do justice to this.

I want to say a word about two items on the Fair Employment Practices Branch. On the matter of equal pay

for equal work, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the law as it now stands cannot be enforced even if the department would want to enforce it, and I think the department is enforcing it in the same manner the law was introduced and enacted here, with tongue in cheek.

In my humble opinion, the present equal pay for equal work legislation is unenforceable; it is so worded that you cannot possibly establish a breach of the law, except in the most extreme cases.

HON. MR. DALEY: Except for the fact that our employers are fair people. They know the Act requires this to be done, and it is being done without a great deal of difficulty. For the hon. member to rise in his place and say it is unenforceable—we do not have to police everything. If we get a complaint, we check it, and when it is drawn to the attention of the employer, it is remedied. We are a fair-minded class of people in this province.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Have there been any prosecutions, may I ask?

HON. MR. DALEY: We have not actually prosecuted, but we have remedied a goodly number of cases which came to our attention, and certainly they will come to our attention if they exist. Our employers think it is fair, and they have accepted it. We do not look for a great deal of trouble with it.

MR. J. A. FULLERTON (Algoma-Manitoulin): Have you finished?

MR. SALSBERG: I am not finished yet.

MR. D. McM. KERR (Dovercourt): You never will be.

MR. SALSBERG: The fact is that some Conservatives in this province feel the same way about it. I have before me a news item from the *Toronto Daily Star*, under the by-line of a very well-qualified and well-informed newspaperman, Mr. A. O. Tate. He has written

the story from London, Ontario, dated May 7th, in which he said:

The Ontario Government was called upon yesterday by the Western Ontario Women's Progressive Conservative Association to amend the Equal Pay for Equal Work legislation, to prevent evasion. More than 100 women unanimously supported a resolution for the solution at the association's annual meeting, and they said this legislation was being evaded continually, and it is held that discrimination against women still exists.

I suggest those 100 women knew what they were talking about.

I am sorry I have not the Act in front of me, but I think I can remember the wording—unless the hon. Minister wants to help me out. I think it says, "The same work in the same establishment." There is the danger. All a firm has to do is to get rid of the men doing the work, then put women on the job, and there is no comparison to be made, therefore, the rate can be fixed lower, although the women are doing the same sort of work.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Do you know of any one case where that has happened—just one? It is like the fictitious "Mrs. Smith." Was she complaining to you?

MR. SALSBERG: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney-General has become infatuated with the non-existing lady. I would ask him to be more prosaic and more earthy.

HON. MR. PORTER: I would like the hon. member to be more specific.

MR. SALSBERG: The lady is the one who cheated one of your constituents out of \$2,000.

HON. MR. PORTER: We want a specific case.

MR. SALSBERG: I never mind your diversions, but it is not now \$2,000 which "Mrs. Smith" took. My latest information is that it now amounts to \$2,500. However, the information is

being gathered for the hon. Attorney-General.

Let me go back—

MR. COWLING (High Park): Have you enquired recently?

MR. SALSBERG: I have not a case here to prove it, but it is universally recognized as being the case throughout this province, and every trade union knows it. All the complaints since the enactment of the law have been concerning evasion.

I have just read to the House an item concerning the Women's Progressive Conservative Association of this province.

Let me tell you in other provinces where similar legislation is enacted, they use the term, "same work" to "work of a comparable character." Where you use the wording, "work of a comparable character," you can enforce the Act. In British Columbia and Saskatchewan, they have a law worded far better than it is here. Here, by using the words "the same work in the same establishment" it becomes possible to evade the law by simply discharging the men from a given rank of operations, and handing them over to the women.

I say the law worded in this way is nothing but camouflage; it is flim-flamming the female workers of this province; it is fooling them; it is cheating them; it is leading them to believe the law is protecting them, when the law does not protect them.

I have a current case in connection with which I have been trying to secure information from the department, to which I referred earlier when I said I had to put my question as an order for return, because I was refused a copy of the letter. This is a case in Toronto where all the men in a department were transferred, and women were put in at lower pay, and there was no means of comparison. Whoever wrote that law was a pretty smart "cookie"—to use a colloquial expression. I think it is a shameful matter, and we should do something about it. I maintain it is an inopera-

tive law or enactment "equal pay for equal work"; it is actually unenforceable.

Vote 87 agreed to.

On Vote 88.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the hon. Minister. This has to do with the office of the athletic commissioner, and I note that an item for \$7,500 is given by way of a grant toward the British Empire Games to be held in Canada this summer. As the hon. members know, the British Empire Games are taking place in Vancouver next summer, and great preparations have been made. They have built a stadium, and are looking forward to receiving guests from all over the British Empire, and I am very pleased to note the fine financial contribution our province has made toward the ultimate success of this great project.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): On that vote. Mr. Chairman, there is an item, I see, of \$10,000 for the promotion of amateur sports.

HON. MR. DALEY: That is from the revenue account and the athletic commissioner's office. It is the proceeds, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, of taxation on wrestling and things of that kind.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, but the commission is now under the Department of Labour, and what assistance is provided to amateur sport is provided by the hon. Minister's department. This is the point I want to make: I think we are missing a great opportunity in this province to expand and extend amateur sport, and to say that we will allow \$10,000 for that great object is insufficient. I think there is a great opportunity in Ontario to serve the young people of the province, and to get them interested in amateur sport. In fact we are doing very little about it.

HON. MR. DALEY: It is only recently we began to do anything like this, but we now provide that where there is a team of juveniles or youngsters, they

may be furnished with baseball bats and gloves, hockey sticks and pucks, and many similar items of sporting equipment. In general I would say we have assisted thousands of young people, and encouraged them to form teams, particularly in the smaller towns, where they have constituted junior leagues in baseball and hockey. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will find that we have been able to meet the requests of thousands of young people who are now playing games in this way, but I would agree with him that there is probably a big field here, though I am not prepared to go into that now.

MR. OLIVER: What the hon. Minister has told the committee is that this amount of money has been expended to help, in the main, in a rather minor way, existing organizations. What I say we lack in this province is an over-all promotional organization to foster the creation and practice of amateur sport. I think the time has come in Ontario when we should do that under government auspices. We should set out on a programme of interesting young people generally in amateur sport, and supporting their organizations with government funds to some extent. We are certainly lacking in a programme of that character.

Votes 88 and 89 agreed to.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): There is one question, Mr. Chairman, in connection with Vote 90 which interests me very much. Last year an amendment was made to the Factory Act giving authority to allow young persons to work after 11 o'clock. I wonder if the Minister—

HON. MR. DALEY: Young persons? No. We gave authority in certain instances for the employment of women—but 18 years or over they must be.

MR. THOMAS: How is that legislation working out?

HON. MR. DALEY: Very well. That is what the letters which I sent over to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) dealt with—the application of an industry, to put women on a

shift in order to prevent the development of a bottleneck. The union agreed. I have never given my permission, if there is a union in the plant, without getting the union's approval. We have been very strict with regard to young boys.

Vote 90 agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; the Acting Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Acting Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The following bills were read a third time, and were passed as intitled in the motions:

Bill No. 7, An Act respecting The Home of the Friendless and Infants Home.

Bill No. 9, An Act respecting The Township of Toronto.

Bill No. 12, An Act respecting Royal Botanical Gardens.

Bill No. 13, An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. 16, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Bill No. 20, An Act respecting St. Michael's College.

Bill No. 30, An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie.

Bill No. 33, The Department of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Bill No. 59, The Bees Act, 1954.

Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.

Bill No. 61, The Plant Diseases Act, 1954.

Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would say that on Monday there will be the Report of the Committee on Indian Affairs and any other Order appearing on the Order paper might be taken. We will start with the Estimates on Lands and Forests, and there will be a night session.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Before the hon. Minister moves the adjournment of the House, there is a notice of motion standing in my name for the return of some letters and documents. I asked the hon. Prime Minister before he left if he had any objection to this motion being carried, and he indicated he had no objection. As I would like to see these before the end of the session—and as it takes some time to get such

matters under way—I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit me to put the motion at this time.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That can stand over until Monday.

MR. NIXON: All right, as long as I get the documents.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves the adjournment of the House.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: I have been asked to state that the meeting of the Committee on Representations in error was announced for 1 o'clock. Instead it should be 1.30 p.m., on Monday.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.35 p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, March 29, 1954

Afternoon Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, March 29, 1954.

Tenth Report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Nickle	873
Report, Select Committee re Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Collings	873
Act to Promote Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario, introduced by Mr. Frost, first reading	873
Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading	875
Report, Select Committee re Civil Liberties and Rights of Indian Population, Mr. Goodfellow, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Cathcart, Mr. Noden, Mr. Wren	875
Motion to Adjourn Discussion, Mr. Murdoch	893
Ross Memorial Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Letherby, second reading	894
Hamilton Foundation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Elliott, second reading	894
City of Peterborough (No. 1), bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, second reading	894
London Foundation, bill respecting, Mr. Patrick, second reading	894
Town of St. Marys, bill respecting, Mr. Pryde, second reading	894
City of St. Thomas, bill respecting, Mr. Patrick, second reading	894
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Collings, second reading	894
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	894
Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend, reported	894
Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Division Courts Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Evidence Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Judicature Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Warehouse Receipts Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Wills Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Parents' Maintenance Act, bill to amend, reported	895
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954, reported	896
Corporations Information Act, 1953, bill to amend, reported	896
Unemployment Relief Act, bill to amend, reported	896
Milk Industry, bill respecting, reported	897
Professional Engineers Act, bill to amend, reported	898
Infants Act, bill to amend, reported	898
Credit Unions Act, 1953, bill to amend, reported	898
Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954, reported	898
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, reported	898
Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, reported	898
Schools Administration Act, 1954, reported	899
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	899
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	899
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, reported	900
Recess, 6 o'clock	902

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1954.

3.00 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very happy today to welcome the students from the Regents Park Public School, Scarborough, the Allenby Public School, Toronto, and the James S. Bell Public School, Long Branch.

Despite the inclement weather, we are very, very happy to welcome you here, and hope your visit will be of profit and an education.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. M. NICKLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Tenth Report of the Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Nickle, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presents the following as its Tenth Report:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec."

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. W. H. COLLINGS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to

consider Bill No. 78, "An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly."

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Collings, from the Select Committee appointed to consider Bill No. 78, "An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly," presents the committee's report as follows:

Your committee begs leave to report that it has arrived at a unanimous finding and submits herewith a schedule of 98 electoral districts, recommending that the same be adopted, and set out in the schedule of the bill.

Your committee also recommends certain amendments to the text of the bill.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, will there be an opportunity to discuss this when the bill comes before the Legislature?

HON. L. M. FROST: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

FAIR ACCOMMODATION PRACTICES

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to Promote Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Prime Minister please enlarge on that?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this legislation to provide for fair accommodation practices in Ontario, we are following a line of policy which has been greatly developed in the last 10 years but which had its beginnings in the basic fact which made our country possible. Canada's greatest contribution to the world has been the example of two great races working together and founding this country in partnership. Since those early days our land has become the home of peoples of various racial and religious origins and our pride has been that all are free men in a free country.

During the last 10 years in Ontario, we have developed this fundamental policy in many practical ways. We have declared by Statute our opposition to racial and religious discrimination. These experiences of policy are found in the following measures:

1. The Racial Discrimination Act of 1944—prohibits publishing or displaying any notice or other representation indicating discrimination or intent to discriminate because of race or creed.

2. The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act of 1950—renders void covenants restricting sale, ownership, occupation or use of land because of the race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin of any person.

3. The Labour Relations Act of 1950—invalidates a union-management contract which discriminates against any person because of race or creed.

4. The Fair Employment Practices Act of 1951—prohibits discrimination in hiring, in all conditions of employment, and in union membership.

There is still a place in our life not covered by statutory enactments and declarations. This relates to the accommodation, services and facilities available in any place to which the public is customarily admitted. Appeals have been made to the government by leaders in church and civil affairs, the Association for Civil Liberties, and many others

to remedy this situation, which can be distorted, particularly outside of our country, into overshadowing the great principles our people have long accepted and have almost generally put into operation. It is now proposed to remedy this. The Racial Discrimination Act of 1944 will be repealed and the provisions of that Act embodied in a new Act to be known as "The Fair Accommodation Practices Act, 1954," in which will be included enactments providing against discrimination on grounds of race, colour and creed in places where the public is customarily admitted. The machinery for enforcement is similar to that in The Fair Employment Practices Act, 1951.

In placing this before the House, I do so at a time when the world is gravely concerned with the strides being made by science which can be directed to the suffering and destruction of human beings. This is a world which is constantly growing smaller and what used to be "far distant lands" are now close to us. There is a challenge to all mankind to promote world-wide respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Systematic and deliberate denials of basic human rights lie at the root of most of the world's troubles. In Ontario, where we have accepted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we can do our part not only in advancing in the policies upon which our country was founded and which have become part of us but in furthering the International Declaration which we have adopted by the full recognition that the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights to all members of the human family are the foundations of freedom, justice and peace in the world.

Shortly we shall emancipate about 35,000 of our Indian citizens, giving to them for the first time full civil rights and liberties, while preserving fully their treaty rights. We shall give them the vote. Thus in Ontario, we shall no longer have "bond and free" but all of our citizens without regard to race, colour and creed, will be able to enjoy the full status and privilege of citizenship as becomes free men in a great province such as ours.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

THE MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Municipal Affairs Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: This bill authorizes the Municipal Board, in an annexation or amalgamation order, to make provision for the payment of grants by the annexed or amalgamated municipality, to compensate for loss of assessment resulting from the annexation or amalgamation.

The present provision whereby an annexation or amalgamation order, if objected to, does not come into force until confirmed by special Act of the Legislature, is removed, and provisions are substituted under which an objection may be filed with the Clerk of the Executive Council. Upon the filing of such objection, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is authorized either to confirm the decision of the Municipal Board, or to order a re-hearing of the application by such members of the board as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may designate.

The expression "by such members of the board" means, for example, that the chairman might have to be present, or that the attendance of a certain number of members might be specified. Or, of course, the Cabinet has the power to bring in an outsider, or two, to deliberate on an order of the board.

But when this is passed a second time, that is final, unless the matter can be carried to higher courts on a point of law.

After this bill becomes law there can be no more annexing or amalgamation matters before the Private Bills Committee.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Report of the Select Committee set up

to study the matter of the civil liberties and rights of the Indian population.

In presenting this report, I feel I should make a few remarks to explain to the House the reasoning behind our actions and decisions.

In the first place, it may be stated that the purpose of this Committee was the emancipation of the Indians in this province. It has long been the feeling of many of us here, and indeed throughout the whole province, that there should be no second-class citizens in the Province of Ontario.

Many Indians, however, felt they were rated as second-class citizens. I know that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. G. G. Johnston) on whose motion this committee was appointed, have never felt that way about Indians. The member for Victoria (Mr. Frost) has lived amongst Indians from his boyhood in Oro Township. The senior member of the committee, the member for Simcoe Centre, has lived at Minesing—an Indian name itself, and amongst Indians—for the major part of his life—a life which is not exceeded by many members of this House.

At the outset, I must pay tribute to the members of the committee. Their record of attendance could hardly be excelled. Indians could not find a truer group of friends than the 11 members who made up this committee.

The member for Brant (Mr. H. C. Nixon) has made numerous speeches in this House on behalf of the Indian population of his riding. I would personally like to thank him for his contribution to the committee's work. And also the member for Cochrane South (Mr. W. J. Grummett) whose legal mind helped us through some technical questions.

The committee was well chosen since it was representative of those ridings across Ontario which have an Indian population. We had the members from Kenora and Rainy River, who brought us knowledge of the ways of northern, nomadic Indians; the members for Addington, Hastings East, and Lambton,

who have known Indians who are almost integrated with our way of living because of their intermingling with white people. In between the two regions were the members for Algoma-Manitoulin and Bruce. I want to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that we received the very highest degree of co-operation from the federal authorities under whose jurisdiction Indian affairs are placed. And I want on behalf of the committee to thank not only the Minister, the hon. Mr. Harris, but also the officials of the Indian Affairs Branch under his jurisdiction for the co-operation we received from them during our meetings and deliberations.

Also, at this time, I should like to thank on behalf of the Committee, Mr. Alf Cole, the secretary of the committee, who did a splendid job. A great deal of the work embodied in this report was the compilation of our very able secretary, Mr. Alf Cole of the Press Gallery.

The committee visited a majority of the bands and agencies of this province. The report which I am now tabling is not a lengthy one, but one which I sincerely urge every member of this House to read and familiarize himself with. We collected a great deal of information, but sought to summarize our conclusions in as brief a form as possible, to make it readable to any who are interested in the welfare of the Indians of Ontario and, in fact, the welfare of the province as a whole.

At this point I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are only 9 recommendations. We realize, as a committee, that we have missed one point: that is in respect of Disabled Persons' Allowance. As soon as agreement is reached between the Federal Authorities and the Provincial Government, this committee would suggest, and recommend, that the Province of Ontario make Disabled Persons' Allowance available to disabled Indians.

We do not think that this will be a cure-all for all the problems which beset the two civilizations living here together. It is rather a suggestion of what this government might do to assist the

senior government in its work toward the eventual intergration of Indians.

One of the problems that we—as a committee — repeatedly encountered, was that of people asking “what has the Provincial Government to do with Indians? I thought they were a federal concern.”

So they are. The British North America Act clearly outlines the responsibility for Indians and Indian Reserves. They are solely under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. While there are some provincial treaties with Indians, the majority are with the Federal Government and Indians over the years have always considered themselves as wards of the Federal Government.

But Indians who live in Ontario are citizens of this province. They are wards of the Federal Government to some extent, but they are still citizens of this province. Where does the responsibility begin and end? Who should care for an Indian who has been off his reserve for 6 months, 1 year, 2 years, 20 years? When is an Indian an Indian? These were questions which this committee sought to answer. In some cases, we have not been able to find an answer and we would advise a continuing study of some of these problems. To that end, we are suggesting that a full-blooded Indian be appointed as an executive officer to work either under the Minister of Education or the Minister of Public Welfare, to be a liaison officer between the various departments of the Provincial Government, the Federal Government, and the Indians.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that during a recent visit to British Columbia, where we sat in with the officials who have to deal with Indian affairs in that province—a committee set up by the Province of British Columbia under the Department of Labour—we were very much impressed with the work that is being carried out by a full-blooded Indian who has been appointed to a position such as we are suggesting in this report.

We feel a very important function could be performed by such a person in

bringing to the attention of the Indians some suggestions as to what the Provincial Government could do for them, and reporting, to the various departments of the Provincial Government concerned, the problems of the Indians; also by working with these departments to create a very close relationship. Moreover, we think he could make a worth-while contribution to progress in this field by consulting, and working closely with, the federal officials concerned with Indian affairs.

The Provincial Government has already entered the field of Indian affairs to a large extent. I would estimate that close to \$600,000 per year is being spent by various Provincial Departments on Indians. This is being done, and has been done for many years on a strictly voluntary basis. Indians are citizens of this province, and this government and past governments have long recognized this. But how can the provincial services now available to Indians be reconciled with the British North America Act? Surely it is time that we had a Dominion-Provincial conference on this whole question. Obviously the trend is to turn over more and more responsibility to the various Provincial Governments.

If the province is going to take over a responsibility which was, according to our constitution, given to the Federal Government, then some adjustments should be made. The Federal Government, with its unlimited tax-fields is surely in a better position to finance a programme of integration of Indians. However, in many respects, we are in a better position to provide the services which will lead to that integration.

We found few, if any, Indians who did not want to become a part of the integrated whole of this province. Some of the older generation would like to live in the past, but as a whole, there seems to be a general desire for integration. Then surely on matters such as education, welfare, highways, and health, the government closest at hand could most economically and efficiently administer the services. We recommend that agreements be reached dealing with

Children's Aid Societies and Homes for the Aged. These are two provincial welfare programmes to which the Federal Government does not contribute, but these are services which should be extended to Indians.

Indians can leave the reserve, and as long as they do not choose to become enfranchised, they always have the right to return to the reserve. But when they are off the reserve, they are just as likely to become well-to-do or poverty-stricken as any other member of society. If they drop into poverty, they become a charge on the municipality. They might choose to return to their own reserve, but generally speaking, the public assistance which a municipality offers far exceeds that which they might receive from band funds or any federal source.

All this leads to the basic problem of the Indian. They do not admit they are a problem. We are the problem, because we came to this country and ruined their economy. They know we are not going to leave and return the country to them, and they realize they must learn to live with us, not as second-class citizens, but as our equals. Many have now learned to live with us. Many are leaders in our society. No Indian to my knowledge can say that he has been discriminated against in the broad field of ordinary society because he was an Indian.

We need only to look around us, in this province, to see many prominent citizens who are of Indian blood, who have not only made a success, but are leaders in their field.

What, then is the problem? Rt. Rev. Rennison, Bishop of Moosonee, summed it up when he said the whole reserve system was outdated. There is nothing we can do about reserves. These were set aside generations ago. On some reserves we visited, we found only the old and the young, the women and a few of the middle-aged men. Where were the rest? They were out working in industry in nearby towns or cities, or they had gone across the border to the steel industries in the United States, or to other profitable employment. Apparently the reserves attract them

when they are old. Possibly through an improved educational programme this tendency will lessen.

The Indian bogey man is a word called "enfranchisement." With that word they associate so much that is non-existent. Enfranchisement means an Indian gives up his Indian rights. What are his Indian rights? They are simply to have a home on the reserve, to collect treaty money of \$4 or \$5 per year, and to have his health and education bills paid for him.

The next move must then be to have the province assume the problem of extending health care and education to the Indians. Through their constant association with the rest of the citizens of the province—not isolated in Indian schools or Indian hospitals, but in the white schools and hospitals—they will come to prefer the white man's way of life and gradually the reserves will come to be nothing but refuges for the aged and the indigent.

If the province is to extend these services, it is only logical that the Federal Government should pay for them.

An unfortunate predominance of the publicity of the studies of this committee has been given to the question of alcohol. We have all heard expressions such as, "what an Indian he is when he has a drink under his belt, etc." The committee studied carefully the whole problem of granting Indians the right to consume alcohol. In the first place, the restriction on Indians consuming alcohol was placed on the Statutes at the request of the Indians themselves, because the white man, in the early days, used liquor as barter and thus exploited the Indians. Therefore, the Indians requested restrictions to protect them from the white man. From some 90 per cent. of the Indian bands we visited, we received the same request: "Give us the right to take liquor into our own homes." "Why should we have been allowed to drink while we were in uniform and refused the privilege as soon as we were discharged?" As one Indian said, "Why let us get shot overseas, and not even let us get half-shot at home?"

We could find no medical evidence that Indians were any less capable of using alcohol than any other race.

No objection has been put forward by any temperance or prohibition organization against giving Indians the right to drink.

In British Columbia, where some time ago the Indians were granted the right to drink in public places, there have been some problems, but on the whole, very few unsatisfactory incidents such as discrimination and over-indulgence have taken place.

I might point out to the hon. members of the House an excerpt from the report of the British Columbia Committee which has been set up to study Indian Affairs in that province. This deals with the consumption of alcoholic beverages by Indians and reads as follows:

The behaviour of the native Indians in beer-parlours, since this partial lifting of the ban on the sale of liquor to natives, has been assessed by most sections of the general public in a variety of opinions. There have been some cases where individual natives have abused this new privilege, but, generally speaking, the majority of the Indians have used their new freedom from prohibition with discretion . . .

The general consensus of public opinion appears to be that a satisfactory adjustment in drinking habits is being made by the Indians of this province.

This government has consistently attempted to eliminate discrimination wherever found. Prohibition of Indians drinking in public places cannot be classified as anything else but discrimination. It is not up to this committee to say whether Indians should be allowed to drink on the reserves, or not. That is a federal matter. Suffice it to say that the vast majority of the Indians whom we interviewed wanted that privilege, and it is difficult to see why, in this day and age, a home on the reserve should be considered different from any other home in the province.

Members of the committee will deal with other points raised in the report,

such as the great waste of some of the best agricultural land in the province, through lack of interest of Indians in agriculture.

I shall deal only with one more point—the right of Indians to vote in provincial elections.

We did not find that all Indians wanted to vote in provincial elections. They were afraid. The vast majority have had tales handed down from father to son about the treachery of the white man. When we suggested that they might be given the right to vote, they were suspicious of the white man and told us to put in writing that the right to vote would not in any way affect their treaty rights. They have had too many sad experiences of white men offering them something and taking much more back in return.

Anyone who does not have the right to vote in a general election of a province or the Dominion, cannot be considered as a full citizen. It is true that in some reserves, there would be no knowledge as to what Party stood for what form of government, but on most reserves we found a reasonably keen knowledge of the value of the vote. In British Columbia, Indians were given the right to vote a few years ago. As a matter of interest, an Indian has been elected to the B.C. Legislature. I was most impressed with him when I met him a couple of weeks ago. A representative or representatives of the Indian race, regardless of Party affiliation, would be an asset to this House.

Indians are not going to learn the value of the vote from textbooks. While it may mean nothing to many bands at first, it will be an indication to them that they are our equals, and this will not only develop their interest in public affairs, but will make Indians more aware of the privileges and responsibilities of full citizenship.

The right to vote would be another step toward integration. It would appear that education will play a greater part in bringing about full integration than any other force. Through education, the Indians will gradually appreciate the fact that in spite of desires which they

have inherited to retain their own way of life, to survive and progress they must, of necessity, assume full citizenship.

The non-Indian must learn to appreciate the Indian—to accept him as his equal—to understand his problems, so that there will be full equality regardless of race, colour or creed.

It is a paradox that so many non-Indians consider the noble savage of history to be to a large extent superior to themselves and yet hold back from the noble savage's descendants their due rights. During our fact finding tours, we visited many Indian homes which members of the Legislature would be proud to own, where families were living as anyone else would, and taking the same attitude toward the backward Indians as we do.

What we must do is to extend every possible educational benefit to the Indians. We must open our schools to them. We must particularly encourage them to attend our vocational schools and teachers' colleges. Through our discrimination of the past, the Indian has developed an inferiority complex; he thinks we look down on him; let us make them understand that this is not the case. Let us remind them of the greats of their race from Joseph Brant, Pauline Johnson, Tecumseh, to Elliot Moses, Magistrate Martin, Canon Sanderson, and many others. Let us by our every action assure them that only they themselves stand between being wards of the Federal Government and citizens, in the fullest sense of the word.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) has very fully presented to the House the report of the Select Committee appointed by the Legislature, at its last session, to make a full inquiry into all matters concerning the status of the Indians in this province, and to bring in its report.

I would like to say, first, what a pleasure it has been for me to have had this opportunity to serve the Province of Ontario in this particular capacity as a member of this committee, a member under the very able chairmanship of the

hon. Minister of Welfare. I want to thank him for the kind personal reference he saw fit to make to me in my humble capacity as hon. member for Brant, and as a member of this committee. I want to reciprocate by saying, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister certainly discharged his important duties as chairman of that committee in a manner which was able, fair, satisfactory, and certainly acceptable to every member of the committee, to the public at large, and to the bands of Indians we had the privilege of visiting.

I think in this instance it was a wise departure from the usual practice in placing an hon. Minister of the Crown as chairman of the committee. It certainly added a great deal of dignity and prestige to that committee in our many contacts with the public, and with the bands when visiting them on reservations.

It is of particular satisfaction to me that my name as hon. member for Brant has been associated with this unanimous report, which is now before you, Mr. Speaker, for discussion. This is really the first sincere effort, to my knowledge, which has been made by the Legislature of this province to acquire first-hand knowledge of the problems connected with our 36,000 Indian citizens of this province, and to seek a remedy for some of their difficulties under which they have been carrying on for many, many years in the history of this province.

The last few years have seen great advances, as the hon. Prime Minister stated in his explanation of the bill which he presented to the House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. We all can remember well when it seemed to be the attitude that there had been created in this world certain people to be superior, and certain people who seemed to be delegated to an inferior position. My own very deep conviction is that this was never any part of the Divine intent, that it was always intended that all men were created equal in the sight of God. We must all rejoice, I think, at the progress which has been made in civilization, even in our time and age, in the

elimination of many of these discriminations which existed against these people in the past.

Some reference has been made in this session by the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) to the Declaration of Human Rights as passed by the United Nations, and I would like to refer you to one or two of those 30 articles:

ARTICLE 1:

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

ARTICLE 21:

Every one has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives; every one has the right of equal access to public services in his country. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government. This will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage.

ARTICLE 25:

Every one has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including, food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

So one might go through nearly every one of the 30 articles, and we must admit, judging by this standard or any other standard of equity, our Indian population in the past has not had a fair deal in this country.

I recommend a careful study by every hon. member of this Legislature of this report, which is now before you. It is brief and very readable. While we, as a Legislature or government in this province, have not the jurisdiction to deal with all the problems concerning our

Indian population, if we deal with those by carrying them out and putting them into effect, I believe we will have gone a long way towards doing our part, at least, in seeing that the Declaration of Human Rights is put into effect in this province, insofar as it concerns our Indian people.

To show you to what extent this discrimination has been carried on in other provinces and elsewhere across Canada, I noticed a press report as of March 3rd, from Winnipeg, Man., our sister province, to the effect that at this late date in that province they have passed a bill which repealed a prohibition that prevented Indians from going into pool rooms, so that now, in the Province of Manitoba, an Indian may go into a pool room. We never got that far in Ontario in discriminating against Indians, but I think something is certainly long overdue.

I only intend to deal with one or two matters in this report. I have had the opportunity on previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, of addressing you in connection with the great Six Nations Band on the reservation in my riding, and for that reason I will not take up too much of the time of the House this afternoon.

I might refer you to the recommendation in regard to agriculture. Now the situation which the committee found on various reservations was, frankly, not too encouraging or satisfactory with respect to the agricultural development of some extremely valuable lands in this province. These lands, of course, are entirely outside of the jurisdiction of provincial authorities who have in all other cases absolute jurisdiction over property and civil rights. In my riding, for instance, there are over 50,000 acres of extremely valuable agricultural land which constitutes the reservation, and which is not being used nearly as satisfactorily as we would like to see it used. Some would almost go so far as to tell you that it is difficult indeed to make a good farmer of an Indian. However, I do not subscribe to that. I know many Indians who are splendid farmers. I have had the benefit of their assistance on my own farm since I have had any-

thing to do with its operation, and living so close to the reserve, my father and my grandfather before me in my day made extensive use of the services of Indians, without exception they were found to be entirely satisfactory.

However, a situation exists there which is beyond the power of this Legislature to deal with, that the equity of the individuals on their land is not clearly understood, nor is it in good condition, and many Indians who are living upon Indian lands do not know to what extent of equity they have in that property, whether it is entire, partial, or non-existing. An effort is now being made to clear up these uncertainties, which makes it difficult for any individual to put a great deal of time, money and effort into the improvement of his property.

As they have no power to grant mortgages on their land, such legislation as the Junior Farmers Establishment Act of this province could not possibly apply, and we have no power to assist the junior farmers, the young men who would make the best farmers, by such legislation as that. So our opportunities to assist in this connection are very limited, and no matter which way you turn, you seem to be thwarted.

Just to give you an example of that, last year, our very able agricultural representative in the county visited the Indian reserve and delivered a very fine speech on conservation. As we have a Grand River Conservation Authority, which is very active, this speech would appear to be very timely and appropriate. He went on to tell them that if they would build farm ponds, for instance, there was a provision they could be reimbursed to the extent of 50 per cent. up to \$100.

One of the Indians, who incidentally was a graduate of the Ontario Agricultural College—and we have very many well-educated Indians on our reserves—thought he would like to take advantage of this. He engaged a contractor to come in with his large equipment and he scooped out a farm pond on a dry run through his property, where, in flood times, enough water would

accumulate to carry his large stock of animals grazing there, during the dry times. Otherwise, his herds had to cross a travelled highway and go down a very steep bank to the Grand River.

When he got his pond built, he applied to be reimbursed to the extent of \$100, and was told that of course he was not eligible as no assessment had been made against the Indians on the reservation for the purpose of conservation under the Grand River Authority. When you explain that to the Indian, he just says: "Well, that is just another instance where the poor Indian is left 'holding the bag'."

I have tried my best to see that this case should be dealt with, and if I do not succeed before another session I may go to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) and ask him to put this item in his Estimates. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would back me up to the extent of \$100, which is, I think, very much deserved, particularly as it was following the advice of a representative of the Department of Agriculture that the expenditure was proceeded with.

We are recommending that at the different levels of government everything be done to assist agriculture on the reserves. While that recommendation does sound a little inadequate to meet a very real difficulty and situation, I do not see how much further we can go, having such limited authority as the Provincial Legislature. But, certainly, if something is not done in the very near future, much of this land will be grown up into thorn trees and weeds. We see very valuable land in Ontario which is not in Indian reserves growing up into almost impenetrable forests of thorn trees, and it is difficult for anyone to clear it up and make a financial success by attempting to farm it. Before this valuable land gets into that condition, I sincerely hope that something is done.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, as I travelled over this 50,000 acres of the reserve, I was also almost tempted to assert my rights as an Indian chieftain of the

Mohawk tribe, and ask for an allotment of land there, on which to live and farm. The land I have is rolling and hilly, and burdened with railways, highways, pipelines and hydro towers. It would be nice, indeed, to spend the rest of my life in peaceful conditions, with no land tax, no school tax, no income tax, and no hydro towers to take the joy out of life any more.

I can well remember when the agricultural production of this reserve was much greater than it is now. They have fine agricultural land, naturally rich, and it is not too late to make good use of the land. I do suggest to those who have authority that something might be done in the way of long-term leases, even to non-Indians, to get this land back into production, and give some revenue to the band, and have the land in better shape when the Indians are in a position to make full use of it.

That does not only apply to the Brant reserve. When we visited one of the reserves in the Bruce Peninsula, the chief said that, just a few years ago, it took over 3 months in the fall of the year to thresh the grain production, whereas today it could be done in a very few hours, and, certainly, would not require more than 3 days.

So there is much to be done in connection with the development of agriculture on the reserves.

Reference has been made to the recommendation with regard to the right to vote at provincial elections. I was glad to hear the hon. Prime Minister state, even before the report was presented, that this right will be extended to the Indians of Ontario. In the two eastern provinces, Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, I do not think the right of the Indians to vote has ever been questioned; they have always voted, as a matter of course. British Columbia and Manitoba have recently extended the right to vote in provincial elections, and, when this is done in Ontario, there will be 5 provinces in which they will have the right. I do not think anyone would suggest that Ontario should be more than half-way down the

list of provinces when it comes to progress.

I sincerely hope when 5 provinces have taken this step forward, the Federal Government might be willing to consider it is time for it to do likewise, and make the matter nation-wide. I most sincerely endorse the recommendation in the report which extends the right to vote at provincial elections to Indians on the same basis as the non-Indians enjoy in this province of Ontario.

Just one other matter, in connection with the report, upon which I will touch . . . having introduced it to this Legislature at the last session . . . and that is in respect to intoxicants. Several sections of the Indian Act—5 in number, from 93 to 98—deal with the matter of intoxicants amongst Indians, and the most rigid prohibitions are set out in these sections. Severe penalties apply to anyone who serves intoxicants of any nature to an Indian in a public place, or to anyone who takes intoxicants onto an Indian reserve.

However, in the last amendment to the Indian Act, in 1951, there was a provision that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council could pass an Order-in-Council, asking the Dominion Government to make applicable to the province the provisions that Indians might drink in public places, which would be beverage rooms, and cocktail bars, in this province. That is the first time the door has been opened, in connection with the application of the Indian Act, for the provinces to take any action.

We are recommending that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council pass the appropriate Order-in-Council requesting the Governor-in-Council to proclaim Section 95. It was in this connection that I presented to this Legislature, last year, a resolution passed unanimously by the Council of the Six Nations Reserve in Brant, that the members of the Six Nations band of Indians be allowed the privilege of patronizing beverage rooms in the Province of Ontario, as provided for by Section 95 of the Indian Act.

I followed that up with a resolution

on the Order paper, asking the Legislature to express the opinion that the discrimination against the Indians, which has existed so long, should be removed by appropriate action of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

As the hon. Minister of Welfare—our chairman (Mr. Goodfellow)—has said, I received no criticism whatever from the temperance forces in my own riding—and they are very strong—nor from any other source in connection with this. I am satisfied the people of this province feel that our Indian citizens should be governed by the same laws as apply to the non-Indians of the province in this, as well as in other matters. I certainly am of the strong conviction that when the Parliament of Canada sees fit, in its wisdom, to repeal this prohibition, and leaves the Indian population subject to the same laws which are enjoyed by the rest of the population, it can be put on a provincial basis. Ontario should see to it that these prohibitions are removed, and the Indian citizens of this province be subject to the same laws and regulations as the non-Indians.

I would like, for a moment, to direct your attention to the very proud history of the Six Nations of Brant, Mr. Speaker. They are not in the same category as some of the other Indian bands in the province, as they are not our first citizens. These people were civilized and well developed, according to the lights of the times, living on very valuable land in New York State and Ohio. At the time of the War of Independence in the United States, they sided with the English, against the Colonies, under the leadership of Captain Joseph Brant—Thayendanege, his Indian name—who fought with very great distinction in that war on behalf of the Crown.

Joseph Brant was born in 1742, and died in 1807, at just about my own age, Mr. Speaker. Sad to relate, nearly all of the great chieftains of the Iroquois Six Nations have passed on, and I am not feeling very well myself.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): You are looking very well.

MR. NIXON: But Captain Joseph Brant was a very remarkable man. At the age of 13, he was an active warrior in the war against the French, and discharged his duties with great credit to himself, and rapidly rose to be a leader amongst his people.

When, in 1775, the difficulties developed as between the Colonies and the Mother Country, he was quite at a loss to understand how quickly his allies and his enemies changed sides. He went to England to get first-hand knowledge of these matters. It is said that when he was presented to King George III, the King suggested he should kneel before him, and kiss his hand in homage. Brant said: "I cannot think of that; I am just as much a king as you are, but your Queen is a very lovely lady, and I would not mind kissing her hand."

He apparently made quite an impression on the Court of St. James, and came back apparently convinced of the rights of the Mother Country, and led his 3,000 warriors for the Crown, and against the American colonies.

Had the forces of the Crown been as brilliantly led, and fought as successfully as the Indians under Brant, I can assure you the outcome of that war would have been quite different. But it went the other way. In the course of time, Brant and his Indians, through the Treaty of 1782, lost their land, and were backed up into the Niagara Frontier. It was from that section they carried on raids of terrific severity. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker—and I think history will bear me out—that the reason this valuable part of Southern Ontario remained to Canada and to the Crown, was largely because of the tremendous effort put forward by Captain Joseph Brant and his 3,000 Indians.

Having lost their land in the United States, they were given a grant of land of the 6 miles on each side of the Grand River, from its source to its mouth. This was a very valuable tract of land indeed, as you can well imagine, extending to Haldimand and Brant, up through Waterloo, Wellington and Dufferin. But, unfortunately, Joseph

Brant very rapidly disposed of very large areas of this land at a great sacrifice. It was not long until he and his Indians were backed into the Township of Tuscarora in the County of Brant, which was named after him, in recognition of the great debt this country owed to that famous warrior.

As a matter of fact, when my own grandfather came to Brant in 1839, he purchased the farm on which I live now, for some £214, from one Thomas Street, of Niagara, who had received the concession of a very large bloc of land in that district from Brant, for a very small consideration, indeed. Naturally, I am very greatly interested in Indian affairs, and the land upon which I have lived throughout my life, and upon which my father and my grandfather lived before me, was Indian land just a few years before my grandfather secured it.

We have developed from the Indians of Brant many illustrious individuals, in addition to Captain Joseph Brant. Many hundreds of our fine young men from the reserve have served with great distinction in 5 different wars of the Empire, and have been promoted in rank to even as high as brigadier, and many honours have been awarded for very illustrious services.

Even in the last affair in Korea—and I quote from our local paper—one petty officer, George Jamieson, one of the fine names of that riding, has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for outstanding courage and bravery on board the destroyer *Iroquois*, which was quite an appropriate name for the boat on which he was serving.

To give you another example, one of our ministers, after completing some 8 years of service on the reserve, left last year to serve in northern Saskatchewan. This is what the local press had to say about him:

After nearly 8 years' service on the United Church Grand River Mission, Reverend E. T. Montour will return with his family to the West at the end of June. Born in Tuscarora Township, Reverend Mr. Montour attended the Hagersville High School,

later going to McGill University in Montreal. He graduated there in Arts and Theology and won a scholarship for proficiency in Oriental languages. Then he preached in the Province of Quebec, preaching in French.

I mention these wonderful records to show the capacity of our Indians. When they have the opportunity, they can certainly hold their own, perhaps even better than others of the population, as exemplified by Rev. Mr. Montour, as demonstrating his capacity, winning a scholarship in Oriental languages.

I certainly would not want a contest with him on that score myself, I can assure hon. members.

Then we have Pauline Johnson, a poetess who was the daughter of Chief Johnson, whose beautiful home in Chief's Wood is still on the north bank of the Grand River at Middleport. She was a writer of prose and poetry which constitutes a great store of Indian knowledge, and one which has been greatly enjoyed by people of Canada and elsewhere. Certainly she was one of the greatest poets of her day. One could go on to give many other instances.

Recently Dr. G. C. Montour was written up in *Collier's* magazine. He is a Dominion geologist, a native of the Six Nations Reserve, and one of the outstanding geologists in the country. He did some remarkable work in developing the uranium deposits of northern Saskatchewan. And so one might continue, Mr. Speaker.

The committee had the pleasure of visiting the reserve at the time of a 3-day agricultural fair, and I am very certain that all members were most favourably impressed with the splendid type of citizens who received them in the great council hall and placed their arguments before the committee in so able a manner. Afterwards we went to a banquet prepared for us by the ladies of the St. Peter's Anglican Church, and never have I attended a banquet which was better prepared or more graciously served. Later we went to the fair, and there we saw thousands of Indians in

holiday mood, well dressed and happy, and in no single instance did they give any indication they were not thoroughly responsible citizens, such as one would find in a happy holiday gathering at any other fair throughout the length and breadth of the province.

Their only disappointment was that they did not have the hon. Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) there to confer honorary chieftainship upon him, but I hope there will be an opportunity for that at the next fair.

It is simply absurd that we should go on any longer treating these fine people as a people apart from the rest of us, or as second-rate citizens, and certainly I am sure this Legislature will be of the unanimous opinion, as is the committee itself, that our Indians should be emancipated, and receive the fullest citizenship of this province, with all rights, privileges and opportunities the rest of us enjoy.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will realize there is very little left for the rest of us to say after listening to the hon. Minister and to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). I was pleased indeed, Mr. Speaker, to be a member of this committee, and to serve under the very able chairmanship of the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). I do not think the government could have chosen a better chairman for a committee of this kind. The Minister who looks after the Department responsible for the welfare of the people of Ontario was chosen to be chairman of this committee, set up to look into the welfare of Indians, and I know, with his usual kindly interest, he gave the committee his very best services. I was pleased to be able to serve with him.

The only thing I regretted was that owing to my membership on 3 other committees, I missed a few of the meetings. In particular I missed the trip to the Brant Reservation, and I may say that some day I am going to look over the Brant Reservation myself, if the opportunity arises. I would have liked very much to have gone with the

committee when they were visiting that area.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there seems very little to say that has not been gone into by the chairman of the committee, and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) but I should like to refer to one or two subjects which have been touched on by both the hon. members.

One is the Indian's right to vote. Why should we, who are, after all, secondary citizens in Canada, and in Ontario particularly, withhold from the Indians their right to vote? By doing so we have deprived these people, who are the first citizens of Ontario, of an elementary right of citizenship. As citizens of Ontario we have held that right back from them over the years, crowding them into reservations as if they were subnormal citizens of the province. I agree wholeheartedly with the recommendation of the committee that the Indians be given the right to vote. If some hon. member of the House wish to refer to the report, on page 13 they will see a reference made to the section of our Election Act which deprives the Indian of his right to vote:

A person who is an unenfranchised Indian of whole or part Indian blood and who resides among Indians or on an Indian reserve shall not be entitled to have his name entered on the list of voters or to vote unless he served or is serving as a member of the Canadian Armed Forces within the meaning of the National Defence Act, Canada, or of the armed forces of any part of the British Commonwealth or any ally thereof.

What peculiar distinction was given to a man once he entered the army to serve as a member of the armed forces? How did that change an Indian so as to make him different from an ordinary Indian on the reserve? Why should he be given the right to vote merely because he served in the armed forces? This provision is a sort of belated recognition of the Indian's inherent right. It was for this reason that we gave to the Indian the right to vote after he had served in armed forces. I think that right should

be extended to all Indians, not only to Indians who served in the armed forces during the first and second world wars and the Korean war (perhaps there are some Indians who served in the South African war)—in that case they would have the right to vote which is denied to the ordinary Indian. But give to all Indians the right to vote in the same way as other citizens of the province.

British Columbia and Manitoba enacted legislation in 1949 and 1952, respectively, giving to the Indians the right to vote. Why should we in Ontario lag behind in extending to our own first citizens this major right of citizenship? Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, as pointed out by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), never did deprive the Indian of his right to vote. In those two provinces they always enjoyed this right as an ordinary citizen.

The next point to which I want to refer deals with the sale or consumption of liquor by the Indian. If hon. members of the House would turn to page 22 of the report they will see there the legislation which prohibits the Indian from consuming liquor. It is section 95 of the Indian Act and it reads as follows:

(1) No offence is committed against subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (a) of section 94 if intoxicants are sold to an Indian for consumption in a public place in accordance with a law of the province where the sale takes place authorizing the sale of intoxicants to a person for consumption in a public place.

(2) This section shall not come into force in any province until a proclamation bringing it into force in the province is issued by the Governor-in-Council at the request of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of the province.

This means that though the section in the Indian Act states that no offence is committed by an Indian going into a beverage room to consume liquor in accordance with the laws of the province in which he is living, in order to acquire that right the Governor-in-Council of

the Dominion must approve a recommendation sent to him by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of a province.

The only thing that can be done in Ontario is for our Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to ask the Governor-in-Council of the Dominion to put this regulation of section 95 into effect, upon which the Indian will be permitted to enter our beverage rooms.

That is as far as we may go. We have not the right to permit Indians to buy packaged goods or to take them onto the reservations. We can only, according to the present provisions of section 95 of the Act, permit Indians to go into beverage rooms. We cannot give them the right to buy packaged goods and take them to the reserves.

Some day perhaps, after the Dominion authorities have seen how the Indian treats his rights in respect to this privilege of going into beverage rooms, the Federal Government will withdraw that restriction, too. I hope it will because, as long as restrictions of this kind remain, we cannot avoid a big difficulty, and one mentioned by the Indians themselves, that is: bootlegging on the reserves.

Indians told us, when we were visiting different reservations, that they knew that members of their bands were paying as high as \$14, \$15 or \$18 per bottle for very poor brands of liquor. Having once purchased these rather poor brands of liquor, these Indians were rather dubious about carrying bottles on their persons for any length of time, and one or two of them immediately consumed the bottle, in order to avoid having it on their person, with the result they became intoxicated. In other words, the very restriction which prevents Indians from having packaged goods resulted in a greater degree of intoxication. The Indian thought he had better get rid of the liquor he had on his person because he thought he might perhaps run into police officers, and get into trouble. I believe that if the Indians were given the right to take parceled goods onto the reserves they would treat that privilege in the same way as the white man.

I think it was the hon. Minister himself who referred to a number of the McGregor tribe who was quite sarcastic about the restriction of the privileges given to Indians in connection with drink. He said: "We were permitted to go overseas, to join the Canadian Army, and perhaps get shot overseas. As soon as we come back, however, the government forbids us the privilege of getting 'half-shot'."

On all our visits, the Indians stressed the differences we in Ontario and Canada attempt to maintain between them and the white men. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), Indians have reached very high positions. Many of them are very able men, as able as any of the white people in the province.

I refer to such men as Brigadier-General Martin and Canon Sanderson of Northern Ontario, an Anglican Church missionary who has served his community on behalf of the Church and presently holds the appointment of Canon. Canon Sanderson went with us as our interpreter, and many of us grew to appreciate to the full this very able old gentleman. All Indians can acquire this same status if they are given the opportunity of education, and treated as equals. I think, Mr. Speaker, the committee is agreed that we should continue no longer to impose an unfair status on the Indians. The Indian is the equal of the white man, when given educational privileges, and his service in two world wars proves it. When Indians went into action they proved themselves to be equally able and efficient soldiers as the white soldiers of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I agree whole heartedly with the recommendation contained in the report giving the Indians the right to enter beverage rooms and consume beverages there. I am sure there are several other members of the committee who want to say a few words, so I will not refer to any more of the recommendations. I hope hon. members of the House will read this short report. That is one of the advantages this report has. It is short. Hon. members read a

short report, whereas they tend to put a longer report aside. I hope it will be given the fullest consideration and that the government will implement the recommendations contained in it.

MR. BRYAN CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker. As a member of what I consider to be this very important committee, may I first of all say that I am in full agreement with all that has been brought out by our chairman, the hon. Mr. Goodfellow, the member for Brant, and the member for Cochrane South. I do want to take a moment to express my keen appreciation to our chairman for his leadership throughout the past year of our study of Indian affairs in this province and to sincerely thank him for the impartiality which he showed to all members of the committee. It can be understood that we were not all in complete agreement at all times. However, the Minister of Public Welfare showed his real qualities as a diplomat by bringing us together to produce a fully unanimous report. In other words, he was not the old schoolmaster type, who endeavoured to whip us into line, but rather the considerate type, and the fact that more than 80 per cent. were in attendance at all meetings points up the interest of the members and surely is a personal tribute to him. Each one of us had a full opportunity to express our views.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to direct my remarks first to a field which the chairman mentioned earlier, that of education of Indians and non-Indians to live together and the mutual benefits which are available if this can be achieved. Our report is not bulky, it was kept short so that everyone could read it easily. It is well worth-while reading.

I was privileged to have the committee visit 3 reserves in my county. They are Sarnia, Walpole Island and Kettle Point. The Sarnia reserve is in an unusual position since it lies entirely within the city limits of Sarnia. The reserve has accumulated some wealth through the development of what is recognized as the great Chemical Valley of Canada today. Most of the chemical

valley was originally part of the reserve and the large companies now situated there have bought land from the Sarnia band and purchased rights-of-way for pipelines, etc., all of which has brought wealth and in turn many benefits. Over the years it has been my privilege to become personally acquainted with most of the families and to feel as much at home at their get-together as I would any place in the riding.

When the announcement was made that the committee was going to meet the Sarnia band, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Sarnia came to me and asked if it would be all right if they sat in on the committee meeting. Without hesitation I assured them we would not only be glad to have them, but would appreciate having their views. Some 15 or 20 of the group attended and 2 or 3 of them spoke. A question was asked by one of our Indian women: "Could Indian children use the city parks?" Well, of course, we all know and take it for granted that the parks are open to all citizens and visitors, but you see the Indians were not sure. They did not want to push in where they might not be wanted, with the result that our Indian boys and girls were not playing baseball, football and hockey, simply because they did not know what facilities were available to them.

The fact that our "jaycees" attending our meeting, and their very enlightening talks, I am sure removed much of the strain and possible misunderstanding between our two peoples of the city. The Sarnia jaycees did not stop at telling them they were welcome in the parks, the city arena and to join in the sports. They went much further and organized boys' work with the Indian lads.

Before this meeting, I am sure the jaycees did not know too much about conditions on the reserve, and more particularly the condition of thinking on the reserve, but when they found out, they went to work. Within a week they were getting the young Indian boys out to join in the parks sports with the non-Indian boys.

I have here a couple of pictures taken during football season. They show Indian boys playing football with the white boys. I have also a note from a member of the jaycees and in his own words I quote:

Here are photos proving your Indian Committee did some good. These are originals from the *Windsor Star* showing equipment and coaches donated as a direct result of the visit to our city of the Provincial Indian Affairs Committee.

If the committee accomplished nothing else, it brought Indians and non-Indians of my district together and I think that is a very important factor in our educational programme.

I hope this will not be considered off the subject or as they say, away from the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, but there has been some discussion in the press as to whether my home football players team—the Sarnia Imperials—should import football players from the United States. I don't profess to be an expert, but from the report of some of the men who worked with these Indian boys last fall, I suggest they scout the reserves for talent. The Indians are natural athletes, and with a little coaching, they will produce many great names in sport. In fact, I might go further and suggest the same method for our Toronto football teams and the Maple Leaf hockey team. Sport is important. It is an easy way of getting people together. Many of our Indians tend to be backward in expressing themselves, and this applies especially to the younger people, who need encouragement to bring out their qualifications, but if they find they can compete equally in sports, it will give them confidence that they can compete equally in other fields of life and will encourage them to take their proper place and thus make even a greater contribution in the affairs of this province.

An agreement was recently reached whereby the Indian children could attend the public schools in our district. The Indian Affairs Department pays a per pupil per diem grant and has said

it will share in building costs to the extent needed for the reserve children. As evidence of this I have here a clipping from the *Canadian Observer* and with your permission I would like to quote a portion of it:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ADMIT INDIANS

Sarnia Board of Education Monday night passed a motion to accept in principle a proposal of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to admit Indian children from Sarnia reserve into public schools operating under the jurisdiction of the board.

The article goes on to say:

The Sarnia Board of Education was also informed that the Federal Government would not wish to exercise any control over the operation of the school.

No distinction will be made in the provision of educational facilities to the Indian children.

At present, there are 12 such joint school systems operating in Canada. Purpose of the assimilation is primarily to integrate Indian and non-Indian children.

I hope that this mixing during school will mean that when they grow up, they will be able to take their place as any other citizens. There are many Indians who feel as I do, that their children should mix and acquire the white man's competitive spirit.

On the question of giving Indians the right to vote in provincial elections, I do want to stress that it is not a compulsory vote. We had several Indians tell us they would not vote even if the right were given to them. I feel it must be made very clear to the Indians that if they want to vote, they can, and also for whatever Party they choose. We must assure them that by casting a provincial vote, they do not in any way jeopardize any of their Indian rights.

An educational programme will eventually remove a feeling that now exists, that there is possibly some difference between the two races. At this point I would like to refer to the almost unanimous feeling of Indians in my riding

that they want to have the right to buy liquor or beer and take it home to the reserve, where they can enjoy a social drink in their own home, like any other citizen. One should remember that giving the Indian the right to drink in public places means that if he should be indiscreet and have one too many, he has a long road to wend home. If he was able to drink at home, I think he would not tend to drink as much. Certainly many Indian women came to our committee meetings and said that they did not want their husbands allowed to enter beverage rooms, but on the other hand they would be happy to have them allowed to bring the packaged goods home. The Indians of the last century asked that the right to drink be taken away from them, now they are asking that it be given back to them. As far as I am concerned I think it is plain discrimination not to allow them to indulge in their own homes in the same way as any immigrant or citizen is allowed to do today. In all of our travels and from almost every quarter, where deputations and those closely concerned in this matter appeared before us, the plea was made for the privilege of purchasing and taking packaged goods to the home.

As far as disability pensions are concerned, I hope the province will act quickly when the federal legislation is brought down and extend these pensions to the Indians on or off the reserves. This pension is one that I have been greatly interested in and have spoken on many times in this House as well as publicly. It was my hope the Federal Government would join with the province to make it available across Canada when it was introduced in the province. However, they did not see fit to do so and the Province of Ontario, realizing the great need of this one group, who had been overlooked, brought in this legislation and not only has it been of real help to the disabled person, but indirectly to the municipalities as a whole. As an example I have a clipping from the *London Free Press* of Friday, March 26th, which has this to say:

ELDERLY PERSON ONLY ONE ON RELIEF ROLL AT DELHI

An elderly woman is the only person on relief in Delhi at the present, according to W. J. Worrall, deputy clerk and assessor. It is expected that the municipality will not pay out more than \$500 for relief this year.

In 1953, about \$2,000 was paid out for relief in Delhi. Approximately \$3,000 was paid in 1952; \$3,500 in 1951 and \$2,300 in 1950.

The establishment of a disability pension by the Provincial and Federal Governments has assisted in removing several persons from the relief list, said Mr. Worrall. It pays a maximum of \$40 per month to a person.

On other welfare questions, such as Homes for the Aged and Children's Aid Society work, I feel these should be made entirely available to the Indians, but not at the expense of our municipalities—rather the Federal Government should compensate for this care. At present these facilities are not to any extent available to Indians. I think they should be and that a conference should be sought with the federal welfare officials to work out a cost sharing agreement. Already much provincial legislation and benefits under certain acts are available to Indians, the province is doing more than its share and it is really only where a programme is operated through the municipal governments, that Indians do not participate. The Federal Government should take the place of the municipality in these programmes.

I must point out, Mr. Speaker, that this Provincial Government has not shirked its responsibility towards all of the people who reside within its boundaries, rather at every opportunity they have stepped in to see that regardless of race, colour or creed, equal opportunities are made available and given.

The appointment of this Select Committee to examine into conditions, etc., of our Indian population—the fact that under the leadership of our chairman the committee can boast of an average attendance of over 80 per cent. visiting

Indian reserves, talking with their council and in many cases visiting the homes and talking with the residents right on their own doorsteps, is a concrete example of the interest and concern of this government and this Legislature towards the Indian population. Realizing full well that the province is limited under federal legislation and the B.N.A. Act to do things for these people, a very thorough inspection and examination has been made with the hope that no avenue to place all of our people on an equal basis has been overlooked.

As I said before it is not hard to understand that the Government of the Province of Ontario is going far beyond its line of duty in payment of old-age pensions, the payment of disability pension when the Federal Government introduces such legislation, and the recommendations made by this committee, all point up the fact that the government is anxious to leave no stone unturned towards this end of equality for all.

May I just add that in spite of all these efforts, in spite of any legislation we may pass, we will have done little unless such legislation has the moral support of each one of us. Let us remember that while government laws are necessary, they do not achieve their purpose unless backed by the moral conviction of our people and especially so in matters that concern the hearts of men. As it has been so well said, government can pass laws, but they have not yet the power to pass a miracle.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that one of the highest compliments I have ever received was paid when the committee was visiting an Indian reserve in my riding. An Indian friend of mine said that although I was not an Indian, I had sort of been inoculated. He said they considered me to be one of them. A great honour and one that I value very highly. From personal experience I know that once you have proved yourself and been accepted as a friend, you can be assured of his loyalty.

As the representative of that great riding, of Lambton West, a riding of

great development and sound growth, a riding with a great future, and with almost 2,000 of the kind of people I have been talking about within its confines, I have every reason to be proud, as I have always considered our Indians to be the same as any other citizen and the sooner we all rate them as complete equals in every respect, the better it will be for all of our people and for the Province of Ontario as a whole.

MR. W. G. NODEN (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, at this time I will be brief. It was my pleasure to serve on this committee under the able chairmanship of the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). I found it most interesting and educational in furthering my knowledge of the first citizens of Canada.

Being a member from the north-western part of Ontario, and having some knowledge of the Indians and their way of living, as well as some knowledge of their thinking, I was very much surprised to find that the Indians in Southern Ontario were so far ahead in their education, and in their mode of living, and there was no comparison with the Indians of Northern Ontario.

We found that in Southern Ontario certain Indians have lost their mother tongue: in the north, there are Indians who are unable to converse in English. There are many other observations which enlightened the members of this committee.

The hon. Minister and chairman has summarized the recommendations in a very thorough manner. I would like to mention a statement which was made at one of the meetings when Magistrate Martin, formerly of the Six Nations reserve, was asked the question: "Could it possibly be the provincial vote, as recommended, would be the first step in advanced education?" He replied, "Yes—very definitely." This government is to be commended for the direct interest it is taking in the present and future welfare of our first citizens. As one chief stated to me on the Couchiching reserve, it is the first time any group of government members has come to their reserve to interest themselves in

the Indians' welfare. At the same time, they put on a "pow-wow" for the benefit of the members of this committee.

MR. ALBERT WREN (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on the recommendations brought down by the chairman of this committee, particularly since I represent a riding which contains the largest Indian population in the province. As the report will show, in the Kenora and Sioux Lookout agencies, we have some 6,751 Indians. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) may have more than we who are over the age of 21, but we have over 2,900, as the report will show, who are just over the age of 21, and who will, for the first time in history, if this report is adopted, be entitled to a provincial vote.

As the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) has indicated, we have, in the north, a somewhat different type of classification of Indians. I was particularly proud, since it was I who recommended to the chairman that we attempt to secure the assistance of Rev. Canon Sanderson, at the reception he received, and how he impressed all the members of the committee with his ability and gentlemanly appearance. It was, of course, a sort of personal pride for myself and my family at home, insofar as it was the Rev. Canon Sanderson who was the clergyman who officiated at the christening of our children.

I was very pleased he was able to travel with the committee, because, in recent years, his health has not been too good.

The Indians in the Sioux Lookout and Kenora agencies are spread over a vast geographical area. In fact, these 2 areas containing some 6,700 Indian people, are greater in size, by far, than the whole of the southern part of Ontario.

The work of these 2 agencies is ably attended to by 2 men, who were of great assistance to the committee. One, Mr. Gifford Swartman, the Superintendent at Sioux Lookout, and the other, Mr. Norman Patterson, the Superintendent at Kenora.

I would like to mention some of the work Mr. Swartman has done in regard to the Indian children. I think the hon. Prime Minister will recall that a couple of years ago, the Blackhawk Indians hockey team came to his office here in the Parliament buildings. The children at the Indian school are very proud to show the picture they had taken with the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, and with the Governor-General in Ottawa when they appeared in the arena there.

But one point I want to make about this hockey team is that 2 years before these boys appeared in Southern Ontario, and played in the Maple Leaf Gardens here, and the arena in Ottawa, and demonstrated their ability as hockey players, they never had a pair of skates on their feet. Mr. Swartman and Mr. Schade and a small group, got together and bought skates for them, and made the necessary arrangements. Within 18 months, the team had captured the championship of Northwestern Ontario, in their class of hockey, and went from there to Southern Ontario, and demonstrated its excellence there as well.

This goes to prove that Indian people are vested with the same ability as the whites, and if given the opportunity by this Legislature, if it adopts this report, they will turn out to be as fine or finer citizens.

In the north, it was apparent to the committee that the great responsibility in the past in the education of the Indian population has fallen largely on the churches. The Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches (Anglican and the Presbyterian) in that part of Ontario, have carried, in years gone by, the load of education. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Renison, spoke to the committee in the Parliament buildings here, and pointed out how serious the problem had become to secure the proper teachers for the north country, at a salary range which the churches could afford to pay.

One field in which this province could do much for our Indian people, as the hon. member for Cochrane South

(Mr. Grummett) has said, is in the field of education.

Referring again to Rev. Canon Sanderson: he has raised a family who have all distinguished themselves in Canada in one way or another. He has daughters serving as registered nurses; he has sons in the Dominion Civil Service, and others who have succeeded in the business world, and have demonstrated their ability in every particular.

The other question, which was of great interest to everyone—in fact, still is—was the matter of extending the liquor privileges to Indians.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the granting of this privilege to these citizens is going to create some particular problems in the northern part of Ontario but they are not problems which are unsurmountable. I would suggest to the government and those responsible for the enforcement of liquor regulations, that the inspectors of the Liquor Licence Board be particularly patient and tolerant in the first few months after this privilege is granted. I have no doubt whatever, as the privilege becomes widespread, and is increasingly used by the Indian population in our country, that they will behave equally as well, and in fact, a great deal better, than some of our white people. There is going to be a period, however, when there will be some difficulties, because it is going to create a situation where people will be enjoying a privilege long denied. It may be, at first, that some of these people will abuse it, but that also occurs with members of our own race.

There is one very obnoxious term which is used, not by the Liquor Control Board, but by the people who handle the reports from the board. That is the term "Indian list" when referring to people on the interdicted list. I feel this is rather an insult to our Indian people, and I trust that it will not be used in any form.

Another matter in this report, which is very apparent to those of us who live in the north, and which we highly commend, is the suggestion that a full-blooded Indian be appointed a liaison

officer in matters affecting Indian affairs in the province. I think that is one of the finest recommendations in the report. I have been one of those who, over several years, have advocated a greater part for these people to play in the administration of the conduct of their own affairs. I think, sometimes, the Federal Government would go a great deal farther than it has in training young men and women for positions of higher responsibility in Indian affairs, and I think Ontario is taking a wise step, and one in the right direction, if it adopts the suggestion by the committee that a person of Indian blood be appointed to act as liaison officer between this government and the people concerned.

I wholeheartedly support this report. Mr. Speaker. I am pleased and proud that the Indians, of whom so many served as our brothers of the armed forces, will now become brother citizens to the fullest extent possible under the laws of this province.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker. I move the adjournment of the discussion.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Before the motion is acted upon, may I be permitted to ask one question of the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) who presented the report? May I ask whether the recommendations contained in the report have been placed before responsible Indian bodies before they were brought to this House, and if they were generally approved by these organized Indian groups and bodies?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, we discussed all the matters contained in the recommendations with the bands on their own reserves across the Province of Ontario, and for the most part, these recommendations are the results of conferences we held with the Indians themselves.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that, as some members may desire to speak to

the report after they have had an opportunity to read it, the discussion be adjourned to a later date, and that an Order be placed on the Order paper for its further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the Orders of the day, may I make this announcement? The Standing Committee on Government Commissions called for tomorrow at 1 o'clock has been cancelled.

Orders of the day.

THE ROSS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

MR. LETHERBY moves second reading of Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the Ross Memorial Hospital."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HAMILTON FOUNDATION

MR. ELLIOTT moves second reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act to incorporate the Hamilton Foundation."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF PETERBOROUGH (No. 1)

MR. SANDERCOCK moves second reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 1)."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF PETERBOROUGH (No. 2)

MR. MURDOCH, in the absence of Mr. Beckett, moves second reading of Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 2)."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LONDON FOUNDATION

MR. PATRICK, in the absence of Mr. Robarts, moves second reading of

Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the London Foundation."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF ST. MARYS

MR. PRYDE, in the absence of Mr. Edwards, moves second reading of Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF ST. THOMAS

MR. PATRICK, in the absence of Mr. Robarts, moves second reading of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

MR. COLLINGS, in the absence of Mr. Morrow, moves second reading of Bill No. 25, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee, Mr. Dent in the Chair.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, if any hon. member wants any of these bills held over, will they let me know? These are all bills which have been through committee.

BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 35, "An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is only my experience, but I do not find the bill in my book. If other hon. members have it, I have no objection to proceeding, but if no one has it, perhaps we should not proceed. Has every hon. member a copy or not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: All right, thank you.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 35 reported.

DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 38 reported.

DIVISION COURTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend the Division Courts Act."

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 40 reported.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend The Evidence Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 41 reported.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 43, "An Act to amend The Judicature Act."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 43 reported.

THE MINORS' PROTECTION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 47, "An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.
Bill No. 47 reported.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 48, "An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.
Bill No. 48 reported.

THE WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 49, "An Act to amend The Warehouse Receipts Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.
Bill No. 49 reported.

THE WILLS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 50, "An Act to amend The Wills Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 50 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, we will hold the Telephone Act over.

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 57, "An Act to amend the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.
Bill No. 57 reported.

THE PARENTS' MAINTENANCE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 58, "An Act to amend the Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.
On section 5.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I raised a serious question when this bill was up for second reading, on the principle. I was hoping the government would agree with me, would share my apprehension about the effect of the Act, and would bring about amendments.

I have not written out an amendment; I might have done so if I thought there

was any chance of getting sufficient support for it. I must, however, repeat my fear that the amendment to the Act, especially at this time, entails the danger that it will be used indiscriminately against younger members of a family who may be pressed into giving support of a degree that they are incapable of giving, and, as a result, bring great hardship upon them and the other members of a family.

Mr. Chairman, my experience with the bill, even before amendment, was that it was very harmful during the days of the depression. The amendment before this one was brought in by the Liberal administration of the day. I appealed against the introduction of that amendment, and, contrary to assurances given me and other spokesmen before a committee of the Legislature at that time, the Act was used very harmfully, resulting in the separation of families during that unhappy period in our history. I am afraid that this present amendment will result in a repetition of it.

Sections 5 to 10 inclusive, agreed to.

Forms 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 58 reported.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 63, "The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, this bill is a very long one, and it has been gone over in committee. We adopted a shorter method of dealing with such matters in the past, rather than calling each section. If there are sections in the bill that hon. members would like to speak to, may we not do it by simply calling the page? Perhaps we might make the motion that the bill be reported, without calling the sections individually. We have done that before on a very lengthy bill of this sort.

MR. SALSBERG: Bad practice.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not want to hurry the bill, nor do I want to

deprive any hon. member of the opportunity of talking to any section, but this bill has been through committee in detail. Is there anything to be gained by calling out some 80 sections? I think the bill might be reported.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, before we report the bill, might I ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) what is meant by the reference in this bill, from time to time, to "teachers' residence"? Are there many teachers' residences throughout the province?

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Not very many, Mr. Chairman, just a few, in the rather more remote places. They are not in large cities or towns, or even villages, but a way out in the country some places.

Sections 1 to 80 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 63 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, we will hold over Bill No. 65, "The Corporations Act, 1953."

CORPORATIONS INFORMATION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 66, "An Act to amend the Corporations Information Act, 1953."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 66 reported.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 67, "An Act to amend the Unemployment Relief Act."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) tell us how much money was paid out last year under this provision; how much money was involved?

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Welfare): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. Leader of the Opposition an exact figure. It is not a large amount; simply

a few thousand dollars. From now on, what we propose to do is to pay it out of our Unemployment Relief Item, rather than have a separate item in our Estimates. That is the only point involved.

MR. OLIVER: There is no change in principle, of course?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No change in principle whatever.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to. Bill No. 67 reported.

THE MILK INDUSTRY

House in Committee on Bill No. 68, "An Act respecting the Milk Industry."

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I am not too sure that we should simply report this one. Were there any amendments in committee to this bill?

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Welfare): No, there were supposed to have been.

MR. OLIVER: I understand there were to be amendments, or there were amendments.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: There was just one amendment, which had to do with "market" or "markets," the words "or markets" were to be added to it. I do not know whether that was done or not.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I think there were two minor amendments. They were just changing the singular to the plural. I think that was all.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes, in the Agricultural Committee.

HON. MR. FROST: It is reprinted in the bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew) Mr. Chairman, I am not a farmer but I drink milk, and so I hope does everybody. I imagine I should be more informed on the bill than I confess to be. However, it does seem

to me the bill is terribly confusing. It sets up a structure which reminds one of Rube Goldberg's famous cartoons of wheels within wheels, and dangerously balanced structures on top of needles. You do not know what authority will belong to which board. Even the names of these boards are so similar that it is really extremely confusing.

I do not know how other hon. members feel about it. If they do not speak up, then maybe I am to conclude they do not find it difficult to follow. I do, and I think the public will.

Fundamentally, however, nothing seems to be touched except a reshuffling, a re-arrangement of the authorities. From the correspondence that came to me, as it did I am sure to a lot of other hon. members, there has been a request to hold up the bill for clarification and study.

I am not acting on behalf of any particular group or interest in the dairy industry; certainly not for the milk distributing interests. I do however raise the doubts that are expressed, in correspondence, and in the editorial pages of some newspapers, if only for the sake of generating some discussion at this time, or for obtaining some statement by way of reply to these editorial comments. I think it is the least that should be done at this time.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the bill was before the Agricultural Committee, and I am willing, generally speaking, to be guided by the considerations of that committee. But if no discussion takes place, not only will we not be any wiser than we were at second reading, but the public at large will not be any wiser. I think there should be some explanation, as I said a moment ago, if only by way of a reply to the requests and to the opinions expressed in the editorials of a number of daily papers.

For myself, before I sit down, I want to say that I regret very much that the Milk Control Board is left with the same powers and authority that it had until now; authority over the working conditions of the working men in the distributing end of the industry. As I have said on another occasion during

this session, I think they should not be vested with that power. I think they should not have the right to over-ride the wishes of the working men, and even to over-ride existing collective bargaining legislation. I spoke against it before. Mr. Chairman, and I was glad to see that the unions immediately affected expressed the same sentiments to the government a few days after I had spoken, when they appeared in a deputation to the government. I was hoping the government would, in this revised Act, clip some of the power of the Milk Control Board, especially insofar as it relates to the conditions of work of the dairy employee.

Sections 1 to 54 agreed to.

Bill No. 68 reported.

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 69, "An Act to amend the Professional Engineers Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 69 reported.

THE INFANTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend The Infants Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 73 reported.

CREDIT UNIONS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 74, "An Act to amend the Credit Unions Act, 1953."

Sections 1 to 15 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 74 reported.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 75, "The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954."

Sections 1 to 70 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 75 reported.

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 76, "An act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is not in his place. I would have liked to present to him the information I have received on the "phantom Mrs. Smith." The people concerned collaborated in preparing all the material they had, and if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) had been in the House now, I would have forwarded it to him. In his absence, I will have to deny myself this pleasure, and will give it to him when next I have the privilege of seeing him in the House.

However, I want to add, for the information of the House, that my original figure was wrong. The alleged, or the "phantom Mrs. Smith," was not allowed to defraud people to the tune of \$2,000, but \$2,500, and one of the parties affected told me that he telephoned the lawyer who handled the transaction, and the lawyer told him not to be silly, it is done every day of the year. However, seeing the hon. Attorney-General is not here, I will retain all the materials, and hand them to him as soon as I see him.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 76 reported.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 81, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act."

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Did the counties not have that power before?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I may say, Mr. Chairman, they did not have that power.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 81 reported.

SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 84, "The Schools Administration Act, 1954."

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): May I move that this bill be reported? It is a long one and it has been considered in very great detail.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I was not a member of the committee. Could we at least be told what amendments were made?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: There was one place in the bill, Mr. Chairman, where the words "in accordance with all Statutes made on that behalf" had been left out, and there was an amendment that they should be put in again.

Motion agreed to; Bill No. 84 reported.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act."

Sections 1 to 19 inclusive, agreed to. Bill No. 85 reported.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act."

On section 1.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the same question again. Would the hon. Minister explain the amendments?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: The amendments were: section 12, subsection 1, insert "subject to the provisions of any Statute in that behalf," and section 12, subsection, clause (a), "insert after the word 'establishment' in the first line the word 'organization'." Section 12, subsection 1, delete clause "W" and reletter Clauses to "J". Section 12, subsection 2, insert "subject to the provisions of any statute on that behalf."

MR. SALSBERG: The amendments do not seem to fit the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is Bill 86.

MR. SALSBERG: There are only 10 clauses there. There cannot be an amendment to section 12 in it.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: I was dealing with the wrong bill. There are 5 of them, but the meaning is the same.

HON. MR. FROST: R and S are underlined. I think that is the one.

MR. SALSBERG: R and S underlined. That, of course, makes it abundantly clear.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive, agreed to. Bill No. 86 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Resolutions numbers 13, 14 and 15.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to inform the House that the honourable Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, that is to say, resolutions 13, 14 and 15, recommends them for the consideration of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

RESOLUTION 13:

That the Minister, out of such moneys as are appropriated by the Legislature therefor, may make contributions towards the cost of treatment of poliomyelitis.

RESOLUTION 14:

That,

- (a) for the purposes of The Succession Duty Act, the property mentioned in subclause I to XIII inclusive of clause (p) of section 1 of that Act shall be deemed to pass on the death of the deceased and accordingly shall be deemed to be property passing on the death of the deceased or which passes on his death in addition to any other property passing on the death of the deceased or which passes on his death; and
- (b) subsection 1 of section 49 of the Succession Duty Act shall not

apply where the amount of the premiums mentioned in clause (g) of subsection 2 of section 6 of The Succession Duty Act, 1943, is equal to or greater than the amount of the money received by the treasurer mentioned in such clause (g).

as provided by Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act."

RESOLUTION 15:

That the Minister of Municipal Affairs shall in each year adjust the payments to municipalities under The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, 1953.

as provided by Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend the Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953."

MR. SALSBERG: I am not clear whether that third resolution means that the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Dunbar) will have the power to adjust unconditional grants to the municipalities every year, or whether this will be the result of government policy and legislation.

Resolutions 13, 14 and 15 agreed to.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 87, "An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act."

MR. OLIVER: On this question of teachers' superannuation, I imagine all hon. members of the House have been besieged, and rightly so, if people think they have a grievance, by the older members of the teaching profession who claim, with some justification, it would appear, that they are not being properly dealt with in the matter of superannuation. I would like to hear the hon. Minister (Hon. Mr. Dunlop) on this point, and I would like him to indicate to the House whether we are going as far as we could reasonably be expected to go in meeting the objections of these older teachers to this superannuation fund as presently set out.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, there are, at the present time, approximately 3,150 retired teachers in the province. They have retired, some of them, under an arrangement whereby their pensions were calculated on the average salary of the last 15 years of their teaching. They are asking that that term of computation be reduced to 10 years no matter what it may have been at the time their pensions were computed. There was a time when the term of computation was 32 years. A change was made in the time of the depression to allow teachers a greater average than they would otherwise have had. However, all that is in the past, and we are trying in this bill to provide for the future so that grievances of this kind cannot again, we hope, be repeated.

We have gone into this fully. The matter has been discussed in the Committee on Education, but the fact remains that if we were to attempt to readjust in any way the pensions of those teachers who are now retired and are drawing pensions, we should have to face applications from every pensioner in the Province of Ontario who has any connection with the government in any way whatever. We would have requests from people who have retired under The Public Service Act, those who have retired from the Ontario Northland Railway, those who are pensioners under The Workmen's Compensation Board, and so on. It is simply too large a problem for any government in this country to undertake. It would lead to pressure to readjust pensions for thousands and thousands of people, not only teachers, but all other employees who are now on pensions.

Sometimes, of course, it is claimed that those who retired some years ago built up this fund. But there is another side to that. Anyone who has retired and draws a pension receives in the course of 6½ years at the most, all he has paid in contributions, and what the government has paid, in addition. So with every sympathy for the people who are living on inadequate pensions, and every sympathy for widows of those who passed on years ago, I must tell hon.

members that the problem is too great to undertake. All we can do is try to provide against a repetition of this situation in the future.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) will recognize the great problem that this represents. These payments and pensions were computed many years ago in different conditions from those which exist today. As the hon. Minister has stated, the principle affects a wide variety of cases. It could be said that practically every pension scheme started before the inflationary years is affected. This was the basic reason why the province was so interested in universal old-age pensions at the age of 70. We recognized that this does not meet the situation entirely. However, it goes a very considerable way towards meeting it. Of course, there is the period from 65 until the universal pension operates.

An old school teacher came to see me some time back, and his pension was based upon conditions many years ago. He receives something over \$1,100 as pension, which is not a very large sum. At the time, he pointed out the inadequacy of the pension. Shortly afterwards an arrangement was made with the Federal Government, and he and his wife received \$960 more. It brought their income up to around \$2,100. That, in itself, was a very substantial assistance. I admit that it does not correct the situation which arises in the case of someone who paid in years ago, but, nevertheless, I think the old-age pension scheme was of substantial assistance in the case of this teacher. The pension, unfortunately, was one of the old type which "died" with him. Under the old-age pension arrangement, of course, half of what they receive, or \$40 a month, would go to the widow.

I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we have done everything possible to remedy this situation, but it is a very difficult one, as I think he will realize.

MR. OLIVER: Supposing I was a teacher getting \$5,000 a year? What

would be my pension if I was retiring today and had taught for 35 years or more?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: If you had had that average of \$5,000 for 10 years, \$3,500 after April 1st, 1954.

HON. MR. FROST: That is under the new arrangement. We have taken off the "ceiling" in the civil service. With regard to the teachers, I think the same thing has happened. It is an entirely different situation as compared with a few years ago.

MR. GRUMMETT: When was this bill before the Committee on Education?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Last week, Mr. Chairman. It was Wednesday of last week.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education (hon. Mr. Dunlop) whether his department has calculated the amount that will be required to take care of this particular group of teachers, leaving out of consideration for the moment the political effect, or the stimulating effect such assistance would have on other pensioners who retired years ago. Limiting ourselves, now, to the question of the teachers, how much would it cost this government to provide them with a livable pension, a pension they could live on?

HON. MR. FROST: I might point out to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that, actually, I think the teachers' superannuation fund is set up in arrears to the extent of about \$50 million. As a matter of fact, if a decision were taken to do as the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) suggested, we would have to make up the total arrears, which, of course, would cost a tremendous sum of money. That is on the face of the actuarial figures. The computation shows, I think, if the pension plan goes the way it is at the present time without any attention at all, it will increase until 1970. Afterwards, it will start to decrease. That is the purpose of our adding \$1 million a year,

as we have been doing recently. By doing that we keep postponing that date when the decline starts. Of course, if we can consistently put in that \$1 million, we shall overtake that problem. But there is no surplus in the account being drawn on. There is a very substantial capital deficit which would have to be made up.

MR. SALSBERG: That is not quite the answer to the question. It is a very good explanation, but it is not the answer.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: The answer to the question is: in the neighbourhood of \$650,000 a year.

MR. SALSBERG: I think it would be a good investment.

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 87 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: I ask you to note, Mr. Chairman, that it is past 6 o'clock.

It being now 6 of the clock, the committee took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, March 29, 1954

Evening Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, March 29, 1954.

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Gemmell	905
Estimates, Office of Lieutenant-Governor	931
Estimates, Office of Prime Minister, Mr. Frost	931
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	931
Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, reported	931
Financial Administration Act, 1954, reported	932
Telephones Act, 1954, held	932
Mental Health Act, reported	936
Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, reported	939
Persons Who Drill or Bore Wells for Water, bill respecting, reported	939
Petty Trespass Act, bill to amend, reported	939
Public Health Act, bill to amend, reported	939
School Trustees Council Act, 1953, bill to amend, reported	939
Protection for Persons Working in Trenches, bill to provide, reported	939
Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953, bill to amend, reported	940
Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, held	940
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	940

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1954.

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The committee resumed; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

HON. MR. FROST moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain resolutions, and 25 bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Report agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 55, Department of Lands and Forests.

Vote 91, Main Office—\$1,726,400.

HON. MR. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, with your permission, it has become the custom of the House for the Minister in charge of the department to make some remarks about the department before presenting his Estimates.

First of all, I would like to take the opportunity, which I have not done this

year so far, of expressing my sincere thanks to my colleagues who carried on the work of this department during my absence, particularly to the hon. Prime Minister who was so generous in seeing the work was carried on; to my colleague, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) who is absent today; to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger); and to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) who so ably and kindly performed the work during that time.

I would like to take the opportunity also, Mr. Chairman, to make reference to the deaths of three colleagues, since I last spoke. I would like to express my regrets and sympathy to the family in their bereavement in the loss of a very dear friend and associate, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey). He and his family have been long and closely associated with me in the political field. I want to take this opportunity to say how much I will miss him in the days ahead, and to express my regrets to his family in their bereavement. I would also like to mention the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. MacOdrum) who passed away so suddenly some weeks later, and our good friend the former hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. McPhee) who died previous to the opening of the session, and of whom we have so many pleasant memories, and also the late hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault).

The Prime Minister, in his capacity of Treasurer of Ontario, referred in his recent Budget Speech to his 10th anniversary as Treasurer. "These 10 years," he declared, "have been years of

more concentrated growth and progress than the province has seen in any other corresponding period of history."

In keeping with this thought, I should like to take the opportunity at this time to review briefly the place which the natural renewable resources of the province occupy in the economy of the nation, and the part they have played and will continue to play in our growth and development.

In order to properly assess the value of these resources, insofar as they refer to our forests, reference must be made to the industries which produce, process and manufacture the raw material. The following figures from a report by the Federal Forestry Branch, released during 1953, are informative. They cover the year 1950:

GROSS VALUE OF PRODUCTS FOR CANADA

Woods operations	\$ 625,734,603
Pulp and paper	954,137,651
Sawmills	496,948,398
Wood using industries	488,911,095
Paper using industries	297,006,474

Total	<u>\$2,862,738,221</u>
-------------	------------------------

These figures clearly indicate something of the actual and potential values of our forest and the part they play in the general prosperity of the province. From the primary product there has developed an ever-expanding industrial growth using wood as the basic material and providing a wide variety of useful and practical commodities.

PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY

The Department of Lands and Forests is mainly concerned with the pulp and paper, and the sawmill industries, because these industries are primary producers and are, through contractual agreements, under the close scrutiny of my department.

The gross value of production of the pulp and paper industry for 1951, as given by the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, totalled \$1.2 billion. This production covers the operations of 130 pulp and paper mills extending across Canada from coast to coast. It is estimated that these mills employ some

60,000 permanent workers, and provide seasonal employment for approximately 225,000. The industry's wage bill runs to \$270 million annually.

Indicative of the growth of the industry is the fact that production of pulpwood in Canada has grown, since the turn of the century, from about $\frac{1}{4}$ million tons to over 9.2 million tons in 1951. The major part of this increase has taken place during the period of progress and development mentioned by the Prime Minister, so that it is evident Ontario's share of the increase is important. Actual figures provided by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics show that, in 1939, Ontario production of pulpwood was 1,159,000 tons, in 1951 it had increased to 2,475,000 tons, or considerably more than double.

The 1952-53 cut of pulpwood, for which we budgeted last year, was 2,442,670 cords. This year we are budgeting on a cut of 2,810,200 cords.

The following extract from *The Canada Year Book, 1952-53* is particularly interesting:

The pulp and paper industry is one of the largest contributors to the public purse in Canada. Taxes and payments of all kinds to governments run to \$135 million annually, but the extent to which the industry contributes to the national welfare cannot be assessed solely on this basis.

The significance of the industry in the economy may be judged also from the fact that it accounts for about one-third of all the power used by industry and in mining; that it accounted for almost 1 out of every 8 revenue freight cars loaded in Canada in 1951; that the value of the output exceeds the mineral production of Canada including gold and all metallics, coal, gas and petroleum; that its exports are close to twice the value of wheat and all other exports of grain; and that it expends annually \$72 million for chemicals and mill supplies, \$44 million for fuel and \$100 million for other purchases. Indeed, the gross value of the production of the industry exceeds 5 per cent. of the gross national product of Canada.

SAWMILLING INDUSTRY

From the figures which I have already quoted, it will be noted that the gross value of products for the Canadian sawmilling industry was given as \$496,948,398. It will be apparent, therefore, that this industry also makes a very substantial contribution to our total economy.

Production figures for the industry in Ontario during 1952-53 were 10,128,000 cu. ft. representing 316,162,000 board feet. For 1953-54, the figures are 8,490,332 cu. ft. or 310,576,000 board feet.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The outlook for the pulp and paper industry is particularly bright. There is an increasing demand throughout the world for pulp and paper products of all kinds. Wood pulp, which a few years ago was used principally for paper, is now an important element in the manufacture of rayon, cellophane, plastics, building and packaging materials and many other products. Fortunately for Canada, the United States pulp and paper consumption far exceeds that country's production of pulpwood. It is apparent, therefore, that because of the present international situation, a major portion of the needs of the free world for pulp and paper will require to be supplied by Canada for some years to come. This of course presents a pleasing prospect for the industry in Ontario. Here we have abundant supplies of raw material in accessible areas and new fields of operation waiting to be developed.

During the past 10 years there has been an unprecedented demand for lumber. At the moment, however, the Ontario lumber industry is somewhat unsettled, due indirectly to a sharp curtailment of the export market. This condition occasioned some distress in the Province of British Columbia, which found itself with large inventories and a greatly curtailed export market. The result was that a substantial quantity of lumber from that province reached the Ontario market at sharply competitive prices, in some cases at prices below Ontario's cost of production. I am happy

to report, however, that the quantities of western lumber on our local markets have fallen off sharply within the last few weeks. Inventory stocks of British Columbia lumber appear to be about exhausted, and mills are beginning to operate again. In the meantime Ontario's lumber industry should benefit from lessened competition. With the sustained demand for general and house construction, there is little doubt but that the industry will continue to maintain the upward trend of the last decade. May I mention in this connection that, while that may sound contradictory to the presentation of the White Paper, it is significant to note that the reference in the latter is entirely in connection with the white and red pine section of the sawmill industry.

The department's White Paper refers to the current production of red and white pine at 150 million board feet per annum being sustained for not more than 17 years. We are, of course, taking every possible step to correct the trend.

Recent financial reports issued by the pulp and paper companies indicate that, though the demand for their products has levelled off, production is still being maintained at an exceptionally high level.

There is some evidence, however, that the kraft industry in Ontario is meeting increasingly stiff competition from southern pine of the United States in the American market. Southern pine is the chief competitive product of our jack-pine pulpwood, a specie of which we have a substantial surplus over current requirements. We do not foresee that southern pine can materially affect the demand for Ontario spruce.

FISH AND WILDLIFE VALUES

Ontario's resources of fish and wildlife also have a high economic value. The commercial fishing industry gives employment to about 4,000 men, and has over \$8,300,000 invested in the business. Latest figures, those for 1952-53, show a production of 38,044,049 lbs., or 19,022 tons, representing a market value of \$7,500,000.

I could, of course, emphasize the part our fisheries play in the great tourist industry which occupies a high place in

our national income, but I prefer to note that they have a recreational value which cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents, but which is of tremendous importance to the health and well-being of our people.

I am glad to be able to state that our fish and wildlife resources are being maintained at a high level; indeed recent developments in the reproduction of certain new species of fish promise more, and even better, fishing in the future.

WATER VALUES

With about one-fifth of the total area of the province under water, Ontario has been blessed with a renewable resource of tremendous magnitude, and of a value which it is difficult to compute. The universal uses of water, beginning with the fact that next to air, water is the most important requirement of man, and extending through the fields of industry, agriculture, power developments, transportation, recreation and sanitation, indicate its importance to human life and progress.

Recent power developments, water diversions and the conflicting interests of diverse users make it necessary for the department to make an appraisalment of the whole situation with respect to the conservation and control of our water resources. The problems involved are extremely complex and will necessitate a very careful and exacting study with a view to a proper assessment of present uses, developments, and jurisdictional powers. As indicated in the department's White Paper, a preliminary survey to determine in broad outline the extent of the problems involved is being carried on within the department.

DEPARTMENTAL TRENDS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

I should also like to take this opportunity to provide the House with a brief summary of departmental activities during the past year, and indicate some future trends.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT

One of the most important accomplishments of the Division of Timber Management was the completion of the

original forest resources inventory and the publication of final reports for the accessible areas of the province.

During the year the forest resources inventory was expanded to cover an additional area of nearly 100,000 square miles to include all lands in the province north to 52 degrees north latitude.

The Doyle Rule was discarded and replaced by the Ontario Log Rule as the official rule for the measurement of sawlogs in feet, board measure, cut on Crown lands within the province.

The Crown Timber Act, 1952, was proclaimed early in the year. It provides for the management of the forest resources on a sustained yield basis. Steps were taken to implement the requirements of the Act.

During the year, the organization of management units was completed.

Timber cut from Crown lands during the previous year and reported in the fiscal year 1953-54 was 461 million cubic feet, the highest ever recorded as coming from Crown lands in Ontario. This was about 100 million cubic feet greater than the 1946-1950 annual average.

Future trends will follow the lines indicated in the sustained yield policy of the Department, and the recommendations contained in the White Paper.

FOREST PROTECTION

The 1953 fire season demonstrated clearly the advantages of complete flexibility of aircraft, equipment and trained personnel on a province-wide basis. This embodied the organization of men and equipment for rapid transportation to any part of the province where the urgency of the situation demanded their services.

For the first time in the history of the province, 2 helicopters were in use during the 1953 fire season. Operating alone, and in co-operation with the department's regular air service, the helicopters proved their adaptability to reach and extinguish fires immediately upon discovery in a manner heretofore impossible.

The more effective use of men and equipment was demonstrated by the fact

that while the number of fires during 1953 was 1,517, an increase of 250 over the average for the past 5 years, the average acreage burned was 38 as compared with an average of 42 acres for the 5 years indicated.

Employees of the department and industry were given training courses in fire-fighting. This is considered an extremely important development.

A suppression crew (and equipment) is carried on air patrol during periods of extreme hazard and this has speeded up the work of fire suppression.

Water-bombing from the Beaver aircraft was used extensively to extinguish incipient fires and in retarding the spread of others.

Specially trained crews known as "shock forces" have been developed in several districts to take initial action on fires and carry out training programmes during non-hazardous periods.

Forest insect and disease surveys to determine control possibilities are being carefully studied in co-operation with the science service, Canada. The forest insect laboratory at Sault Ste. Marie, and the forest pathological laboratory at Maple, provide excellent facilities for this important phase of co-operative forest protection.

These are agreements entered into with the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion Government, whereby the province provides the building and maintenance, while the Agricultural Department of Canada provides the staff and equipment to carry on this work. One such laboratory is situated at Sault Ste. Marie for the study of insects in connection with forestry work; the other, situated at Maple, which is north of Toronto, studies diseases in this connection. It was completed only a year ago.

REFORESTATION

The first full year of operation under the Forestry Act, 1952, which authorized the charging for nursery stock for use on private lands, resulted in a reduction in the number of trees applied for, but still left the available supply of most species over-subscribed. Some 14 million

trees were furnished for private lands during the year.

A total of 9 million trees were planted on Crown lands and management units operated by the department.

An additional 7,400 acres of new lands were taken over by the department for reforestation and management under section 2 of the Forestry Act.

The regeneration and reforestation of burned or cut-over lands is receiving the attention of the division and already extensive areas in Northern Ontario have been sown from the air.

LANDS

As most hon. members know, in the northern part of the province last year we encouraged a method whereby in each of the 18 districts of Northern Ontario we had committees set up with our district foresters in charge as chairmen. The committees were attended by representatives of industry, representatives of the anglers, the Fish and Game Association, and various other bodies interested, in addition to the local Member of Parliament, to review this work and make recommendations to the department on what improvements might be made, in this particular field, and in our work in general. This year the district committees had a meeting in Toronto in which they presented the recommendations as they came from the different districts, and these were finally assimilated by the regional foresters whose recommendations, in turn, are now in the hands of the department and will receive careful attention during the coming year.

We intend to carry on these meetings during the year in order that the information and encouragement we obtain from them should be made available to the department.

The growing use and development of public lands in Ontario has necessitated a revision of the regulations under the Public Lands Act to more adequately provide for the administration of Crown lands for recreational and agricultural purposes.

Considerable progress has been made in planning for the use and recreational

development of public lands. Because of the varying characteristics of the land and water areas available for public use, it is proposed to set aside certain lands in each district for specific purposes. These include lands for commercial summer camp development; summer cottage development; general public uses; parks, etc.; wilderness areas where no developments will be permitted; and deferred zones where, for various reasons, including fire hazard, development will be delayed for the time being. Areas which are at present fairly well developed will continue to be used for all kinds of recreational purposes for which they are suited.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

Perhaps the most outstanding accomplishment in fish and wildlife development has occurred in connection with trapline management by which the fur production of the province has been increased many fold during the last few years. This is illustrated by the fact that the 1952-53 production of beaver pelts was over 125,000 skins which is a record high for many years. The management programme was actively carried forward during 1953 with the restocking of marten in three areas of the Patricia district and in other selected areas.

A deer production study was carried out in Tweed district as an extension in Southern Ontario of the work on deer production in the Kenora-Fort Frances area and the Sudbury district.

Work on the training of guides has been developed to the stage where it has been possible during the year to lay the basis for guide training programmes in certain districts throughout the province. It is hoped this training will add to the efficiency of the hundreds of guides who serve the public and make for better public relations.

The major development in fisheries during the year has been the initiation of a Great Lakes fisheries research and lamprey control programme, supported jointly by grants from the Federal and Provincial Governments. The work has been under the direction of a committee

including personnel from the Federal Department of Fisheries and the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests. This programme has been supported extensively by continuation of the work carried on by the province during the last 8 years and initiation of new work by the staff of the department.

Those hon. members of the House who were members of a committee on this subject will realize the seriousness of the problem, and the amount of work that is going on in an attempt to avert the destruction of the lake trout fishing in the Great Lakes, particularly Lake Huron and Lake Superior. They will be familiar with the tremendous damage that these sea lampreys are doing to this industry. We are not only working in conjunction with the Federal Government, who are making substantial contributions, both in finance and in staff, but we are holding meetings with the bordering states of the United States in the hope that at some time a treaty might be entered into as a foundation for a more effective programme. At present at least one of these states has objected to a mutual treaty in this matter, and as a result no treaty has as yet been entered into between Canada and the United States with regard to the Great Lakes fisheries.

The use of aircraft for the distribution of hatchery raised fish in various lakes has been placed on a practical and efficient basis in Ontario; this practice facilitates the rapid distribution of fish thus relieving the hazards of slow distribution and transportation from the hatchery to the receiving waters. It is satisfactory and economic, as it takes but a few men to do in a short time what formerly required the services of many men, as well as trucks and other forms of transportation.

Those of us who represent northern ridings and places closely associated with the tourist and the lumbering industries during the years will realize the importance of this development in the distribution of stock for our lakes. I personally witnessed many of the methods used in the years gone by, and I am sure that those who have had the

same experience will recognize how important is the advance of the method I have just mentioned in the proper and efficient distribution of singlings and fry to our lakes.

The development of two hybrid forms of fish is of particular interest, because it shows the broad lines of development which are taking place in order to maintain good fishing conditions. One of these hybrids, commonly called "splake" is a cross between the lake trout and the speckled trout. This fish is said to embrace the most desirable characteristics of both species, and may well occupy waters not presently used by either of the parent species. There has already been a substantial preliminary experimental stocking of splake in several lakes of the central region in Ontario.

The second hybrid is a cross between a maskinonge and a pike, and this specie should add greatly to the fun of fishing.

GENERAL

The names of the remaining divisions within the administrative setup of the department, namely: Research, Surveys, Air Service, Operation and Personnel, and Accounts, indicate the specialized work of these divisions and the important part they play in the overall management plans of the department.

Research. In the field of research, for example, study has recently been directed towards the solution of forest regeneration problems in the northern pulpwood forest. A special vehicle to assist in forest fire control was designed and developed in the laboratories of the research station at Maple. General fisheries research problems of importance to the department are being carried on at the new fisheries research laboratory at Maple. All of this work is pertinent to the successful carrying out of work by other divisions.

Surveys. During the year the Division of Surveys, among other things, made surveys of base and meridian lines in the northwestern portion of the province north of the Albany River to provide control for the mapping by aerial photography in connection with the forest resources inventory.

Operation and Personnel. The recent sportsman's show with its emphasis on conservation is typical of the co-operation the department is receiving from those most interested in the protection of the resources. This co-operation extends to all phases of woods operations, to tourist outfitters, conservation authorities and to many other organized conservation groups.

Departmental policies are based on sound conservation principles and the division of operation and personnel is carrying on a broad and effective programme of conservation education by means of every media through which it is possible to inform the public. Conservation education is extremely important because public support is an essential factor in the success of all administrative efforts.

BUDGET-FINANCIAL

This year for the first time, the Estimates before the House for the Department of Lands and Forests show the proposed allocation under the headings of the five main services for which the department is responsible. Allocations for the other services are shown in the statement supplied to members of the House, together with the percentage allocations of the totals included in those of the main services.

It will be noted that the allotment to timber management of \$2,350,000 is less than the allotment for forest protection (\$4,760,000). Management of our timber resources entails forest protection and reforestation, so that the amount set aside for timber management actually aggregates an expenditure of \$8,600,000 in the next fiscal year.

The total amount asked for is \$12,760,000 which is \$150,000 above that voted last year. This increase will be devoted wholly to timber management in order to at least initiate the many long term recommendations set out in the White Paper. In this connection it will be recalled that in his recent Budget Address to the House the Prime Minister, speaking of the department's White Paper, stated that "additional funds will be allocated as this new programme

takes more definite shape." I am happy to state that approval has been given to a programme necessitating an additional expenditure of \$2 millions over a 5 year period, to implement the recommendations outlined in the department's presentation. That has been quite successful, and we are hopeful in the days ahead that these units will provide, together with other programmes, for sufficient wood to maintain in perpetuity, the industries I have mentioned, plus many others in that great area.

After 5 years' operations and beginning last year, it was announced another 12 units were established along a similar line in the province, in varying degrees of maturity; some contained less mature wood which would require immediate attention; others would require attention 10 years hence, and still others, 20 years hence.

This year, we are commencing with a vote of \$150,000 to pay some attention to these management units, particularly the 12 I have mentioned, and as I mentioned in the House last year, in a period of 5 years, we are lining up a programme—beginning now—which will amount to an expenditure of \$5 million in connection with such methods as we can discover, and to know how to carry out silviculture practices, regeneration practices, and everything you want to name, to add to the productive capacity of the areas which I have mentioned.

At the end of 5 years, it is proposed to review the results of these expenditures in the light of what has transpired over the years, to see if we are getting proper value for our money, and to see if we can go forward from then onward to ensure a proper stand of timber which will increase the prosperity of each citizen of this province.

Typical of the growth and development of the department and the value of the resources entrusted to its care is the fact that expenditures in 1944 were but \$3,600,000. Today's Estimates of \$12,760,000 represent an increase during the 10 year period of 354 per cent.

However, the ordinary revenue of the department in 1944 was \$6,500,000. The

estimated revenue for the next fiscal year is \$16,719,000, an increase of 257 per cent.

CONCLUSION

Analyzing the situation as it affects values, revenue, and expenditures, and having in mind the information contained in the recently completed forest resources inventory, I am confident that Ontario's forest capital is capable of greater development, particularly in the production of pulpwood; by increased use of certain species for which heretofore there has been little or no demand; by extending operations to areas now considered inaccessible; by sound management practices and by the reduction of losses from fire, insects and disease.

To attain this desirable end, long term programmes embodying every advance in scientific and practical management, have been instituted. We are conscious of the fact that it will be necessary in many cases to build up what has been destroyed or depleted over many years of unwise use; to replace, where we have been unduly prodigal, and to co-operate more efficiently with nature in her plans to maintain and replenish the gifts she has bestowed upon us.

To these ends we are directing all our energies. We have enlisted the services of men of outstanding ability in their respective fields to counsel and advise us, and we will explore every possibility and potentiality which will ensure the economic stability of the trust for which we are responsible, in the best interests of all the people of the province.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 91, Main Office, \$1,726,400.

MR. ALBERT WREN (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to make a few remarks about the conditions in Northwestern Ontario.

One subject has been brought to the attention of the hon. Minister over some months, which is relatively important, to the settlers in the north—I am not just sure what attention it has received here. I realize the hon. Minister has been away from his office unavoidably for some

months, and perhaps he has not had an opportunity to study this and make a statement about it.

I refer to the tragedies which occurred in the north on two or three occasions last summer when youngsters wandered away from summer resorts. By the time the parents noticed their absences, they had become hopelessly lost. On two occasions, two of the children had been mangled by timber wolves, and, of course, died from the effects of the attacks and exposure.

At that time, through the press and other means, I and others in the district, suggested that, inasmuch as these searches for people who become lost—whether they be children or adults—were extremely expensive, a plan might be worked out whereby an organized search party could be kept available under the direction of the Regional Forester in a particular region. The reason behind that was, on two separate occasions where children lost their lives this past summer, it seems to me it was not from want of diligence in the search on the part of the volunteer searchers, but it was simply a matter that many amongst those who did volunteer were not experienced woodsmen. Although they put their time in willingly, paid their own personal expenses while on the search, the result was not very satisfactory.

Finally, in one particular case, it was only when they brought in experienced woodsmen that the body of a child was found. We think if a search had been organized with two or three highly-skilled woodsmen, who could be assembled on an emergency call, and be flown into an area, or transported by automobile or boat, immediately a person becomes lost, it might save a great deal of expense, and result in the saving of lives.

The hon. Minister has referred again to the lumber industry in the northern part of the province particularly, as he did in the White Paper some days ago. Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing this matter in the Committee on Lands and Forests, and Mr. Sharpe, of the Timber Management Division, gave us

an excellent outline of the picture of that industry. It is causing a great deal of concern. I repeat what I said some weeks ago, there is going to have to be some adjustment in the price of dues on pine timber for lumber purposes, and this province is going to have to support the northwestern part of Ontario in its appeals to the Board of Railway Commissioners and others, for adjustments of freight rates for the movement of timber products.

Another thing, which remains a matter of extreme concern, is the proper development of spruce timber areas north of the Canadian National Railway, in the northwestern section of the province. Great sections still contain standing timber for want of proper development.

After I resume my seat, I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would outline to me, and to the hon. members of the House, what steps he thinks are necessary now that these management units have been established, for interested parties who require concessions, or licences, or whatever it might be, to undertake the development of a particular section. It remains most disconcerting to all of us that large areas in that part of Ontario are still suffering the ravages of the spruce budworm, and there is still the situation of millions of cords of matured timber waiting to be cut.

Another matter, which somewhat ties in with the activities of the Department of Mines, as it is now functioning, is that of access roads. In the past, there has been considerable difficulty between the public and the lumber companies and the pulp and paper companies, over the use of roads in relatively inaccessible areas of the north. The position the lumber companies and the pulp and paper companies sometimes take is readily understandable. When they are held responsible for fires which might occur in their areas, and might be caused by careless tourists or other travellers, it still remains a necessary function that more accessibility should be prevalent throughout this part of the province. Through the activities of the department, and the committee in

the department which has been considering this matter, I am hopeful that something can be worked out which will relieve the companies of a large share of responsibility in these matters, and provide more accessibility to many sections of Northwestern Ontario. It is not only important to us, from a recreation standpoint, or from an access standpoint, but it is just as important to the department itself if these roads become more widely used, and justification is found for further extension and further accessibility for the department's own fire-prevention and fire-fighting equipment.

Last summer, as the hon. Minister has outlined, the department began a study of the zoning of tourist areas, in charge of a forester in a particular area. Those of us who are members of this House, from the northern part of the province, sat on this committee and a great deal of valuable data was gathered, and presented by the foresters to the officials in Toronto.

The zoning of tourist areas presents a particular, and somewhat peculiar situation because of the fact that we do have the problem of providing protection to certain areas, where more experienced operators might be denied the right of coming in and establishing a better class of camps.

However, the situation as of the present time in Northwestern Ontario—particularly in my riding—is that ownership of tourist camps is falling more and more into the hands of American capitalists. I have no objection to the investment of American capital in this province, or any other in Canada, but I do feel that this important industry, which is so dependent on our natural resources, should not be controlled largely by people who are not citizens of our country.

I repeat again a recommendation I made when speaking in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that we take into consideration some form of financial assistance to Canadian citizens who are desirous of establishing in this industry, or expanding where expansion is known to be justified.

I am also concerned with the salaries which are being paid, particularly to some of the important officials of this department. I submit that the salaries which are paid to regional foresters and district foresters, particularly, are entirely inadequate in the light of the responsibilities these men have, and in the light of the importance of their duties, and responsibilities regarding the future of our province. The responsibilities they undertake, and the recommendations they make today, will have consequences not only for this year, but for many years ahead. I feel we would be in a much better position in future years if we could recruit the very best type of professional men in this field, and, at the same time, prevent as much as possible losing these men to industry at the present time. If you consider the salaries of men in industry, who have like responsibilities as those in the forest industry, I think you will find the forestry men are entitled to special consideration.

And again I say, as I have said every year, that the salaries of the law-enforcement officers of this division, together with our provincial police, for the type of duties they have to perform in the north, and the difficulties under which they work, are insufficient.

In the White Paper there were two suggestions, and I realize they were only suggestions. One was, the hon. Minister assured us, that the angling licence would not be considered at this time. I suggest again, Mr. Chairman, that the levy of a \$1 licence for angling would not be tolerated by the people of Ontario, because this is the one thing which I feel we should retain in perpetuity for our children, the right and privilege to fish to their hearts' content.

Another matter which has caused a great deal of concern . . . and while there has again come an assurance from the department that nothing might be done immediately, but which is under consideration . . . is the abolition of certain fish hatcheries across the province. I think the department should be very cautious, indeed, in considering at all the abolishment of fish

hatcheries. It took many years to get them established. While we respect and listen with great interest to the opinions and theories of some of the experts who work in the department and advise us about these things, even they admit that many of their theories on biology and other things are yet only theories and they have not had years of experience that might be useful in forming a permanent opinion on some of the subjects.

I know that the people in the north—and I may say the people right across the province—who are engaged in fishing as a sport, or as a commercial venture, would view with grave concern any attempt at this time to close off hatcheries, especially in the absence of positive biological information that they are not necessary or economical.

Again, in the studies of our wildlife generally, we hear sometimes glowing reports of the increasing number of moose and deer, and the increase or decrease in various kinds of fur-bearing animals. If you talk to any of the old-timers—after all you must respect their opinion, because they have lived through many of these years and have the basis of experience for many of the opinions they express—each time you discuss a subject like that with a man who is now 65 or 75 years of age or upwards, who has lived in that country all his life, he will remind you time and time again that we should not tamper too much with the natural processes of the forests. The reason he gives is that he can go back over some years and recall for you, times of plenty and times of scarcity, even before we had as many experts as we have involved in this work at the present time.

I do not for one moment suggest that the work of these men is not valuable. Indeed, I think it is, but I believe, too, that it is going to be, perhaps, another generation before the results of their studies will have any great import in this particular field.

There is one subject I had hoped we would get to in Lands and Forests Committee before this time, but I am

sure the hon. Minister will be quite willing to see that the subject is fully discussed in the Standing Committee before the House adjourns. Of course, I am not entirely aware of when the House will prorogue, but this is one subject I think in Lands and Forests which should be fully discussed. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the Mississagi operation.

I realize again that the hon. Minister who is now in charge of this department did not have the responsibility of setting up this operation, and, through no fault of his own, has been out of touch with the situation for some months recently. However, there has been a great number of questions asked about the Mississagi operation. No doubt, hon. members have noted the lengthy question I had put on the Order paper about it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the whole operation should be thoroughly reviewed before the Standing Committee on Lands and Forests. There should be a complete accounting, a complete report submitted to the House during the committee, or after the House prorogues, by direct communication with each member, containing the activities of this operation year by year during its existence.

In April, 1950, a question was asked in the House in Votes and Proceedings, No. 35, about this particular operation. The hon. Minister at that time stated that the company, which was organized to handle the produce of salvage operation, was not a Crown company.

I was informed today by an official of the department that the company was first organized, more or less on private capital lines, but financed somewhat by the government and organized as a stock or limited company. I think the basis of the organization of this company should be explained to us, particularly since there was provincial financing of the operation, along with a complete outline of its activities.

One of the things which has caused some question, and which is actually a matter of perhaps submitting a report about it, but still a matter of some

concern, was that during the function of the Mississagi operation, the province or its agency, or perhaps both, saw fit to stop the operations and seize certain assets of some companies and operators in this scheme.

I am told, only actual timber was seized. In some cases, both timber and equipment were seized, and, in other cases, it was necessary to seize the entire scheme. I think there, too, there should be a report to the House and to the people who had money invested in these operations, so that we would have a complete account of the stewardship of the department or its agency, as the case may be, in the handling of the capital investments of these people.

In any woods operation, this House well knows, there is a considerable amount of money invested, before a log is ever taken out of the bush, in roads, dams, plant, surveys, equipment and so on. I do not know whether the hon. Minister can do it tonight. I do not suppose that he would want to and I certainly would not expect him to. But I would like to see this whole matter reviewed in committee by the financial officers and the technical officers of the department who had the responsibility of seeing the operation through from beginning to end.

The importance of this report is emphasized, I say again, Mr. Chairman, by the numerous requests we have had in our offices for information. I have looked back in *Hansard*, back to questions, and I have read everything which has been said in the House about it, and a good deal that has been said out of the House in the press from time to time, but there still seems to be a certain void of information there which could properly, and very effectively, be reported to us by officers of the Department in Standing Committee. I sincerely hope the hon. Minister will call a special meeting of the committee any morning this week for the purpose of having a review made of this entire subject.

Those are the main points of my remarks tonight. I would like, as I say, some review of this Mississagi operation, and some consideration to other

matters I have raised here tonight concerning search parties, the lumber industry, the development of spruce areas, our access roads, salaries of certain staffs, fish hatcheries and so on, and with those remarks I will conclude.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Can we have the assurance of the hon. Minister that there will be a meeting? I imagine it could easily be arranged some morning this week during which the matter of the Mississagi salvage can be gone into in detail.

HON. W. S. GEMMELL: I can give assurance to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and to the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) that I am quite prepared to have the matter of the Mississagi salvage operation discussed in the Committee on Lands and Forests.

I might say in that connection that we are having a meeting of the Fish and Game Committee on Wednesday morning, so that this will close us off for that morning. Secondly, I agreed at the last meeting to provide the committee with all the information from the departmental officials in connection with the Hearst situation and the export of raw wood in particular. As a matter of fact, on the morning when they presented their brief, an opportunity was not given, on account of time, for the Deputy Minister, or the accountant, or the Timber Management Division, to express their views on what had transpired in connection with the Hearst area. I thought, in order that the committee might make a recommendation to the House that they should be heard. This also applies to the Mississagi salvage operations.

I might say that a complete accounting will be given when the whole operation of the Mississagi salvage is complete. My information at the moment is—

MR. OLIVER: When do you anticipate that?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I believe there is 9 million feet of lumber to be disposed of. The Great Northern Woods

project is now a closed book. When all the wood is disposed of, a final accounting will be published of this whole matter.

The present Estimates are going to show a net cost to the government in this salvage operation of about \$840,000, or \$860,000, possibly. In the course of that operation, which should salvage over 300 million board feet of pine lumber, 112,000 cords of pulpwood, we opened up 139 miles of all-weather roads and 400 miles of bush roads; in other words, we opened up 1,000 square miles of timber land in this country and made accessible over 650,000 acres, for management, and for the tourist industry. So that in the long run, I think we can honestly assume that there was no loss to the province. In fact, the benefits which will accrue from the development that took place will adequately take care of any costs to the Consolidated Revenue Fund by the province.

I assure the hon. member it will be discussed in committee with an up-to-date record of all the lumber produced, the manner in which it was handled and the type of contract we had. I believe the hon. member for Kenora brought up the question of seizing certain operations. In no case did we seize an operation. The J. D. Campbell Lumber Company was financially in difficulties, and we took over and held for escrow all the stock of the company, and carried on the operation.

Nothing was seized in this connection, but I am not certain that the operation will end up as a successful project financially.

Then there was another contract that was entered into by a man named Lahti, who became financially embarrassed, and the government had to assume responsibility. This gentleman had two types of contracts: one for cutting the logs and putting them into the water, and one of cutting the logs, sawing them up and disposing of them; in fact I recall there was a third type of contract. Well, we did not seize it; we took all the logs that were then in the hands of this operator, and proceeded to process them, and put them through the North Bay

yard, because we had substantial sums invested in the project. We advance funds to all these projects.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Did you take over all his equipment too?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: By agreement. He signed an agreement to allow us to use, not all, but some of his equipment to carry on the processing of his lumber and get it into the North Bay yard. But he signed an agreement. It was entirely in co-operation with him.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, this salvaging operation was something entirely new in our province. I do not think such a project had ever been attempted before. Hon. members will recollect the circumstances. In the spring of 1948, there was a devastating fire in the Mississauga forest reserve, involving the possible loss of millions of board feet of the finest timber in Ontario. At that time the government decided, and with the full acquiescence of the Legislature, to go into that area in a salvaging operation.

We invested from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, a sum of approximately \$1½ million of actual cash. It was not done on a loan basis; it was taken from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and invested in this salvaging project. Out of that salvaging operation has come 300 million board feet—perhaps a little more—which would, under the old system, have been entirely lost to the province. Of the \$1½ million we put up in cash, we hope for a return of approximately half. In the meantime, we have the benefit of roads and other development which has been carried out in the area.

May I remind hon. members that this had to be done, if it was going to be done at all, as an emergency. The fire burned over valuable timber. There were no preparations for salvage; there were no plans; there was no organization. It was felt, however, that it would be almost criminal to lose the immense amount of timber which would have been destroyed in that fire, unless it had been salvaged.

That plan, Mr. Chairman, has worked out a good deal better than we had any cause to anticipate or hope for at that time. Having been thrown into an operation of such magnitude, and of such a kind, without any roads, and without any preparation, I certainly anticipated that the \$1½ million we had put into it would probably be written off in the operation. I am delighted to know that such is not the case. It appears we should get back about half of the original amount which was placed in the operation, and, in addition, we have the forest roads and other assets which are probably worth the balance, and represent a good start in connection with matters relating to forest management for the area.

This great operation was something which was entirely new, an experiment carried out by the government to salvage the great timber losses that otherwise would have resulted from that fire.

MR. WREN: May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) one more question? I understood him to say it was going to committee; however, this Campbell, I think he said, and Lahti—was it?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Lahti.

MR. WREN: These men, whose equipment and assets were taken over, as the hon. Minister says: do they get a statement every so often containing information as to what has been done?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Lahti does.

MR. WREN: When could they expect to get settled up and get their money out of it? Or will they?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Lahti was a financial failure.

MR. WREN: He was a failure?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Yes.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on the Vote for Main Office, on a matter of policy, I would like to present a point of view, and enquire whether the government

would not consider adopting an entirely different policy than it is now pursuing. In raising the question of policy, I want to point out that the things which are objectionable, in my opinion, are not those things which are the responsibility of or the fruit of the deeds of this government alone but which ante-date this government by a great many years.

I think hon. members will all agree with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) who, in his introductory remarks, emphasized the great importance of the forest industry to the economy of the province. We all agree with that, and precisely because it is so fundamental to the economy of the province, it has been a subject which has agitated the province from time to time, throughout the years since the beginning of organized forest cutting. I think the report of the Royal Commission, tracing the history of forest activity, points this out. There were a lot of misdeeds, some wilful, some unintentional, which militated against the best interests of the people.

In 1941 Mr. Drew, who was then the Leader of the Conservative group, at that time the official Opposition, made statements which left a very deep impression upon the minds of the people of this province. For instance, he pointed out that in one year, in 1937, the Liberal Government, in a period of 6 months, granted to 8 companies areas which contained a combined total of over 15 million acres of forest land, without public tender or competition of any kind.

That is an astonishing fact, and since the statement was never challenged, I assume it to be a correct statement of fact; in other words, that it was possible, under another government, to give concessions of this magnitude, and establish veritable empires in the north, without tender, and without any competition.

That was a serious situation, and in order to cope with it, Mr. Drew, on behalf of the Conservative Party, advanced a policy which was, in my opinion, the soundest policy on the handling of our forestry resources ever offered in the history of organized

government in the province. What was it? His plan was that we establish in Ontario an impartial commission, such as Hydro, to handle our forest wealth, to administer it on behalf of the people, to guarantee that the maximum price would be obtained, guarantee a perpetual harvest of our forest crops, and guarantee employment opportunities for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, I think that was an excellent proposition, and, indeed, it became one of the 22 points of the Conservative programme in 1943, and resulted in a great many people voting for the Conservative Party.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I answer the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg)?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows where I am heading.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member but he has asked that same question every year for the last 10 years, and it has always been answered. I have answered it each year during the last 10 years.

Of course, the hon. member's question boils down to this; why is there not a commission? May I answer the hon. member, as I have answered every year now for a number of years?

After all, 85 per cent. of Ontario's land is still in the Crown, and, of course, could conceivably be the subject matter of commission operation, if such was put into effect. However, I do not think that would be at all satisfactory. I think Mr. Drew came to that conclusion himself. That idea was advanced in the days when he was in Opposition, and I find that Opposition members say some rather funny things at times.

MR. SALSBERG: Did the hon. Prime Minister, when he was in Opposition?

HON. MR. FROST: I never did myself, but I have heard some pretty funny ones.

MR. SALSBERG: Then Mr. Drew did.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not think it is feasible, nor is it "democratic"—which is a word that the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) uses a great deal—to hand over the management of 85 per cent. of our land area, involving the interests of hundreds of thousands of our citizens, to the control of a commission.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is the answer. On coming into office, and looking at this problem, you at once see that if you take the management of the people's affairs from their hands, and put it into those of a commission, regardless of how efficient that commission may be, you are placing the lives of the people under a system against which they have no appeal.

MR. SALSBERG: What about Hydro?

HON. MR. FROST: I think the answer is plain. We have endeavoured to meet this problem, through an Advisory Committee, through consultants to the department, through sales by tender, and through Committees of the House. In this way we give the fullest opportunity for hon. members to examine into the workings of the department—and by means of a White Paper, which was submitted to the House, and to which hon. members have been giving great consideration—we are attempting to find the answer to the problem, rather than to place it in the hands of a commission which is presumed to be all-perfect, but could not do a job of that sort efficiently.

Mr. Chairman, I have given that answer to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) on a number of occasions.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, you see I still have hope of convincing the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that it is worthwhile adhering to policies one advocates in the Opposition, when one gets into power. One of the great difficulties we encounter is that political Parties forget their policies, and the advocacy of them in which they engaged when they are in Opposition, once they get into power. If the hon. Prime Minister would practice

what he preached when he was in Opposition, we might have better government, and better administration. I still hope he will see the correctness of the stand he took in former days, when he was over on this side, and supported Mr. Drew. And if I wanted to "rub it in," I could quote from a speech the hon. Prime Minister made at the Head of the Lakes on this question.

HON. MR. FROST: Not on commissions, surely?

MR. SALSBERG: The local press there carried a very full report.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Not at the Head of the Lakes.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, at the Head of the Lakes.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Go ahead and quote it.

MR. SALSBERG: In which the present Prime Minister advocated the very thing Mr. Drew advocated.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not think I ever said such a thing in my life.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I will get it for the hon. Prime Minister. I think that 2 years ago he had forgotten that he ever adopted a bill to establish a forestry commission, and he questions my statement. I had to go and get the Statutes and show it to him. I do not blame the hon. Prime Minister for forgetting these things. According to Freud, we forget the things we do not want to remember. We usually remember what we want to remember.

That was not only in the 22 points. This promise—one of the very few to be implemented—was acted upon in the letter and the spirit of that pledge—point 7 of the 22 points—as soon as the Conservatives came to power. In 1944 the bill was introduced and it looked as if we were really starting a new page in the administration of this great natural resource. The Liberals, who now seem to agree with the hon. Prime Minister that it would be wrong and "undemocratic" to appoint a com-

mission, at that time voted with the government. They could not oppose such a democratic procedure, and the CCF agreed, and my colleague from Bellwoods and I were very happy because everybody was supporting the government in its efforts to implement the pledge made to the people. The pledge was eminently promising, but obviously, Mr. Chairman, it was too good to be true. I am not sure that Prime Minister Drew realized it was a mistake. I rather suspect the pressure brought to bear upon him was so great that he and the government found it irresistible.

HON. MR. FROST: There has never been any pressure on me about the matter. I do not agree with it. I do not think it is workable or feasible, and therefore I will not do it.

MR. SALSBERG: I said the pressure was on Prime Minister Drew. He was the Prime Minister at the time. He undoubtedly felt the pressure, with the result that instead of implementing the Act he appointed a Royal Commission to start the whole thing over again.

HON. MR. FROST: The commission reported against it.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not ready to accept every recommendation made by the Royal Commission and I am not asking for the complete implementation of what they recommended. Some of the recommendations were very good.

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that the history of the management of our forests is a history of commission after commission. In 1927 speeches were made by the late Mr. Finlayson, then the Minister of Lands and Forests in a Conservative Government, speeches which, when compared with the present utterances by hon. members of the government sound so similar that it is almost amazing. He said we had to discuss our forestry resources and he, in 1927, introduced legislation which resulted in a commission being appointed.

Then came a Liberal Government and hon. members heard what Mr. Drew said about them, and what they

did in 1927. Then the Conservative Party came to power and we had another commission. And now we have a White Paper. And where do we go from here? I am a very moderate person. I am not going to say what the former Leader of the Liberal Party said about the Ontario forest industry and its management. He said "The people of Ontario had been sold out to the robber barons." I have never said that. But I do say that all previous governments have pursued a wrong course. I argue over a fundamental policy, not a picayune thing which one government after another has done. What we need is a change of management which will make impossible such things as the sale of 15 million acres, without tenders, without competition, and mostly to United States concerns.

There was a man who has unfortunately passed to the "Great Beyond," who said 3 years ago at a meeting in London, Ontario, that the policy of waste applied to our northern forest resources was dictated by "monopolistic robber barons of Wall Street, St. James Street and Bay Street." That was not said by me, it was said by a man who was a multimillionaire in his own right, a man who knew the timber situation. He said "the pulp and paper industry, with unwarrantable provincial support, were squandering the forests, and that the 65,000 square miles of merchantable timber in Northern Ontario were now completely under the domination of these men." This is what was said by a man in the forestry business. At this time, I cannot refrain from bringing to the attention of the House these basic issues. In doing so, I am not taking exception to this government alone, for I think this applies to all former governments in the province. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that mismanagement of the forests of Ontario will continue, unless, and until the government lives up to the promise made to the people, and carries out its pledge of a Forestry Commission like Hydro to provide really good administration of forest resources. Unless and until the government does that, we will go on from one commission to another,

from one investigation to another, and more and more waste and mismanagement will result.

Vote 91 carried.

On Vote 92, item 2, Ground Surveys, \$175,000.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT: Does that represent the total cost of ground surveys, or are these surveys performed by officials of the department? Would their salaries be included in this sum?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: That represents the work we give to other surveyors throughout the province, largely in connection with summer resort places, and that sort of thing.

Vote 93 carried.

On Vote 94, Basic Organization, District Offices, \$8,715,000.

MR. CLIVER: On Vote 94, I want to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) a question relating to something which was mentioned in the White Paper he presented to the House a few days ago. It is suggested in that White Paper that at least 6 of our fish hatcheries are not giving a good account of themselves, and may well be abolished. What I want to know is this: Is there a movement on the part of the Department of Lands and Forests away from fish hatcheries as a means of propagating fish, or were these particular hatcheries not considered to be giving sufficient value? Was their output not enough? What is the thinking of the department in relation to fish hatcheries in general?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: That subject was dealt with in an appendix to the White Paper, and represented the views of people in our department, and of biologists working with us. First of all, in relation to the recommendation that these hatcheries be closed, I believe every one was a hatchery commenced by the Federal Government somewhere around the 1860's and turned over to us about 1900. They have been operated ever since entirely in connection with the commercial fisheries in the Great Lakes. Of course, as a result of the

sea lamprey and the decline in the value of the Great Lakes fisheries, the worth of these hatcheries, so far as the biologists are concerned, has diminished. Their opinion was that they were no longer giving us a good return, or at least as good a return for our dollar as they should. I think it was explained in the Lands and Forests Committee, by the chief of the division, that some of the hatcheries were practically out of operation last year because it was not possible to get the spawn—so marked was the scarcity of fish in the Great Lakes—to maintain the hatchery in successful operation.

We have made no decision whatever regarding the closing of these hatcheries, however. It is an expression of opinion on the part of the biologists that, to carry out certain programmes they have in mind requires a certain amount of money, and corresponding economies might be achieved by closing these hatcheries, and a further sum raised by the imposition of a \$1 fishing licence. We are not convinced those recommendations are entirely acceptable. We are feeling our way. We think a hatchery provides the same facilities as a nursery with regard to forestry, inasmuch as they furnish new fish for waters in which they can reproduce themselves. The work of the hatchery extends beyond the field with which the biologist is concerned, and we are not convinced at the moment that the closing of these hatcheries is going to serve a useful purpose. The specific hatcheries mentioned in the White Paper are hatcheries which are providing fingerlings for the commercial fishing on the Great Lakes.

MR. OLIVER: Was the production from these hatcheries, in general, down last year, as compared with the year before?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I believe the game fish production was down, but the commercial production has risen. We have been carrying out a programme of renovating at least one of the older hatcheries each year. This year, I believe, the major programme is being carried on in connection par-

ticularly with the Sault Ste. Marie hatchery. There are certain factors which make the supply of fish scarce there this year.

MR. SALSBERG: On this subject of fish hatcheries: I would like to appeal to the hon. Minister to do something to improve the fishing conditions in the lower Muskoka area where the mass of the people go for their vacations. Those who can fly in with airplanes and fish in virgin waters find no trouble in getting bites, but the ordinary working man who takes his family out on vacation to the lower Muskoka district finds that the rivers and lakes have been fished out, and he has a hard time getting a bite. I feel we do not do enough to replenish the waters which are being fished out year by year.

I am not raising this from the point of view of the hotel and camp operators, though they should be considered. I am thinking primarily of the man and his family who drive up in their "jalopies"—or maybe in better cars—for a week's or fortnight's vacation and find there are no fish for them to catch. When I was up the Haliburton area with a number of other working folk I found the fishing none too good. And, of course, the hotel keepers there, and the camp operators, were sure the hon. Prime Minister, who represented them, would look into it.

I am appealing for all the people in that category who really need assistance.

While the hon. Minister is about to rise, may I ask whether a stop has been put to the landing of United States craft in the northwest area of the province, around Lake-of-the-Woods, where airplanes would come in, in large numbers, and their occupants would not even buy a licence, nor spend any money in the vicinity, as they had all their food and tackle with them, and they would land, and fish around for a day, and then get back into their amphibian planes, and go back from whence they came. Has action been taken to stop the procedure?

Above all, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with my first question about replenishing our lakes and rivers in the lower part of the Muskoka area.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: The hon. member probably went fishing on the wrong day or the wrong time of the day. His statement about the scarcity of fish indicates the importance of increasing the production of the fish hatcheries, because we find, particularly in that connection, that they catch the fish as fast as we put them in.

There are problems in connection with it, which are being studied, and we are not too sure as yet just where we are going. We are more or less consolidating our position, and trying to find out definitely whether we are spending our money in the proper manner, and carrying the plans out adequately, and one method of doing that is to increase the number of biologists on our staff, particularly the field staff, which has now grown to 34, operating in different districts of the province. Their first duty is to examine the various lakes and regions, and in an endeavour to meet the problems with which they are faced, they are making recommendations to the department as to the proper methods of replenishing the stock, or whether we should take the coarse fish out, and various different methods.

As the information becomes more available, we are making an assessment of this picture, and I am sure the situation will continue to improve, as indications are it has in the past year or two, because the reports this past year have been exceedingly encouraging in regard to the work being carried out by our Fish and Wildlife Division, and particularly that of the biologists whom we have added to the staff.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): On Vote 94, item 3: there is one portion of this statement reading as follows:

"Miscellaneous, Including Legal Expenses, \$110,000."

Just above that, three or four lines, we find an item "Rent, \$5,000." The rent is outlined in detail at \$5,000, but here we have "Miscellaneous, Including Legal Expenses, \$110,000." Would it not be possible to give us more information on this item, and break it down,

separating "Legal Expenses" from what might be called "Miscellaneous Items"?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: My accountant tells me our total legal bills would probably amount to in the neighbourhood of \$30,000.

We have on our staff, Mr. Yoerger, the head of the division, on a salary basis. Then we obtain legal services in the fields where infractions take place.

In connection with timber licences, and the review of certain matters of that kind, we bring in outstanding legal counsel to assist us, men who are experienced in this type of work, and who are given a special fee in connection with that work.

MR. GRUMMETT: Does not the hon. Minister think it would be advisable to set out an item of that magnitude as a separate item, instead of lumping it in as "Miscellaneous"?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I can have that for you in committee, if you like.

MR. GRUMMETT: That will be satisfactory.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. Minister will tell us how we can ascertain from these Estimates how many buildings the department has built this year, or how many fish hatcheries, or just what is being done in a construction way? We cannot tell from these Estimates.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: All our construction work is done by the Department of Public Works, or in conjunction with it, and the Vote is in its Estimates.

I think last year the expenditure was in the neighbourhood of \$1½ million. This year, it will be about \$700,000 or \$800,000.

We have two methods of doing that. One is where we request Public Works to construct the building, and the project then is entirely the responsibility of the Department of Public Works. The other are projects which they

supervise and for which they supply the funds, but the work is done by our men in their spare time. I believe they are called "l.a.f. projects."

MR. OLIVER: Has the hon. Minister listed the projects which are being proceeded with this year?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: That will be in the Public Works Estimates. The specific projects will all be listed. I can get a list for the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Vote 94 agreed to.

Vote 95, Salaries and so forth, Maintenance and Operating, \$800,000, agreed to.

On Vote 96, Public Information on Fire Prevention, Fish and Wildlife, Reforestation and Timber Management, Salaries and so forth, Maintenance and Operating, \$108,000.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT: On Vote 96, Mr. Chairman, I presume that is to cover departmental documents such as silva and other documents of that nature?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: That is correct.

Vote 96 agreed to.

Vote 97, Ar Service Branch, Salaries, Permanent and Temporary, \$420,000; Travelling Expenses, \$16,000; Maintenance and Operating, \$340,000.

MR. OLIVER: Somewhere I wanted to ask the hon. Minister this question: In the White Paper, on page 15, he refers to the saw-milling industry, and he says, in the last three lines of the second paragraph:

Measures will be taken in the next few years to provide for the continued existence of the saw-milling industry within the province.

May I ask the hon. Minister if he will outline to the House the nature of those measures which are to be taken?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: The people who examined this, include our departmental officials, and others whom

we asked for advice, in connection with the preparation of the White Paper, and their advice was that at the present rate of operations, the red and white pine saw-milling industry could very possibly come to an end in 17 or 20 years. We are attempting to slow up these operations as much as possible. The hon. Leader of the Opposition can well realize the difficulties in connection with it. There are two main ones. The first is this: you may be operating in an area where the timber is mature or over-mature, so it does not seem wise to stop the operations, because it is on the down grade. That is particularly true in the North Bay district, where the large stand of pine in the Sturgeon watershed, for instance, was at that stage.

Then we are limiting the diameter sizes of the trees which can be cut. White pine is limited now to 18 inches, and red pine to 16 inches. The diameter sizes limit the amount of the trees which can be cut, in order to allow them to attain their greatest timber size.

Certain mills, as pointed out in the White Paper, will be covered first of all by importation of logs from Quebec, which still has a substantial number of acres available, and certain areas accessible, but on which cutting rights have not been given. Some of the mills on the Ottawa River are receiving a portion of their supply in that way.

Then, as will appear obvious, we are going to ask our saw-mills to switch their cutting to other species, as well as the white and red pine. As a matter of fact, a large share of the production over and above the 150 million feet which I mentioned, is jackpine and spruce. We intend to encourage that. We have issued directives, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition is well aware, whereby we do not allow the operating companies to use, for pulping purposes, a log over 9 inches, and in some cases, 8 inches, and we ask them to distribute them to the sawmilling industry.

The difficulty there is they say, "What is the cost going to be, and who is going to cut it?" That creates some difficulties.

But the hon. members can also realize there is difficulty in handling that, because there may not be a sufficient number of logs to warrant economic production. I had a case where the operators have come to the office in connection with their problem, concerning the supply of various kinds of material, which involved piling, ties, and lumber, and all the various products outside the pulp and paper field, and we have sent them into areas where the companies have offered to co-operate, and supply them with the logs they say they cannot economically take out, because there is not sufficient to warrant production.

So our directives now read there must be 25 logs to an acre, and 5,000 in a logging chance, or the company does not have to follow the directive.

That was done on the recommendation of our foresters, among whom is one of the best the department ever had, a man by the name of Matthews, who realized that difficulty, and thought it would be impossible to enforce the directives beyond that point.

MR. WREN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would, while on the saw-logging industry, say what he thinks about the present dues on timber for saw-logs?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: The question of dues, Mr. Chairman, is a perplexing one. If you are going to accept the theory that the Department of Lands and Forests must derive revenues from dues, to carry on the proper administration of this department, then you are going to have to accept the present dues rate, plus a certain percentage contributed to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, which, I think, is justifiable.

When you think that the Federal Treasury collects \$9 out of every \$10 in the taxes which are paid by this industry, you will see the position. I think I can take an example. I believe one of our companies operating and paying Crown dues to us, paid more to the Federal Treasury in income taxes alone in 1951, than it took to run the whole Department of Lands and Forests,

including Fish and Wildlife. If there is going to be some relief given to these operators, any reduction of dues we may grant will only be of a psychological nature, and the relief is going to come from all the various fields of costs in connection with these operations.

I know that most of the operators are concerned about the cost of wood operations in this province. They continuously complain to me about the cost of the raw material to their mills, and that it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to meet competition. This is particularly true at the moment and is worrisome to the craft industry, which became very firmly established in this province in the 1940's.

We were not a large producer of craft wood, particularly for export, in this province until the opening of Marathon, Terrace Bay, and Red Rock, and I might remind the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that, due to the policy of the Progressive Conservative Government, we became a large exporter of this product. With that, of course, came the use of jackpine and poplar and many of the wood species. Jackpine, for instance, really only began to be used when these concession areas went into operation with their mills.

I am thinking of 2 at the moment, specifically, whereby in their negotiations sometimes they would get the jackpine at 40c. a cord—that was their “upset price” or the minimum the government would accept—and place with that bid, a 10c. bonus which made their Crown dues 50c. per cord to the province.

Taking into consideration inflationary trends, the wholesale index price, and the value of the dollar in the period up to the time we increased the jackpine dues, by, I believe, 1950, in order for us to get the same amount of money in real dollars, in comparison with the 40c., we would have to have a Crown dues cord price of 90c. to match that dollar value and perform the same service.

You must remember our costs are going up at the same time. Consider the way costs have gone up in operations alone. In one specific instance, we used to be able to put a game warden in the

field for \$2,500 a year. Today, that cost, including facilities for enforcing the game laws, getting around the country and everything else, more than \$6,000; in other words, the cost to the department including the increase in the number of officials has gone up considerably, and it was necessary to increase Crown dues.

Over and above that fact, if we want to get the same real dollar value as we were getting when the concession agreements were let, we would have to increase the dues from 40c. to 90c. You must remember as well that our jackpine dues in the province today are \$2, but when you take into consideration the federal taxes of 49 per cent., and that Crown dues are deductible as an expense against an operation, in fact the Crown dues cost to the company are only \$1 a cord as opposed to \$2 a cord.

So I say once again, if the industry is in difficulties, if their wood costs and their whole operational costs are there, and we eliminate Crown dues entirely, it will have very little effect on the health of the industry as far as Crown dues are concerned.

MR. WREN: Will the hon. Minister tell me if any representations have been made to his office concerning freight rates for the movement of timber products?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Not particularly, except over the whole picture. No representations have been made except as has been pointed out, very definitely, that wood costs across the board are very high, and freight rates contribute very substantially to these costs, together with all the other costs which enter into the matter.

I might say, in connection with this, because of the concern which is being shown, that a committee has been set up—as a matter of fact, I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) referred to it as a “brain trust”—however, I do not think he said that in a disparaging manner.

MR. NIXON: I would not do that.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: He would not do that. He is too fine a gentleman for that.

Together with the men in our department who are familiar with timber management, the Deputy Minister, and the accountant, a committee has been set up to go into the entire economics of these operations, where concern is being shown, to see whether we as a department of government might enter into this picture if relief is necessary, either by actions within our own department or by actions in other fields of endeavour, to reduce the costs and make our industry competitive, so that we will not suffer the loss of this industry.

MR. WREN: One more question; in the present policy of curtailment of export of which I have spoken before—and with which I agree—what is taking its place in the absence of new mills being built? If you are going to cut off the export to the United States, for example, what other activity will take its place in areas such as Hearst and other places, to keep them out of trouble?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: If you will take the figures of export, going back to 1925 or 1930, you will see the over-all picture. As you know, and as is government policy, we are reducing the export of pulpwood in this country by 10 per cent. annually until there will be a complete elimination by 1957, if the policy is carried out.

In the second place, as the White Paper says, if, after a proper assessment of all our timber resources has been made, we find certain areas where the local domestic industries now established, or which will be established, will not absorb over-mature stands within the next 25 years, then it would be in order to grant export permits. Furthermore, I think I should remind the House that this policy applies especially to spruce, balsam and jackpine, which were the three covered by the original Order-in-Council, the most important

of which is the spruce. There is no question that white spruce, but more particularly, black spruce, is what keeps Ontario competitively strong and supreme in the newsprint field, and in the pulp and paper field. I cannot for the life of me see why we should adopt a policy whereby we should allow any exporter in this country, foreign or Canadian, to export that valuable species, until we are absolutely sure it is not going to be required by the industries now in existence or those to come.

Spruce is a wood above all others which, when it has reached maturity, can maintain its soundness in some cases for as many as 100 years. There is no reason, from the information we have available, to change our export policy in that regard, unless some other factor comes into this picture, and if they are going to get export rights—and there are certain places where there are mixed stands—I would not be adverse to advising a policy whereby we would allow, if all the circumstances considered indicated that export was the right thing to do because of over-maturity, and if they will take all species, poplar, jackpine and spruce, I think there would be some reason to do that. But to allow them to take “the cream of the crop” is, to my mind, unreasonable and would only be a temporary measure in connection with the Hearst problem.

For instance, our big problem there is, while there is a temporary situation, some of the municipal improvements made in that area were made 3 and 4 years ago, after this policy was announced.

In the beginning, I started to point out to the hon. member for Kenora that if he reviewed the export of wood from this province for the last quarter century, he would find that the export of wood from private lands decreases, or the export ban is lifted from Crown lands and vice-versa. As a matter of fact, the figures vary very little, and the annual totals do not seem to change greatly year by year. The total export

of wood from private and Crown lands combined seems to amount to an almost constant figure.

MR. NIXON: Has the hon. Minister the figures before him for the last 3 years?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I think I have. The contractual rights for spruce and balsam were 250,000 cords under the quota system, and we only exported 200,000 cords in 1953. I believe there will be a slight drop this coming year of about 10,000 or 20,000 cords. As a matter of fact, you may recall last year I told this House that of the original group of exporters, who had contractual rights, many were dropped until there are only 6 or 8 left. Their figures vary very little and they will come to an ultimate end in 1957.

MR. NIXON: Those are from Crown lands only.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Yes. In 1953, from Crown lands the total figure is 329,303 and from other lands 255,325. That is the total including all species, not only spruce, balsam and jackpine.

MR. WREN: Do I take it from what the hon. Minister has said—and I am asking this not so much about the Hearst area because we are getting into the same kind of situation—from the hon. Minister's remarks can we take it that anyone who started in the export business, shall we say, and any community which was more or less dependent upon that after this policy was commenced, cannot expect much relief?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I do not think so.

MR. WREN: I am not criticizing your policy in reducing exports. What I am looking for is this—what is going to take up the shock until we can get into mill production, or some other use of the wood?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I would think those views come to the hon. member again as the result of conversations in connection with Hearst. As I pointed out in committee, when this

arose, I do not feel the government could very well assume the responsibility of organizations or people who made investments in equipment and so forth, and all that is required to carry on an export business, who entered the export business 3 years after the policy had been announced. That is true of some of the operators who were at the meeting the other morning.

I am not standing here and saying we are not going to review the picture at Hearst completely. We did attempt—and while I was absent my department attempted—to temporarily solve that problem, until a complete review of the whole situation could be made. They were offered a market for an amount of wood in excess of what they requested, by local domestic mills—not by one, but by 3 or 4—and they were not “stuck” with the wood, or anything like that. But the minute we relax restrictions to one in connection with spruce, we must relax them to everybody.

Within the last few days a very important operator in this province has indicated a willingness to review the situation at Hearst, in regard to the amount of wood which would be available, to see if they could use it. This particular company has other rights in this province. There is the possibility of another domestic mill coming out of this, but I am not too hopeful that will happen, because the pulp market and the newsprint field at the present are consolidating their positions in the North American continent. We are only guided by economic conditions affecting both our own province and Canada. British interests, of course, are also in this country, and when the convertibility of the dollar and the pound comes into play, as we hope it shall, I think it will afford some relief to that picture, and I am hopeful that we will have, within the next decade at least, in this province, sufficient mills to process all our domestic wood without any community suffering.

I am sure that, with some temporary arrangements, the Hearst situation will clear. Our information is—and it is of

a confidential nature—that while they indicated some of the retail businesses were suffering tremendous losses, I have had men come to see me from that area, who are in business and who are not suffering. One, especially, stated that his sales were up over last year. As I say, the Hearst situation will be reviewed thoroughly, but we are not going to do it at the expense of breaking our export policy in connection with spruce and balsam wood within this country.

Vote 97 agreed to.

On Vote 98, item 1: Association of Ontario Land Surveyors—\$200.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. member for St. Andrew voiced a question a while ago, but there was no answer from the hon. Minister. It had to do with the tourists coming into our province by aeroplane, and landing on our northern lakes, and I want to know from the hon. Minister how extensive that practice is and if the department is in complete control of the situation and, if the regulations and the laws we have on the Statute Books are sufficient to handle the matter at the present time?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: First of all, of course, it is illegal for any aircraft to enter Canada except through customs. That is the first control, and it is exercised, of course, by the Dominion Government. Secondly, it is illegal at times to travel in this country without a permit, so that we do know where they are. Of course, if he has a fishing licence, and a guide licence, and all other requirements, we have no control over where he is going to fly, or where he is going to land. We have to depend on our enforcement officers to see that the law is carried out, the same as does anybody else. I must say, we do not encourage the practice in any way, shape or form. As a matter of fact, we discourage it, and that is about the limit of our control, through the Travel permit system.

MR. OLIVER: Have you been able to get any convictions at all?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I have not the record here. I will have to check and see.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, in connection with this matter, if my memory serves me right, I think we enacted some legislation a few years ago to cope with this special problem. It was discussed in the House. That is how I came to know about it. I am wondering whether the legislation was sufficient.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: It is possible that we may be able to control that through the recreational plan of wilderness areas and semi-wilderness areas, and deferred zones. As far as aircraft are concerned, the regulations would have to apply to local and resident aircraft travel, as well as to visiting aircraft.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) has given any consideration to a subject about which I made a remark earlier. I may be out of order. I cannot find the specific item on which to speak, but has any consideration been given by the department to the matter of properly-organized search parties?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: The matter to which the hon. member (Mr. Wren) referred, in connection with lost people and, in particular, children, is certainly regrettable and heartbreaking to those concerned. I should think, through the provincial police and through our departmental facilities we should be able to put into an area search crews, which would be most competent to find lost persons. I should think that would be about the maximum we, as a department or government, could do in this connection.

MR. WREN: The point, Mr. Minister, was that not only do you have highly skilled woodsmen in the department, but your department is constantly in touch with prospectors and woodsmen of other kinds, whom they know also to be skilled, and if they had them regis-

tered and organized into a particular group, so they could be brought to an area very quickly, when a person is lost, it would save a lot of money and save lives too, because, despite the willingness of volunteers, they will "mess up" a search sometimes.

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I do not know of any search where our services have been denied to anybody, or where the aid of our officials throughout the province has not been supplied to its maximum capacity. However, in most cases where a situation such as the hon. member has described takes place, the direction first comes from the local senior officer in charge of the provincial police, under whose direction the search is carried out, and under whom our men carry out their programme.

MR. OLIVER: Might I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) one more question? Could he tell the House what success has attended the department's efforts to regenerate our forests by seeding from the air?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Frankly, Mr. Chairman, that is of comparatively recent vintage, and, as I said in my opening remarks tonight, a great deal of effort and time is going into examining that picture from a research angle. The Deputy Minister tells me now that the results of experiments show a success ratio of 25 per cent., but the projects have not been underway long enough to properly assess what results will come from air seeding.

However, I am sure you appreciate that in the regeneration and silvicultural methods and research so extensively carried on today, not only by ourselves but in conjunction with industry, and in conjunction with the Ontario Research Council, in conjunction with the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association and other agencies, we are doing our best to insure that the money we are spending on these projects is going to produce results. When those efforts have been proven successful, then a much larger programme can be carried

out which will bring the people of Ontario a much greater return for their dollars.

Vote 98 concurred in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote No. 99, Wolf Bounty.

Item No. 1, Payments of Wolf Bounty, \$60,000.

MR. H. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, on Votes No. 99 and 100, I see the province is spending \$60,000 to catch wolves, and \$10,000 to catch bears, and is killing lamprey eels and bugs on spruce trees.

MR. SALSBERG: Nothing for ants?

MR. FISHLEIGH: And I suggest, the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) is handsome and good natured and a man of affluence, I wonder if he would co-operate with Fishleigh and come out to Woodbine riding and help me kill termites?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Very definitely.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in a statement from the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) as to the extent the wolf increase is being checked by his bounty system. \$60,000 should pay for quite a number of wolves. Are we getting any of those pelts from Minnesota, Manitoba or Quebec?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: We hope not.

MR. NIXON: To what extent do you find the predatory wolf is kept in check?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: Our bounty is \$25 a pelt and is an inducement to the trapper and anyone interested.

MR. NIXON: Does the number of pelts each year run about the same?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I believe so. As a matter of fact, in dollars and cents, I can give the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) the figures for the last 5 years. In 1949, the amount was almost \$58,000; in 1950, it was \$57,000; in 1951, it dropped off to \$46,500; in 1952, it dropped again to \$41,000. And in 1953, it was back to \$46,500.

So I would estimate actually we do not expect it to go much over \$50,000, in any one year. That may be due, for instance, to the reduction in the value of fur. It is more profitable to go into the hunting of wolves, than it is to go after beaver and other furs, in which there has been a tremendous drop in values.

Item No. 1 agreed to.

Vote No. 99 concurred in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 100, Bear Bounty. Item 1, Payments of Bear Bounty, \$10,000.

Item No. 1 agreed to.

Vote No. 100 concurred in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote No. 101, Timber Management Branch. Item No. 1, Salvaging Fire-Damaged Timber, Payments to Contractors, and Other Incidental Expenses, \$300,000.

On item 1:

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the department I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) whether he does not think his department would be best suited to assume responsibility for the administration of the provincial parks which are about to be established, in view of the long experience they have had administering some of our provincial parks?

HON. MR. GEMMELL: I am glad the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) thinks we have done a good job with the parks of Ontario. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will continue to place responsibility for them in such a way that we will continue to do this fine job for the people of Ontario.

ESTIMATES, OFFICE OF
LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR

Vote 102:

Item 1, Salaries\$ 9,300

Item 2, Cost-of-Living
Bonus 700

Expenses:

Item 3, Allowance for
Contingencies 10,000

Vote 102 agreed to.

ESTIMATES, OFFICE OF
PRIME MINISTER

Vote 121:

Item 1, Salaries\$38,000

Item 2, Travelling Expenses 5,000

Item 3, Maintenance 5,400

Item 4, Sundry
Investigations 100Item 5, Cost-of-Living
Bonus 4,500

Vote 122:

Item 1, Salaries 42,500

Item 2, Travelling Expenses 3,000

Item 3, Maintenance 6,500

Votes 121 and 122 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee.

HON. MR. FROST: If there is any item that any hon. member wishes to be held over, I will agree to do so.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION
ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive carried.

Bill No. 90 reported.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION
ACT, 1954

House in Committee on Bill No. 91, "An Act to provide for the Financial Administration of the Government of Ontario and for the Organization of the Treasury Department."

Sections 1 and 2 carried.

MR. SALSBERG: There is a very serious question I want to put to the Prime Minister: whether this re-organization will enable him to predict more accurately what surplus there will be in the coming year? I think that up to now he has been very wide of the mark. That may have been due to the poor organization in the department. Does he think this will enable him to do better?

HON. MR. FROST: I will say to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that I have always been on the right side.

Sections 3 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Could the hon. Prime Minister explain the necessity, or the meaning, of section 15?

HON. MR. FROST: This is only for purposes of administration. Every effort was made to keep the work of these various offices separate, but if, for purpose of convenience, it should happen that some duty is better performed by one officer, that may be done. This ensures that we do not put ourselves in an administrative straight-jacket.

MR. OLIVER: I should not have thought you would need law for that.

HON. MR. FROST: On the other hand, if you do not have this enabling section, it might lead to difficulties.

Sections 15 and 16 carried.

MR. OLIVER: Does section 17 mean that an official in one department might be situated in some other office?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, that is right.

MR. OLIVER: Stationed there?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. I think that is done in Ottawa as well. Supposing one department is a revenue-collecting department, and it is convenient that the collections be made there. It might be desirable that the Treasury should have an official or officials there to supervise.

MR. OLIVER: That is not being done to any great extent?

HON. MR. FROST: As a matter of fact, it is being done now informally. This gives legislative sanction to the practice.

Sections 17 to 37 inclusive agreed to.

MR. OLIVER: On section 38, would the hon. Prime Minister say why he needs that provision? It is a new section.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, and it is a new section. I think it is obvious. The loaning powers of the government are under the authority of this Act. That is the purpose of it.

Sections 38 to 65 inclusive agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that in part VI, miscellaneous sections 66, 67 and 68 be deleted, and substituted therefor, the following:

Section 66: sections 1 and 8, subsection 3 of section 13, and section 17, 20, 23, 28, and 30 of the Audit Act, the Consolidated Revenue Fund Act, and the Public Revenue Act are repealed.

67: Provincial Loans Act, the Provincial Loans Amendment Act 1951, and the Provincial Loans Amendment Act 1952, are repealed.

68: Subsection (1) of this Act, subsections 37 to 42, and sections 44 to 58, and section 67, comes into force the day it receives Royal assent.

Subsection (2); section 37 to 42, sections 44 to 58, and section 67 come into force on a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor, by his proclamation.

69: This Act may be cited as the Financial Administration Act, 1954.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, since this will be the last opportunity to speak on the bill, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether any of these clauses, or anything in the Act, infringes in any way on the rights and jurisdiction of the Provincial Auditor?

HON. MR. FROST: No. Not at all.

MR. SALSBERG: His rights remain as they were?

HON. MR. FROST: Absolutely.

Bill No. 91 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Tomorrow this bill would normally be on the Order paper for third reading. I do not expect to be here at the commencement of the sittings of the House tomorrow. I would, therefore, ask now that this bill be not read a third time tomorrow in order that one or two of the sections may be reviewed. I do not think there will be any change, but some of the officials are in New York at the present time, and I think it would be advisable to hold this over pending their return. So I would ask that the bill be not read a third time tomorrow.

THE TELEPHONES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 51, "The Telephones Act, 1954."

HON. MR. FROST: This bill has been through the Committee on Municipal Law. It has been thoroughly gone over. I think it might be reported. There are 119 sections. If there are any of the sections which hon. members wish to question, we could go directly on to such section.

MR. OLIVER: It says in the Act, that apparently the Court of Appeal shall hear and determine a stated case, and remit it to the authority with the opinion of the court thereon. The question that arises in one's mind is this: why should not other parties be notified of the court's decision, as well as the authority? It would seem to me upon looking through this there is a good reason why the other party should also know what the decision of the Court of Appeal might be.

HON. MR. FROST: I suppose the meaning of it is that any party who was interested, would have recourse to the court in an ordinary case, but in this case, the authority itself might ask for a direction as to its powers for purposes of clarification. This section envisages an application where, possibly, nobody else might need to be notified. It might concern an application on the authority's own part for some clarification of a question.

MR. OLIVER: It is not clear that is the case, from reading it over.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: It ties in with No. 107.

MR. OLIVER: How?

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: It says, "of its own motion." Mr. Chairman, in the provision in the Municipal Board Act, section 96, it says:

The Court of Appeal shall hear and determine any stated case, and remit to the authority—

MR. OLIVER: Yes, but 109 says, "The authority may of its own motion or on the application of any party to the proceedings." It is not the authority asking for a stated case; it may be brought by any party to the proceedings. My question was, why should not the other party to the proceedings be notified, as well as the authority?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: In the Ontario Municipal Board Act, it says, "it may." It is permissive. In this case, the authority takes over the authority

of the board. It says, "The authority may on its own motion." It is a question of law, I think.

HON. L. M. FROST: I suppose the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is in regard to subsection 1, which says:

The authority may on its own motion or upon application by any party to the proceeding.

Subsection 2 says:

The Court of Appeal shall hear and determine the stated case and remit it to the authority.

I suppose the words might be added, "to the authority or such other parties to the proceedings." Or shall we leave it the way it is?

MR. OLIVER: Why should it be left the way it is?

HON. MR. FROST: The law officers advise me the usual procedure is that the Court of Appeal would determine the stated case, and remit it to the authority, and it is the authority's business then to give it to the parties concerned. The Court of Appeal would give it to the authority itself. As I understand it, the authority has before it, certain applications submitted to it by various parties, and the authority may submit a case to the Court of Appeal for a finding, and when the Court of Appeal makes its finding, it remits it to the authority, which in turn makes it available to the parties. I think that makes it clear. I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that upon reading the section, it might appear to be somewhat ambiguous.

MR. OLIVER: In section 111, the last clause, No. 6, it says:

The authority, or any member thereof, is not liable for costs in connection with any appeal or application for leave to appeal under this section.

My thought was that if the applicant appealing the authority's action—if the action is upheld, surely the applicant

should not have to bear the costs of the appeal. I would like to hear the hon. Minister on that point. If the appeal is upheld, why should the authority be released?

HON. MR. FROST: It is the same provision as in the Municipal Board Act, if that carries any weight with the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. OLIVER: It does not. What is the reason?

HON. MR. FROST: I suppose the authority is a judicial or semi-judicial body, and, therefore, is not subject to payment at all. I suppose it would be similar to assessing the costs against a county court judge, for instance.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I have here several sections upon which I would like a little explanation, and I will deal with them one after the other.

On section 3; it deals with the power of a municipality to establish a telephone system, and to expropriate any other system within the municipality. Just how far does the power of the municipality go? Suppose it is a very extensive system, which has lines running through the municipality and is giving service within the municipality; would you permit the municipality to take over that portion of another company's lines, being operated within the municipality?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The municipality might be large enough. Where it has a preponderance of lines and subscribers in the municipality, it might be a company or an independent line, where they might amalgamate.

One of the main purposes of the whole bill is to consolidate different systems in a municipality or any group of municipalities. I assume that gives the municipalities the authority to take over any other company in the same municipality, if it will improve the system.

MR. C. E. JAMES (Lambton East): As a public utility?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes, as a public utility.

MR. GRUMMETT: On section 9; I recall the other day, when this bill was up for second reading, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) asked a question as to what Statutes these sections refer to. In order to clarify the meaning of the section, I think that after the Roman numeral figure "VI," in the second line, might be added, "of this Act," which would clarify the Act. So it would then read:

Section 17, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 37, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 61, and parts V and VI of this Act.

HON. MR. FROST: We will accept that, Mr. Chairman. That is subsection 9?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, Mr. Prime Minister, subsection 9.

The next is section 10, which deals with a petition which is submitted for the establishment of a municipal telephone system, signed by not less than 10 assessed land owners. The section reads:

A petition signed by not less than 10 assessed land owners may be presented to the council of a local municipality, praying for the establishment of a telephone system.

The difficulty is in these municipalities, 10 is a very small number of land owners who may want to have the telephone system established. Why not add to that section, a subsection, providing that a percentage of the land owners in the area to be served should sign the petition, and not only 10 members?

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am raising this point is that our municipality has gone through this process.

In 1951, we set up a municipal telephone system, and all these points posed difficulties for us. For instance, we thought we had covered the areas pretty well, and secured 98 petitioners. We have now about 700 or 750 telephone users, of whom at least one-half

are land owners. These land owners are not on the petition. I think we should set out in section 10, that a definite percentage of the land owners in the area to be served should sign the petition.

HON. MR. FROST: What percentage would the hon. member for Cochrane South suggest?

MR. GRUMMETT: I think not less than 60 per cent.

HON. MR. FROST: That is pretty high.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: That is pretty high. It is only initiating a petition. It is the same as the present Telephone Act.

MR. GRUMMETT: I am quite aware of that, Mr. Minister. That is why I am raising the point, because you are following the old Act in this bill, to a great extent.

MR. JANES: It works pretty well, the way it is.

MR. GRUMMETT: It has to a certain extent, except you have very few petitioners.

As the hon. members know, the petitioners are the property owners, who are responsible if anything happens in the municipality. If you set up a municipal telephone system with 10 assessed land owners, in the municipality, 300 assessed land owners are receiving service, and it is not fair to the 10 assessed land owners who signed the original petition, to be held responsible in future years, should the revenue from the telephone system not be sufficient to carry it.

In other words, if something happens, and a number of those who are now telephone users, cancel their subscriptions, would the cost for all of that indebtedness be placed on those 10 subscribers? I think a greater number of land owners should be compelled to sign the petition.

MR. JANES: In any telephone system, every subscriber puts a mortgage on his farm for the system, by buying debentures.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is not what I am getting at.

MR. JANES: The municipality is not held responsible.

MR. GRUMMETT: No. We need all the land owners in the area to be subscribers, so a heavy burden does not fall on the municipality.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: This is only initiating a petition. Then the municipality passes a by-law, and in the by-law, the subscribers become responsible. It is not just the 10; it is all the subscribers.

MR. JANES: Any subscriber is responsible.

MR. GRUMMETT: Certainly, but the subscriber must sign the petition.

MR. JANES: Of course, one must sign a debenture.

MR. GRUMMETT: Oh, no.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Chairman, this is an initiating petition which has the signatures of 10 assessed land owners, which is presented to the council and the council, on that petition, says, "We will pass the by-law establishing a municipal telephone system." In the by-law, those who subscribe become financially responsible. It is not only the original 10; there may be 50 more. The 10 do not carry all the burden.

MR. GRUMMETT: When do the others become responsible?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: When they subscribe, and sign up.

MR. GRUMMETT: Before the passing of the by-law?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: No.

MR. GRUMMETT: Read section 13, which clearly indicates it is those who sign before the passing of the by-law, who are held responsible.

HON. MR. FROST: May I suggest that the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) and the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) convene together when the House adjourns to see if they can find a solution to this problem.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is on sections 10, 12 and 13. I will now go on to some of the others.

HON. MR. FROST: Do not find any more tough ones, now.

MR. JANES: What about section 14?

HON. MR. FROST: Would the hon. member like to have this referred back to the committee? We will do that, if the hon. member desires.

MR. GRUMMETT: I was not a member of the committee which dealt with this, and I was not present, and I do not know what discussion took place in committee.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: If the hon. member has any further suggestions, we can get together and straighten them out.

MR. GRUMMETT: I may be able to take up some of the smaller ones here tonight.

HON. MR. FROST: I will leave it to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) to take it up with the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) to see if this can be ironed out.

MR. SALSBERG: If they are going to get together, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to section 88. I am sorry, I am a member of the committee, but it did not strike me at the time.

It is bad enough if we are going to lock up a farmer who "lets go" on a

telephone on a day when the rain interferes with haying when, and you might say he has been using insulting, offensive, or blasphemous language, but when you step into telephones which you do not charter, I am afraid it is outside the jurisdiction of the province, because it has a federal and not a provincial charter. Can you also arrest someone when he is using the Bell Telephone and speaking to Montreal?

HON. MR. FROST: We try to, if circumstances warrant.

MR. SALSBERG: I suggest this be referred to the special committee for consideration, because I do not think it is right.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: It has been that way for years.

HON. MR. FROST: We will hold this over for the committee's consideration.

THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: House in Committee on Bill No. 92, "The Mental Health Act."

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

On section 8.

MR. OLIVER: On section 8, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. The Mental Health officer mentioned in section 8, is given very wide powers, and authority to, if he deems it advisable, order a patient be let out of an institution, even over the opposition of the superintendent of that institution.

Surely, we are not going that far in the appointment of these men, and giving them such wide authority as that?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, regarding No. 3: it says the "Minister may appoint a director of Mental Health." We have a Director of Mental Health, Doctor Richardson. Certain of the hon. members have already asked me about that.

In reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, may I say, section 8 only

has to do with the psychiatric units within a general hospital, and not a mental institution. These are short-stay patients.

MR. OLIVER: Where is that defined?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I beg your pardon?

MR. OLIVER: I am trying to find out from the hon. Minister where he finds in this bill that the Mental Health officer deals only with short-stay patients, and does not refer to the mental hospital. I was under the impression that it did refer to the mental hospital.

HON. MR. FROST: No. Section 1, subsection 3, reads:

"Hospital" means a hospital approved under the Public Hospitals Act.

MR. OLIVER: That is right.
Sections 8 and 9 agreed to.
On section 10.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised an important point, because it gives this director power which supersedes that of the psychiatrist, who may be in charge of the mental health unit of a general hospital.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I beg your pardon?

MR. SALSBERG: It gives your Director authority over the psychiatrist who may be in charge of the unit in a general hospital. The Act does not even provide this Director should have the qualifications which we normally would assume would be the minimum requirements for that office.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Certainly the Director will have to be a fully qualified psychiatrist.

MR. OLIVER: We are not talking about the Director.

HON. MR. FROST: It is a Mental Health Officer.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: A Mental Health Officer is a psychiatrist.

MR. SALSBERG: Not necessarily, at all, unless it is defined.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Certainly.

MR. OLIVER: Where does it say that?

HON. MR. FROST: Section 1 (b):

"Director" means director of mental health of the Department.

A Mental Health Officer is a particular type of person, an officer of the Department, appointed under this Act.

MR. OLIVER: Who may or may not be a psychiatrist?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Certainly he is a psychiatrist.

MR. SALSBERG: Let us amend it right now by adding to the definition section.

HON. MR. FROST: Legally, there is no such thing as a psychiatrist.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes. This Act does provide for certain tasks which are to be performed by a psychiatrist. Therefore, we should amend the first section where we speak of the Mental Health Officer to read:

Mental Health Officer shall be a graduate psychiatrist and appointed under this Act.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member is only making it difficult. As a matter of fact, it goes on to say:

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, and the regulations, the Minister may appoint an officer of the Department to be known as "Director of Mental Health."

Gracious me, he is not going to appoint a boiler maker to that job. He is going to get a psychiatrist. The Director of Mental Health has certain

powers. As a matter of fact, the hon. member knows full well there is not a legal definition of a psychiatrist. It would be quite impossible and impractical to do that.

MR. SALSBERG: I disagree with the hon. Prime Minister's definition.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member disagrees with everything.

MR. SALSBERG: There should be a definite understanding if we have an Act—and we have more than one Act which has been before the House—stating very clearly what a “psychiatrist” is. A “psychiatrist” is a graduate of a recognized school of psychiatry, schools where we send students, and for which this government is paying a certain amount of money. We dealt with that last week.

I think it is correct, there is a very clear definition, and I think it should be there, or there is a danger that while they will not appoint a boiler maker, they may appoint a doctor who is totally unfit for this specialized work.

HON. MR. FROST: You have to take certain chances in this world.

MR. SALSBERG: In our administration such things cannot happen, but we are all human.

MR. OLIVER: I am quite serious in respect to No. 8. I would ask the hon. Prime Minister to consider this. Why should he appoint a Mental Health Officer who may, or may not be a psychiatrist, according to my layman's reading?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: He could be a Mental Health Officer. If he were a psychiatrist, he could also be a Mental Health Officer.

MR. OLIVER: Let us take the hon. Minister's (Mr. Phillips') definition then, that he is a psychiatrist. Where are we getting when we appoint this chap to go around to these institutions, to deal with the superintendents of the institutions, who would, I think, be the

equal, at least in training and qualifications, to this man who is going around as a psychiatrist? Yet No. 8 quite specifically points out that if this chap says that, in his judgment, the man should be out, then he has the right and authority to override the superintendent's reluctance to letting the man out. I should think the superintendent's word in this matter would be of just as much importance, as the word of this Mental Health Officer, and I cannot see the necessity of it at all.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition must remember this refers to public general hospitals. They are really not custodial institutions.

MR. OLIVER: I know that.

HON. MR. FROST: Somebody has to have the say, and the officers appointed by the department have broad powers. If the person is so mentally ill that the Mental Health Officer would not release him, there are mental hospitals, for this sort of patient. I think it should be remembered these are not custodial institutions, and you have to have general powers, which would not apply in the ordinary course.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, it is even worse than it appeared at first. The Medical Officer of Health is defined as a “Medical Officer of Health appointed under the Public Health Act or any person having the powers thereof.” That certainly leaves it very, very open, and very wide. When we deal with mental health commitments, and the removal of patients, we cannot be too careful or too cautious in the formulation.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered it is a new problem. We are bringing public general hospitals into this field, and I think this power is a good one at the present time.

MR. OLIVER: If it is new, that is all the more reason it should be right at its inception.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The hon. Leader of the Opposition must understand this is a psychiatric unit within a general hospital.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) has made that quite clear.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: The superintendents of general hospitals are usually lay people and it says here:

He shall discuss the fitness of the patient with the superintendent at the hospital or an attending medical practitioner, and if satisfied that the patient ought to be discharged shall so order in writing—

Surely that is proper.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Minister thinks it is all right.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I certainly do.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not think it is good.

Sections 8 to 14 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 92 reported.

MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend the Mental Hospitals Act."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 93 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, we will hold out Orders No. 48, 49, 50 and 51.

PERSONS WHO DRILL OR BORE WELLS FOR WATER

House in Committee on Bill No. 98, "An Act respecting Persons who Drill or Bore Wells for Water."

MR. SALSBERG: See how clear the definition is, "who drill for water," but when it comes to psychiatric people—see?

Sections 1 to 12 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 98 reported.

PETTY TRESPASS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 99, "An Act to amend the Petty Trespass Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.
Bill No. 99 reported.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 100, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act."

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) what amount of money is set apart for this purpose?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: You mean in our Estimates?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: It is just under \$1 million.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 100 reported.

SCHOOL TRUSTEES COUNCIL ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend the School Trustees Council Act, 1953."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 101 reported.

PROTECTION FOR PERSONS WORKING IN TRENCHES

House in Committee on Bill No. 102, "An Act to Provide Protection for Persons Working in Trenches."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.
On section 5.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, would that apply to the laying of the—

MR. OLIVER: Subway?

MR. SALSBERG: —gas pipe lines, oil pipe lines, and so on?

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Certainly, if they were deep enough and wide enough.

MR. SALSBERG: How deep must it be in order to come under the Act?

HON. MR. DALEY: Four feet.

Sections 5 to 27 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 102 reported.

ELEVATORS AND LIFTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 103, "An Act to amend the Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.
On section 4.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I did not know that dumb-waiters were used in industry very much, but I understand there are still some old houses which have dumb-waiters of one sort or another. Would that apply to them? Do they need appellants?

HON. MR. DALEY: No, dumb-waiters are quite extensively used in industry, and some of them are quite sizeable and require attention.

MR. SALSBERG: Restaurants?

HON. MR. DALEY: Yes.

Sections 4 to 8 inclusive agreed to.
Bill No. 103 reported.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 104, "An Act to amend the Conservation Authorities Act."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like that held over.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition wants it held over? All right. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House reports 9 bills without amendment, and 1 bill with amendment, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when this House adjourns the present sittings thereof, it do stand adjourned until 2 of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended insofar as they may apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there will be no night session tomorrow night, but there will be night sessions on Wednesday and Thursday, and the House will meet at 2 o'clock on each afternoon. Tomorrow, there will be third readings and then the Estimates of the Department of Mines, the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the Department of Planning and Development.

MR. OLIVER: No debate on the budget tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: No. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.25 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 30, 1954.

Fourth Report Standing Committee on Municipal Law, Mr. Beckett	943
Eleventh Report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Beckett	943
Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Division Courts Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Evidence Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Judicature Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Warehouse Receipts Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Wills Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954, third reading	944
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954, third reading	944
Corporations Information Act, 1953, bill to amend, third reading	944
Unemployment Relief Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Professional Engineers Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Infants Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Credit Unions Act, 1953, bill to amend, third reading	944
Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954, third reading	944
Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Highways Improvement Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Schools Administration Act, 1954, bill to amend, third reading	944
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Mental Health Act, 1954, third reading	944
Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Persons Who Bore or Drill Wells for Water, bill respecting, third reading	944
Petty Trespass Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Public Health Act, bill to amend, third reading	944
Ontario School Trustees' Council Act, 1953, bill to amend, third reading	944
Protection for Persons Working in Trenches, bill to provide, third reading	944
Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953, bill to amend, third reading	944
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	944
Estimates, Department of Mines, Mr. Kelly	944
Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Dunbar	957
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	979
Koss Memorial Hospital, bill respecting, reported	980
Hamilton Foundation, bill to incorporate, reported	980
City of Peterborough, No. 1, bill respecting, reported	981
City of Peterborough, No. 2, bill respecting, reported	981
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, reported	981
Telephone Act, 1954, as amended, reported	982
Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, reported	982
Planning Act, bill to amend, as amended, reported	982
City of St. Thomas, bill respecting, reported	982
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, reported	982
Charitable Institutions Act, bill to amend, reported	982
Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952, bill to amend, reported	983
Magistrates Act, bill to amend, reported	984
Judicature Act, bill to amend, reported	984
Security Transfer Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	984
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, reported	984
Resolution No. 16, by Mr. Frost, agreed to	985
Motion to Adjourn, Mr Frost, agreed to	985

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1954.

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very happy today to welcome students from the Owen Sound Collegiate Institute, the Memorial Public School in Hamilton, and the Ajax Public School.

We are particularly happy to welcome those of you from out of the city to this meeting of the Assembly, and hope you have gained a great deal from the various tours which you have taken this morning, and likewise that you will gain something from our deliberations in the House this afternoon.

I would also like to welcome two guests who are seated in the Speaker's Gallery whom the hockey fans will be glad to know about. One is my very good friend, the sports announcer for the Detroit Red Wings—not that I am supporting them at all—and also the gentleman who takes care of those players who may receive injuries as a result of colliding with our Maple Leafs, Doctor Sheets.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. H. BECKETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Fourth and final Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Beckett from the Standing Committee on

Municipal Law begs leave to present the following as its Fourth and final Report.

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. BECKETT: In the absence of Mr. Nickle, I beg leave to present the Eleventh Report of the Standing Committee of Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Beckett in the absence of Mr. Nickle, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the committee's Eleventh Report as follows:

Your Standing Committee on Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its Eleventh Report:

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported:

Bill No. 28, An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

The following bills were read a third time, passed and intituled as in the motion:

Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Warehouse Receipts Act.

Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 58, The Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954.

Bill No. 63, The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Corporations Information Act, 1953.

Bill No. 67, An Act to amend The Unemployment Relief Act.

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Professional Engineers Act.

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Infants Act.

Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act, 1953.

Bill No. 75, The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954.

Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Highways Improvement Act.

Bill No. 84, The Schools Administration Act, 1954.

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 86, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Bill No. 92, The Mental Health Act, 1954.

Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The The Mental Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 98, An Act Respecting Persons Who Bore or Drill Wells for Water.

Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Petty Trespass Act.

Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Ontario School Trustees' Council Act, 1953.

Bill No. 102, An Act to Provide Protection for Persons Working in Trenches.

Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee. Mr. Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Vote 103, Main Office, \$367,500.

HON. MR. KELLY (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, before this Committee of the Whole House begins its consideration of the figures which are to be presented, I ask your indulgence while I outline, as briefly as possible, the activities of the department during the past year, our proposed programme for

the fiscal year 1954-55, and the general picture of Ontario's great and growing mining industry.

It is a pleasure to be able to tell the House that this year the revenue derived from Ontario's mining industry through the medium of modest service fees, taxes, rentals, royalties, licences, etc., has enriched the Treasury by \$5,072,000 against \$1,070,000 ordinary expenditures for the operation of the department. Thus, the net surplus on the year's activities is \$4,002,000 on the basis of 10 months' actual operations and 2 months' forecast.

I believe that every member of this House has received a copy of the preliminary report of the Mines Department covering the operations for the calendar year 1953. I commend the report to your attention—the information it contains is worth much more than a casual glance.

I would direct your attention to a simple graph on page 11 of the report. It shows more forcefully than any words of mine could, the progress which has been made in a brief half-century by those who have invested their toil, skill, and dollars in Ontario's underground wealth.

In the year 1900, the total production of the mines was \$10 million. In 1941 the mines of Ontario produced a total of \$270 million in new wealth. From then until 1946, war and post-war problems resulted in a setback, the most serious which the industry has yet experienced. By 1946 production had dropped to \$190 million, a loss of some \$80 million annually. Then, however, came a truly astounding recovery. The graph's production line swings through an almost complete circle and speeds upward almost vertically, through \$250 million in 1947, \$300 million in 1948, \$380 million in 1950, \$450 million in 1951, about the same in 1952, right up to the all-time high of \$460,476,113 established by the mines of Ontario in 1953.

An extremely important development of 1953, which can be expected to show tangible dividends this year, followed the discovery of wide-spread deposits of radioactive mineral in the vicinity of

Blind River, midway between Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie. A claim-staking rush of major proportions developed, and exploratory diamond-drilling is continuing over a large area.

Already two very large deposits have been outlined and if, as a result of the exploratory work which is still going on, a continuance of the uranium-bearing fault can be proven, we may look with confidence to the development of a new, immensely valuable mining range—a source of that magic material which today stands as the world's No. 1 strategic mineral. One important company has announced its plans to begin underground mining operations this year.

Mr. Chairman, no honourable member of this House can fail to have been impressed with the importance which a newly discovered mining area in Northwestern Ontario has assumed in the economic thinking of this province. The name "Manitouwadge" has assumed magic proportions in the mine-man's lexicon and it has even been said that the copper, zinc and silver showings so far indicated in that area, southeast of Lake Nipigon, would make the discovery the most important single development since copper and nickel were brought to light at Sudbury.

I have dealt with only some of the developments of the last year. There are many others, some perhaps of almost equal importance which I might just mention in passing. There is the Werner Lake area north of Kenora where significant indications of copper, nickel and precious metals have come to light. There is the discovery of radioactive mineral in the Bancroft area. There is a new graphite discovery near Verona in Eastern Ontario. There are the columbium and uranium deposits in the Lake Nipissing area, awaiting only the solution of the difficult metallurgical problems related to separating these minerals from the component ores, before new and important development proceeds. Then there is the reported discovery of radioactive minerals in the Centre Lake area north of Peterborough.

Apart from the actual production figures themselves, could there be any better index of the healthy state of the industry than the fact that, in the 12 months ending December 31st last, an all-time record was set with the staking and recording of more than 29,000 claims throughout the province?

The pace of this activity is continuing unabated and this year up until March 17th a total of 11,965 claims had been recorded in the various recording offices throughout the province.

A few minutes ago I named some of the areas in which staking rushes of major importance occurred last year. So far this year the greatest activity has been in the Manitouwadge area, which I referred to a moment ago. Up until the 17th of this month, the office for that division reported a total of 7,350 claims. Then there has been unusual activity in the Centre Lake area, north of Peterborough. Our Toronto office, which covers Eastern Ontario, reports that up until the 17th, some 1,872 claims had been recorded, for the most part in the Bancroft-Centre Lake area. This total far surpasses anything which had ever previously been known in that part of Eastern Ontario. The search in that area is, of course, primarily for radioactive minerals.

With respect to mining roads, since the inception of the programme in 1951, we have completed 31 of these roads, or have work on them under way. This represents a total of 242.5 miles of road—all good road although it is not, and is not intended to be, up to Class 1 highway specifications. I would refer the hon. members to the table on page 28 of the Preliminary Report and to the accompanying map for a more detailed picture of the physical accomplishment to date.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken on several occasions, both in this House and elsewhere, on the subject of these roads and what they can mean to our North Country. It is a subject which lies close to my heart so I hope you will bear with me if I strive, within the space of a very few minutes, to sum up the part which mining access roads

can be made to play in our whole economy.

Naturally, my primary interest is in the development of our mining resources and under the terms of the fiat implied in the cash Vote for these roads, the one unvarying stipulation is that the road to be built must serve to open up promising new territory for mineral development, or make possible increased output from an already-established producing mine.

Having met this qualification, any other benefits which might accrue from the construction of the road may be considered as a bonus—a bonus which in the aggregate is often fully as important as the primary consideration. In this way these roads have served as avenues through which large areas of our forest can be harvested profitably. Many of them serve as a ready means to reach and combat outbreaks of fire. Some, in areas which are suitable for agriculture, provide means of communication along which settlements may be expected to spring up. Many of them serve as an added lure to holiday visitors—a means of entry to some of the finest hunting and fishing areas on the continent. Through the medium of some of these roads—notably the Sinclair Road from Gogama, the Matachewan-Kenogami Road and the Warren Lake Road, all opened for traffic last year—this government has earned the gratitude and the respect of people who, without them, were either completely isolated from the rest of the world or were obliged to travel a long, round-about route to reach any outside destination. I wish all the members of this House had been able to stand with me in the little town of Gogama last year as the new road, linking that town with the outside world, was opened and the first cars ever seen there swept under the barrier. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to conceive just how much the ending of long years of isolation means to people in that country.

There is a vast empire in Northern Ontario still waiting to be developed. I believe that, within the limits of our capabilities, we have taken important

steps toward this development through the roads we have already built. But these are just first steps and the programme must be continued this year and for a good many years to come before its full potentialities are realized. Thus on a long-term basis, we have a plan to utilize existing bush roads, privately owned lumbering roads and public roads of all kinds, to tie them in with new road links so that, not only individual communities, but whole large areas may be joined by a continuous network of roads spanning the North and making ours one great cohesive province.

If the hon. members will refer to the map inside the back cover of the Preliminary Report, I will endeavour to explain in part my idea as to how this grand design can be brought about reasonably and without any vast expenditure of public monies.

I realize that what the officials of my department and I have in mind involves a great deal of work and the expenditure of considerable sums of the people's money. I realize that it cannot all be done at once, that it must be considered as a continuing programme.

Now let us revert to the estimated ordinary expenditures of the department for the next fiscal year.

Under the "Main Office" Vote we are asking for \$367,500, which is a reduction of \$11,500 from our expenditures for the present year. This is the result of incorporation of \$300 of the cost-of-living bonus salaries, and the appropriated amounts provided for under all other Votes are a part of any increases noted.

The main office is the administrative centre of the department, and it is responsible for policy, accounting procedure, budgetary control, taxation and the collection of revenue, the publication of geological reports and maps, and other informative works, the operation of the public relations and information programme, maintenance of the mining court, operation of the departmental library and general supervision of the department.

The functions of all other branches of the department are self-evident and I

may say, Mr. Chairman, that, apart from additional monies provided for salary increases of \$33,000, the total of appropriations for the department exceeds the estimated expenditures for the current year by only \$30,000. Most of this amount is being devoted to increased activities in the geological, laboratories, and mining-lands branches, all of which are affected by the greatly increased interest in prospecting activity.

In my address on the Estimates last year, I touched at some length on the activities of each branch individually. The general outline remains unchanged from year to year, and by way of saving the time of this House, I will not enter into any sort of repetitive statement just now. In any case, Mr. Chairman, the story is told pretty completely in our Preliminary Report which I hope will receive the attention of the hon. members.

There are others here which I could mention, but I wish to get on the Estimates, and in concluding these remarks, I would like to pay tribute to the members of the staff of the Department of Mines who have worked diligently this year to produce possibly the all-time high in mining in the history of this province, without whose efforts we could not have done nearly as good a job as has been done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 103, Main Office, \$367,500.

On Vote 103.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few general observations which can only be made under the item dealing with the main office, and that is on the question of policy in mining.

We are all very happy to hear of the new developments in the rare and very valuable metals in the province. However, the hon. Minister did not assure this House, nor the province, that the policy of his department and of the government is expressive of a very definite policy to assure the maximum value of the mining resources for the people of the province.

What I have in mind, Mr. Chairman,

is that a government policy, if it is to be supported, should look upon the mining of the wealth that is underground as a heritage of the people, and that the exploitation of that wealth should result in the maximum of employment opportunities in the province, and the expansion of industry and commerce. If no such policy exists, and if the activities of the department are not directed toward such an end, then we are indeed failing in the elementary duties toward the people of the province, and toward the generations which are to follow us.

There is nothing to be boastful about digging up the iron ore and other valuable ores, if the ores are to be shipped out of the country, and will result in a loss of employment opportunities, and in a retarding of the economic development of the province.

What I say, is of course, not entirely new. This problem has been dealt with by a great number of people and many organizations, public spokesmen, newspapers and other periodicals, but I am sorry to say that all these expressions of deep concern about the absence of what could be described as an orientation toward the development of the resources to the great benefit to the people of the province, has failed to change the attitude of the government. I think it was expressed in regard to iron ore very ably by an official of the department, whose words have been quoted in this House previously. However, I think his words are so important, that I will take the liberty of repeating them. They are the words of Mr. Lyle, of the Research Branch of the government. He said:

A ton of iron ore, mined in Canada, and sold to a foreign steel company, brings Canada a revenue of about \$10. When the same ton of ore is smelted in Canada and turned into a wide range of steel products—as a great deal is—it makes about half a ton of such common household products as nails, screws, coathangers, etc.

So used, this ton of Canadian ore becomes Canadian manufactured products with a retail value ranging from \$80 to \$90. It takes no wide stretch of the imagination to calculate

the benefits to Canadians from the translation to our raw materials into end-use products.

In the simple illustration just mentioned, the gain is at least \$70 per ton of ore—a sum that finds its way into a great many pockets and benefits Canadian workmen, wholesalers, retailers and consumers.

The words of Mr. Lyle, I think, should be translated into policy. They have not been. The result is that the action of the department and the government, far from improving the situation regarding the depletion of natural resources, continues merrily—I would say recklessly—along a very foolish path, of inviting, encouraging, and stimulating the entry of American corporations into the vast mineral areas, knowing full well that they are to export the raw materials to their own country for manufacture and fabrication.

At the Head of the Lakes last year there was a great “hullabaloo” about the fact that the Inland Steel Company was going to invest \$50 million in further expanding the Steep Rock field. It is true that an investment of such a large amount will provide a “quick dollar” to some people, but it is a very foolish policy to pursue, and is certainly nothing to be merry about.

The \$50 million will go. The big investors will make their share; a number of workmen and others, who will be employed will earn some money, but it is a penny-wise-and-pound foolish policy to pursue. What we need primarily is a steel mill at the Head of the Lakes. That would be a great accomplishment. The processing of the iron ore from the Steep Rock area at the Head of the Lakes would transform the north-western part of the province, and would create many new job opportunities, would enlarge those communities and create new markets for all kinds of Canadian products. That would be an accomplishment of which this government could justly be proud.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Is the hon. member making a speech on the budget?

MR. SALSBERG: Instead they are very glad when they can announce that Inland Steel or Steep Rock Mining, that is, a corporation headed by Cyrus Eaton, are stepping in and shipping the ore out of the country.

Another example of how incorrect the government's policy is, was provided last year when a bill was introduced and carried in this House—I think it was Bill 67—which made possible the granting of privileges to large corporations to have exclusive rights over an area of 100,000 acres, or so. I think I am correct. It was quite clearly labeled as a very harmful thing by the Prospectors' Association, through their spokesman.

An hon. member close to me says I am not correct. I will read an extract from the *Telegram* dated March 14th, 1953, in which Mr. Cyril T. Young, vice-president of the Prospectors' Association, said his group was opposed to the concessions:

"This bill," he said, "is awfully dangerous. It opens the possibility that Wall St. will blanket the north."

Because only the largest corporations, and most of them from the United States, could undertake the prospecting of these vast areas at the expense of the small-scale independent prospectors. I referred to the clipping, because of the remarks of an hon. member of this House. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition said about that bill last year that it "smells" and I think he was right. The bill did smell. Yet that is the policy of the government being applied toward our ore and the mineral resources generally.

It is not only this government which is doing that. The Ottawa Government is not much better—the Liberal Government. Yet, there is this difference; that the Conservative Opposition in Ottawa is saying things similar to what I am saying in this House today.

MR. D. McM. KERR: No. no.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, yes. It is an astonishing and amazing situation when the Conservatives are in Opposition in

Ottawa; they give—I do not think it would be parliamentary to mention what is commonly referred to, as to what they are giving the government—but they have given them an awful "lambasting" for the policy of handing over our natural resources to American interests. But when the same Conservatives are in power in Ontario, as unfortunately they are, they do exactly the same thing as the Liberals in Ottawa are doing.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Does the hon. member say it is "unfortunate"?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, very much, from my point of view.

It is interesting when the Conservative Party in the House of Commons attempts to argue with Mr. Howe, as I am attempting to argue here, that he becomes very indignant. Of course, the hon. members know that the Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe can become very indignant and resentful of any criticism of his actions.

However, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe said:

Canada is immensely fortunate in that it is rich in these commodities the world needs and which the world is able to pay for, no matter what market conditions prevail in the have-not countries of the world. If we were only making goods that countries might like when prosperous, but be able to do without when things are tough, we would have in this country just about the most unstable economy that could be contemplated. I hope there will not be any more talk of export of raw materials and concentrating on finished goods. The idea is fantastic. It is a ridiculous proposal.

And the Tories, in Opposition, shouted "No."

Here is a case where I share the views of the Conservative Opposition in Ottawa, and I say to this government, why do you not practice what you preach? It would be an excellent thing if you were to practice in this instance,

what your national spokesmen are advocating in the House of Commons.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS: Do you advocate protection?

MR. SALSBERG: You are saying the same thing that was said by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe, that you are proud that the Inland Company has come in, and will spend \$50 million in that rich iron ore area, and you are boastful also of the fact that you continue to ask the American interests to come in and invest their money, as if this country was in its colonial stage, and was dollar hungry, and could not undertake any major capital development. That is not so. You should have a policy, I suggest, which would definitely stimulate the development processing industries for all of our iron ore, as well as other minerals.

MR. ROBERTS: High protection. Is that what the hon. member is advocating?

MR. SALSBERG: No, I am not advocating high protection. I am advocating a policy which was discussed in this House about 30 years ago, in relation to nickel ore. I am only applying it to a wider field.

What happened at that time? An outside group of financiers obtained control of the richest nickel deposit in the world. They dug up the nickel ore, and shipped it to refineries and smelters outside of the country.

In the First World War, it was found the nickel ore from Ontario was finding its way to Germany, and was used in the manufacture of bullets which were fired at Canadian and Allied forces on the Western Front.

This House—I think it was in 1917—enacted an amendment to the Mining Act—a very important amendment—which provided—I will read the amendment, a very excellent historic document, which should be repeated whenever the occasion arises. The amendment reads:

(1) All lands, claims, or mining rights leased, patented, or otherwise

disposed of under this Act on or after the 12th day of April, 1917, shall be subject to the condition that all ores or minerals raised or removed therefrom shall be treated and refined within Canada, so as to yield refined metal or other products suitable for direct use in the arts without further treatment, in default whereof the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may declare the lease, patent or other form of title of such lands, claims or mining rights to be null and void, and the Order-in-Council so declaring shall be registered in the office of the local master of titles or registry office as the case may be, whereupon such lands, claims or mining rights shall revert to and become vested in His Majesty, His Heirs and Successors, freed and discharged of any interest or claim of any other person.

That is a very clear section I would say, and leaves no doubt in the minds of anybody as to what the Legislature of Ontario had in mind in 1917.

Then section 2 provides:

(2) The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is hereby authorized to exempt any lands, claims or mining rights from the operation of this section for such period of time as to him may seem proper.

And the last section, No. 3, reads:

(3) This section shall not apply to iron ore, nor to the lands, claims or mining rights from which iron ore is mined or taken.

That is the section, as amended, in 1917.

The purpose, of course, as was clearly expressed, was to process the nickel ore which was dug up in this province, here in Canada. It made it clear that it should be in a state which would require no further refining or treatment, but ready for the arts—meaning, ready for use.

The fact that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council was given authority to suspend the operation of the Act was, I am sure, deliberately done so as not

to close any operations during the period when the smelter or refinery would be in course of construction. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the government should bring in a bill to amend the Mining Act, to eliminate subsection 3 of section 102. In other words, the exclusion of iron ore in the Act should be done away with. If that were done, then the government would really approach a policy which would, in time, result in the establishment of steel mills, iron foundries and other types of industry, to treat our iron ores.

I will be told that iron ore is not in the same category as nickel ore. That is true. I am not suggesting we do not export iron ore. I am suggesting, however, that section 2 of the Act gives you sufficient power, not to apply it immediately, but you would have a whip in your hands to use, so as to direct the development of the mining industry in a very definite direction. At present you have not got it, and I think the time has come for the government to face up to its responsibility.

I know the hon. Minister of Mines has tried and so has every member of his staff and his department. The opening of roads is a laudable thing and all the hon. members are quite satisfied with it. The discovery of new precious minerals is something we are all very happy about, but it is not a policy, and does not take the place of a policy. A sound policy, based upon the long-range needs and interest of the province, would demand that you stimulate, encourage, insist on and do everything in your power for the utilization of these ores, all of them, for the development of industry, the fabricating industry, the processing industry right here in Ontario. This would provide new towns, new industrial areas, and opportunities for everybody from the labourer to the engineer, to the architect, to the chemist and to other scientists whose services are required in an expanding industry of this sort.

In conclusion, I want to say that I do not pretend to be the only one who desires that. I am sure there are other hon. members in this House who would

subscribe to that. What I say, however, is that the government does not pursue a policy which will ever bring this about. In the meantime until it does there is no cause for merriment, enjoyment or boastfulness when all we can say is we have discovered new ores, new riches. All that happens today is that this riches is being dug up, put on boats and trains and shipped out of this land.

Item No. 2 agreed to.

On Vote 103, item 3, Maintenance—\$116,900.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): On item 3, about the third item from the bottom, 'Forfeiture of Mining Claims,' I was wondering how you could spend money in forfeiting mining claims.

HON. MR. KELLY: The explanation of that is the cost of obtaining abstracts from the Land Titles Office. The costs involved in forfeiting the claims are due to the abstracts from the Land Titles Office, as well as the cost of advertising the claims.

MR. GRUMMETT: Filing documents, and so forth?

HON. MR. KELLY: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 104, Geological Branch—\$250,200.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I want to ask the hon. Minister a question in respect to mining and roads. I noticed in a press release from his department last fall, in connection with the Matachewan-Kenogami road, that this press release sets out the statement and goes on to say there were 22 roads in the Northern Ontario mining areas opened up. Most of these projects were handled on a co-operative basis with one or more established mining companies participating with the department.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister just to what extent do mining companies participate in the building of these roads, if the participation is equal in all roads, or does the department

assess the participation of the mining company in the cost of these mining roads?

HON. MR. KELLY: We have a formula, whereby the mining companies participate, which is in line with that accorded any municipality in Southern Ontario. Where we build a road in conjunction with a mining company, we participate 50 per cent. Where we have no specific mining company to deal with, such as going through the Warren Lake area, the department, on the premise that it is building up potential mining areas based on the advice of our geologists, builds the road in its entirety and bears the entire cost.

Votes 103 and 104 agreed to.

On Vote 105, Mines Inspection Branch—\$131,400.

MR. GRUMMETT: Item 1: How many inspectors are in the employ of the department?

HON. MR. KELLY: The total is 15, including the chief inspector.

MR. GRUMMETT: 15 mining inspectors?

HON. MR. KELLY: That is right.

MR. GRUMMETT: On the same item, the last portion, "Guarding Abandoned Mine Workings," what expenditure do you have in that connection in mines?

HON. MR. KELLY: This is a provision where we cannot recover the cost due to mines which were possibly shut down many, many years ago and the company is non-existent. Yet we must guard the pits which are there and fence them in from time to time. It is a small amount.

MR. GRUMMETT: How much was spent last year on that item?

HON. MR. KELLY: The amount is very close to \$500.

Votes 105 and 106 agreed to.

On Vote 107, Natural Gas Commissioner's Branch—\$34,000.

MR. SALSBERG: In view of the fact there is a Gas Commission to be appointed, I wonder why the Estimates are at the low figure shown here? It is either an indication that the Natural Gas, or whatever they call it, the Fuel Commission will not be within the Mining Department, or that the Natural Gas Commissioner's Branch will be maintained regardless of the new Fuel Commission to be set up. At any rate, I think an explanation is necessary.

HON. MR. KELLY: In connection with the Estimates for the Natural Gas Commissioner's office, I might say at the present time steps are being taken to form the Ontario Fuel Board, which will take in the duties of the Natural Gas Commissioner, the Fuel Controller, the Natural Gas Referee, in which event the Estimates now being voted will not be used for this specific purpose. However, I rather imagine warrants will be issued to provide funds for the Ontario Fuel Board.

MR. SALSBERG: May I continue with this question? Does that mean it is not the intention to have the Fuel Board constituted within the Department of Mines?

MR. KERR (Davenport): That was answered.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not think it was. I am asking the hon. Minister and I hope he will answer.

HON. MR. KELLY: That is a matter of policy. It has not yet been decided where the board will sit. In the interim, it is necessary for the work to go on until these things are all correlated and joined up to form this board. Therefore, at the present time, we can do nothing other than include this figure of \$34,000, for the work irrespective of whether it rests in our Estimates.

In the event that the board is formed shortly, and it becomes unnecessary to spend these amounts, then, of course, we will have a surplus in here. But by

the same token, we would have to provide for warrants for the Ontario Fuel Board whose costs are not provided for in these Estimates.

MR. GRUMMETT: I want to go back to Vote 106, item 1—"Cable Testing Laboratory, Toronto." Some 8 or 9 years ago, the hon. members of the House were given an opportunity to go to the laboratory and watch the testing of cable. That to me was a very interesting experience, and I was wondering if there had been any hon. member of the House who has recently taken advantage of watching the cable testing done over in the laboratory.

It is something which everyone should see, because it is very interesting to watch these great machines tearing the cables apart. To me it was extremely interesting and I am sure all the hon. members would like to see it, if they were made aware of just when cable testing was taking place.

HON. MR. KELLY: I am advised that the testing is going on continuously and the hon. members are not only free, but welcome to go over to the East Block and see this process at any time they desire.

MR. GRUMMETT: Some years ago, a message was given in the House that members could go over on a certain day. I think at least 30 or 35 members took advantage of that offer and watched the testing taking place. Perhaps the hon. Minister could arrange to give the hon. members that privilege again.

MR. OLIVER: What is the picture in respect to the production of natural gas in Southwestern Ontario? Is it on the increase, or have you any figures?

HON. MR. KELLY: As you may know, I have been on the Gas Committee and the figures effecting Southwestern Ontario—and when I say "Southwestern Ontario," I am speaking of natural gas—consumption of gas are as follows: the storage figures are 160 billion cubic feet capacity. They have a potential production for 20 years estimated at 8

billion cubic feet per year. The relation of that figure to the over-all figure of the pipeline would be in the nature of 1/20th of the total required. In other words, Ontario's own production represents approximately 1/20th of Ontario's total consumption.

Vote 107 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 108, Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator—\$10,000.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether there is a decline in the claims on account of these fumes in the Sudbury area, and if that is the result of the improvement in the situation generally up there?

HON. MR. KELLY: I would say that the condition in Sudbury which originated about 35 years ago, from what we call the "open pit roasting process," caused a diffusion of the sulphur in the ore over a wide area that practically ate up all the foliage. But since the installation of the high smoke stacks, it is known now that even forestry is creeping back close into Sudbury in the last 20 years.

It is quite evident in sections not more than 5 miles out of the Town of Sudbury that this is the case.

MR. SALSBERG: Excepting, Mr. Chairman, that as late as 3 or 4 years ago, when we discussed this item, the hon. member for Sudbury brought to this House the complaints of many farmers in the district. I do not believe it is completely done away with, but all I was asking was whether the experience indicates a declining incidence of the effect of the sulphur or not?

HON. MR. KELLY: I think I can answer that. In the Preliminary Report for 1953, there were no arbitrations asked for in that year, either in the Sudbury district or at Port Colborne where the International Nickel Refinery is located.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Were any claims paid?

HON. MR. KELLY: Yes, some claims were paid.

MR. NIXON: What was the amount of damages?

HON. MR. KELLY: We do not have the details of that here, but it has all been settled satisfactorily between the mine and the claimant.

Vote 108 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On Vote 109, Mining Lands Branch—\$173,100.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): In order that I may make this enquiry, I would say it is rather refreshing to have on our desks at a time like this a report made up to the 31st of December, 1953, less than 3 months from this actual date, giving figures for the whole year. I would like to know if this is a new departure which is going to be adopted not only in the Department of Mines, but throughout all the government departments?

HON. MR. KELLY: This is a Preliminary Report based on the facts for 1953, and we made them as tight as we could get them to give the hon. members up-to-date information. I would like to answer two questions which were put to me earlier today. One was dealing with the export of ores from Canada, Ontario in particular. I would advise that we import iron ore from the United States both at Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie. It is necessary in the processing of steel to have different gradations and different types of ore to make certain types of steel. We not only export, but we import ore, so it is a two-way operation insofar as Ontario is concerned with iron ore.

The second question I would like to deal with is the reference to the leasing areas. There are 646,000 acres of them. I would like to read into the record a letter I have received from the president of the Prospectors' and Developers' Association in connection with that organization's feelings about the government's programme. This is a letter addressed to myself, dated March 29th, and I quote:

On behalf of the executive, may I express to you sincere appreciation of the Prospectors' and Developers' Association for the splendid contribution made by you and your department which helped so much towards making this year's convention such an outstanding success.

Dr. W. D. Harding, in carrying the heavy load of work entailed in dealing so splendidly with the very large prospectors' classes in Toronto and throughout Ontario, steadily increases the already heavy debt of gratitude owed to him by all the prospecting and mining fraternity of this province. As you are no doubt aware, our association has attempted to express some of its appreciation to Dr. Harding for his efforts by offering him, on unanimous vote, an Honorary Life Membership in the Prospectors' and Developers' Association.

Mr. Rickaby, ably supported by Mr. Forbes Macfarlane, helped us to make successful a difficult, yet important, Tuesday evening business meeting. The technical programmes benefited from the contributions by W. J. Pearson, E. M. Abraham and H. D. Carlson.

This is a letter received this year from the Prospectors' and Developers' Association. No question was ever raised by them this year as to the leasing which they spoke of last year.

MR. ROBERT HERBERT (Temiskaming): I would like to ask the hon. Minister if any consideration has been given to the issuing of mining tags at the time the prospectors go out to stake their claims?

As it is today, the prospector stakes his claim, comes back to the recording office, is issued tags and must return a great distance to the claim to put the tags on. I know another province is issuing tags at the time of staking and I would like to know the hon. Minister's views on that?

HON. MR. KELLY: I would say representations have been made to the

committee, and the department has it under study.

Vote 109 agreed to.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I noticed in a press release to the Department of Mines last fall that attention was drawn to the James Bay lowland. The press release said during the last few months a number of companies have manifested interest in the oil and gas possibilities of the area. I would like to hear the hon. Minister's views on that, please.

HON. MR. KELLY: I may say that we have determined that the development of the James Bay basin should be carried out on very honest and upright principles. We have been careful to ensure that—to use my own words—no party shall “boom the basin for the sake of mining the public.” The parties interested are, among others, the Lundberg Exploration Company, who inform me they have spent up to \$45,000 on aerial surveys in the area. These people also tell me that, on the melting of the snow in early June, they propose to carry out a seismic survey. Other Calgary interests have taken up some 300,000 acres in 100 square miles lots.

So far as the basin is concerned, I have been very interested in getting capital to come and explore it. According to the best information I can get, we do not know that there is oil in the basin. At the same time, we have no knowledge that it is not there. If it is there, this is a good thing for Ontario, because if we are sufficiently fortunate to discover gas and oil in the James Bay basin it would mean not only a great boom to Northern Ontario, but investment capital—risk capital—flowing into Ontario from overseas would certainly hit the jackpot.

Item agreed to.

Vote 110, Main Office, Construction of Mining Roads, \$1 million.

MR. OLIVER: I should like to ask the hon. Minister with regard to this

Vote, what was the actual expenditure last year of this \$1 million for mining roads?

HON. MR. KELLY: Our total expenditure, as close as I can estimate up to March 31, was \$875,000.

MR. GRUMMETT: I just want to say a word or two to commend the hon. Minister (Mr. Kelly) on what he has been doing in connection with mining access roads. I think it was a good move on the part of the government to set aside certain funds for use by the hon. Minister of Mines in order that he might provide for better access to the mines. The hon. Minister of Mines knows the situation in Northern Ontario and, to put it bluntly, I believe he is a little more sympathetic than the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to the construction of such roads.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) should not say that, after all the money that has been spent in his own riding.

MR. GRUMMETT: The hon. Minister of Highways did a good job on the main highways, but I am also interested in access roads to mines, and I wish to commend the hon. Minister of Mines for what he has done. I sincerely hope that, in the coming year, he will be given even greater scope and a greater amount of funds in order to carry on with this good work.

MR. R. HERBERT (Temiskaming): I too would like to congratulate the hon. Minister on the remarkable job he has done in building mining access roads. I wish to ask him, however, if any steps have been taken to have closer liaison between his department and the Department of Highways. In our area we have several mining roads which are now coming back into use after a number of years during which they carried very little traffic. Both the Department of Mines and the Department of Highways

feel this is the responsibility of the other department, and my feeling is that a closer liaison should be reached between the two.

HON. MR. KELLY: There is very close agreement between us, not only with the Department of Highways, but also with the Department of Lands and Forests. We recognize that Cobalt is coming back, with 30 mines in production, and, between the 3 departments, we shall see that Cobalt mining roads are served.

MR. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): I understand, Mr. Chairman, that a report will be presented on mining access roads shortly. I imagine at that time, hon. members will be given an opportunity to express their views on the allocation of this sum of \$1 million for such roads. I think that report will be highly enlightening, and will give the House some indication of what hon. members may expect to see in this connection.

MR. SALSBERG: I should like to ask whether in the construction of these mining roads, the hon. Minister is contracting the work out to private road contracting companies, whether the work is being done for the Department of Mines by the Department of Highways or if the Department of Mines has its own facilities for the construction of these roads? I think a picture of how this matter is handled would be welcome.

HON. MR. KELLY: Let us take, for example, the situation in the Manitouwadge area, which will, no doubt, develop this year to a point where it will require access roads leading off the main roads entering the region. If a mining company is prepared to contribute 50 per cent. of the cost of a road leading to its own mine, the department, after a survey of the estimated cost, will go along with this dollar for dollar. If, on the other hand, we are determined to build a road to open up an area, such as we are presently doing in the case of the road leading north from the Westing

road to join with the road leading south and east to Timmins, this is a project of the department which is put up for tender and public bids. Is that the answer to the question?

MR. SALSBERG: Not quite. Unfortunately, I did not make myself clear enough. I am asking, Mr. Chairman, what policy the Mining Department pursues in building these roads generally. I will repeat: Does it engage outside contractors on the basis of tenders, or does it make use of the Department of Highways to build these roads, or, finally, does the department possess the machinery and staff to do the building itself?

HON. MR. KELLY: I think I have covered two of those points. As to the third point, of the 22 roads which I have listed in my report, the great majority were built for us by the Department of Highways and under that department's supervision.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister's own department did not build any roads?

HON. MR. KELLY: We have never built them ourselves.

MR. SALSBERG: So that if you decide to build, it is done either by the Department of Highways or the work is put out for tender. Is it true that in no circumstances does the hon. Minister's department finance a mining company's road project? In other words, if a mining company is desirous of opening a road to a mine, the department undertakes to pay 50 per cent. of the cost of that road, would that 50 per cent. be paid to the mining company so that they might build a road to their own mine?

HON. MR. KELLY: I have explained that. A mining company will ask us to contribute 50 per cent. of the cost of building a road. It will ask a construction company to build the road. Upon presentation of the bill, we contribute dollar for dollar. As to the cost

to us, it is limited in the first instance by the total amount allowed the mining company. In the second instance, it is checked to ensure that the expenditure shown has in fact been paid.

MR. SALSBERG: In such instances does the checking of the construction work, to ascertain whether we are getting full value for the dollars we spend, become the responsibility of the Department of Mines or does it fall on the Department of Highways? The latter department would be better equipped, I imagine, to determine such a question.

HON. MR. KELLY: In some instances this is done by our own department, but in the majority of cases we have had to rely on the Department of Highways.

Vote 110 agreed to.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Vote 111, Main Office—\$2,489,000.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Chairman, I suggest through you that I might pass my notes to the representative of *Hansard*, as I have done in past years. Hon. members may direct any questions to me which they may like to ask during the passage of the Estimates. I would point out that this is a service department, giving service to the municipalities and, as I said, I will hand my notes to *Hansard* if this is satisfactory, as has been done in the past. Hon. members can read them and we can get on with the Estimates.

MR. OLIVER: I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) should agree to make a preliminary statement before the Estimates. It is hardly the proper thing to pass this to *Hansard*. That does not do very much good. I do not know whether the speech will or not.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: If hon. members prefer it the other way, I am quite willing to oblige them.

The Assessment Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs was created in 1947, and each year since that time there has been a rapid increase in the volume of their work and duties. Their duties, though always closely related to assessment, have become more varied with the passing of the years.

NEED FOR FORMATION OF BRANCH

The branch was created not only because of the constant demands of municipalities for assistance with their assessment problems, but also due to the proven necessity of assisting municipalities in the installation of proper assessment systems, which in turn would produce an equalized assessment. A correct basis of assessment is necessary for many reasons, among them being:

(1) As municipal taxes are based on assessment, it is necessary to have a proper equalized assessment on properties of all types so that no taxpayer or particular class of property owners will pay more than their just share of taxes.

(2) Many charges levied on the various municipalities, which form part of a county unit, or a territorial district unit, are based on assessment, so an equalized assessment in the various municipalities in the unit must be achieved to apportion such costs properly.

(3) Since the apportionment of costs for the erection and maintenance of not only high schools, but also elementary schools in many high school districts, township school areas, union school sections, etc., are based on assessment, it is necessary to obtain an overall equalized assessment. This is particularly important where such school districts or areas overlap into two or more counties or territorial districts.

(4) As many government grants are based on assessment, an equalized basis of assessment is necessary so that every municipality will receive its just share of such grants. While the new system of unconditional grants is not based on assessment but

population, it is necessary that municipal assessors be properly instructed in their duties, as they are responsible for taking such a population count.

The branch has assisted in the above endeavours in the past years and has spent considerable time and effort in a great number of municipalities in advising and assisting elected representatives and appointed officials when proper assessment systems were installed for the first time, or where their present systems were being revamped. Unfortunately, this work had to be greatly curtailed in 1953 due to the necessity of completing the re-assessment of the Greater Toronto Area. However, when possible, this work was carried on and it is expected that in future years it will be greatly extended.

FUTURE EXPANSION

Early in 1954, it is expected that the staff of the Assessment Branch will be augmented by at least 7 new assessors. This will enable the branch to carry out some of the projects which have been promised. It will also enable the Assessment Branch to arrange a future programme embracing more extensively the establishment of a proper equalized assessment in all the municipalities of Ontario.

MANUAL OF ASSESSMENT VALUES

As of December 31st, 1953, at least 500 municipalities had adopted the manual for assessment purposes. During the year 6 cities completed their re-assessments on the manual basis, namely: Ottawa, Sudbury, Peterborough, North Bay, St. Thomas and Woodstock, with very successful results, in addition to a number of towns, villages and townships.

The branch has tried out changes and additions to the manual in the Toronto area, and these changes will be incorporated in future revisions of the manual. Some very good suggestions which will benefit the manual have been again received, but it is noted that criticism is still being received from persons who apparently have neither read nor studied the manual. In the manual there

are at least 5 different classifications (and 2 more will be added shortly) of properties. These, along with the rental capitalization feature, affect the so-called old-age and obsolescence depreciation factors. If used properly, any depreciation necessary for age or obsolescence is taken care of in the manual.

GREATER TORONTO ASSESSMENT BRANCH

Legislation was enacted in 1953 to provide that the assessment, made by the board in 1953, should be used for taxation purposes in 1954. As at the end of December, 1953, 10 of the 12 suburban municipalities had returned their assessment rolls on the new basis, while the last 2 returned their rolls in January of this year. The total assessment rolls in the individual municipalities showed an increase of anywhere from 100 per cent. to 384 per cent., while some individual assessments were raised as much as 1,000 per cent. The difference in the increase was created by 2 factors:

(a) the percentage of actual value the local assessor was assessing for previously, and

(b) the amount of growth in the municipality.

The percentage of appeals against the assessment was amazingly small. Less than 2 per cent. of the assessments were appealed (including the rolls returned in January), while the total adjustment at Courts of Revision was less than 1½ per cent. of the new assessment, of which the majority was suggested by the board. In 8 municipalities there were 70 appeals from the Court of Revision to the county judge. In the hearings before 3 county judges there were adjustments made of \$33,000, of which the board recommended 80 per cent. Only 5 appeals as of December 31st, 1953, have been carried from the county judge to the Ontario Municipal Board, all of which were appealed by the Greater Toronto Assessment Board.

The amount of work and detail has been enormous, due to several factors, among them being:

(a) the large and rapid growth in the municipalities,

(b) the lack of records and assessment personnel in the municipalities to keep up with the growth.

(c) the desire of some local municipal councils to have a low assessment. (1) to secure larger government grants, or (2) to pay a smaller share of the York County costs, or the costs of the new Metropolitan Area.

It is expected that the work of the board will be concluded by the middle of 1954. This will release the members of the Assessment Branch to their ordinary duties.

HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

In 1953, legislation was enacted to provide that where a district assessor had not been appointed, the Department of Municipal Affairs would make an equalization of assessment for the purpose of apportioning the costs for the erection and maintenance of a home for the aged among the municipalities comprising a territorial district. As noted before, no district assessors have been appointed, and late in 1953 requests were received from 6 territorial districts requesting the Assessment Branch to carry out this project. It is hoped that in 1954 it will be possible to meet some of the requests. In the scattered municipalities this entails considerable travelling. However, if the work is extended to include the school sections in unorganized townships, the project should be of assistance in determining the apportionment of costs and educational grants in the different high school districts and township school areas which overlap into both the organized and the unorganized municipalities.

ASSESSMENT OF ONTARIO GOVERNMENT AND ONTARIO HYDRO PROPERTY

The work of placing valuations on properties owned and operated by the Government of Ontario or its agencies or by the Ontario Hydro Electric Power

Commission, which came within the scope of the 1952 legislation, was again carried out in 1953 by the Assessment Branch. A larger number of new properties were either purchased or erected by the government or the Ontario Hydro since 1952. These properties had to be inspected and a valuation placed on them for grant purposes. In addition, in the municipalities which had changed their basis of valuation since 1952, all Ontario Government and Ontario Hydro property had to be revalued so that the valuations could be brought into line with the new re-assessment. This was, of course, in addition to checking the assessments of the properties where no changes had been made in the values.

COUNTY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

At the end of 1953, 27 counties out of 38 county units had appointed county assessors as the preliminary step toward establishing a proper basis of equalized assessment. It is anticipated that at least 2 more counties will adopt the county assessment system in 1954.

As yet no district assessors have been appointed for any of the 11 territorial districts in Northern Ontario, though legislation was enacted in 1950 to permit such appointments. No appointments were made due to the lack of sufficient requests from the municipalities in the various districts.

It would appear that if the branch carries out the requests for assistance made under the Homes for the Aged Act, the municipalities may decide that the equalized assessment when established by the Assessment Branch is sufficient for their purposes. However, unless the equalized assessment made by the branch is comprehensive enough, it will not alleviate the necessity for a local equalized assessment.

In 1953, a grant of \$1,500 was paid to each of the 27 counties operating under the county assessment system to assist them in defraying the costs of establishing and maintaining a proper basis of equalized assessment.

METROPOLITAN TORONTO ASSESSMENT

	<i>Assessment made in 1952 for 1953 taxes</i>	<i>Assessment made in 1953 for 1954 taxes</i>
Suburbs	\$ 271,362,613	\$ 918,281,954
Toronto	1,468,908,646	1,497,959,486
Total	<u>\$1,740,271,259</u>	<u>\$2,416,241,440</u>

MUNICIPAL AUDITING AND ACCOUNTING

The duties of the Municipal Auditing and Accounting Branch of the department of Municipal Affairs may be summarized briefly under the following headings:

1. Licencing of municipal auditors.
2. Review of municipal audit reports.
3. Instructions and recommendations to auditors.
4. Instructions and recommendations to municipal clerks and treasurers.
5. Preparation of special reports or financial analyses of certain municipalities.
6. Special investigations.
7. Revision of accounting forms and financial statements for greater uniformity.

LICENCING OF MUNICIPAL AUDITORS

A municipal auditor's licence may be granted on payment of annual fee to chartered accountants or certified public accountants.

All other persons must pass an examination set by the department. This examination is divided into 3 parts: Municipal law, municipal accounting, and auditing.

The examination questions are similar to those given to accounting students at the intermediate level.

Licences are renewed each year as long as the licensee is in good standing and has performed his duties in a satisfactory manner.

Licencing powers are exercised and fees prescribed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs as regulations have not been made by the Lieutenant-Governor-

in-Council to govern the exercise of these powers.

Licences may be cancelled or suspended by the Minister if the auditor has carried out his duties in a negligent manner.

Licence fee, \$2 per year. Examination fee, \$3 per year.

REVIEW OF AUDIT REPORTS

Audit reports are reviewed carefully for the purpose of detecting errors of omission or commission which may arise from an incorrect interpretation of the Statutes or from failure to follow instructions in the preparation of the financial statements.

INSTRUCTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO AUDITORS

After reviewing the audit reports, correspondence is carried on with the auditor to obtain explanations of certain items in the statements, to advise him of errors and how to correct them, and to make recommendations for improvements in subsequent reports and statements.

Memoranda are sent to all auditors once or twice each year which contain instructions for the preparation of financial statements and information on changes necessitated by new legislation.

INSTRUCTIONS TO MUNICIPAL CLERKS AND TREASURERS

When the audit report indicates that the accounting system in a municipality is at fault, advice is sent to the clerk or treasurer on the manner in which the fault may be corrected.

If necessary, a representative of the department will visit the municipality to give the officials accounting instructions and to assist them in setting up the proper books of account.

SPECIAL REPORTS

A considerable part of this branch's time is spent on the preparation of special reports or financial analyses dealing with the affairs of a particular municipality.

Such reports may be prepared for the use of the Ontario Municipal Board or

for the use of the department's Administration Branch, or for the use of another department of the government, or at the request of the municipality concerned.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS

Special investigations may also be made into the affairs of certain municipalities which necessitate visits to those municipalities and an examination of their accounts.

Such investigations may be made to assist the local auditor, at his request, to determine whether a defalcation exists and its extent, or to determine whether an auditor has been negligent in his duties.

UNIFORM ACCOUNTING

For the past few years, the department has taken an active interest along with other Canadian provinces and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in promoting uniformity in municipal accounting and in municipal financial statements. The advantages of uniformity are that it facilitates comparisons of revenue and expenditures, not only in Ontario municipalities but in all municipalities throughout Canada.

Much of this work has been completed and only minor revisions will be necessary after 1954. The completion of this foundation will now enable this branch to undertake the preparation of an accounting manual of instructions and procedures for small municipalities which will fit in with the uniform style of financial statements.

PROVINCIAL GRANTS

In 1943, the 1-mill subsidy = \$3,063,907.

In 1948, the 1-mill subsidy = \$3,442,269.

In 1949, the department introduced grants under: The Police Act, The Fire Departments Act, The Children's Protection Act, and The Homes for the Aged Act, in place of the 1-mill subsidy.

At the same time a guarantee was given that no municipality would receive less under the new form of grants than it received under the 1-mill subsidy.

Under the new system of grants, the following moneys were distributed among Ontario municipalities:

1949	\$4,118,452
1950	4,761,647
1951	5,490,067
1952	6,453,201
1953	7,257,928

The following is a statement showing a breakdown of the 1953 grants:

Police Department	\$2,726,535
Fire Departments	2,218,219
Children's Protection	1,096,211
Homes for the Aged	932,438
1-mill Guarantee	284,522
Total	<u>\$7,257,928</u>

This is an increase over the 1-mill subsidy paid in 1948 of \$3,442,269.64.

During the 1953 session, the Legislature repealed the grants payable under The Police Act, The Fire Departments Act and the 1-mill subsidy and in lieu thereof provided for per capita grants under the authority of The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, 1953.

These grants vary according to the size and class of municipality, as follows:

TOWNS AND VILLAGES:	Per Capita Grant of
Population up to 2,000	\$1.60
Over 2,000 but not exceeding 5,000 ..	1.60
Over 5,000 but not exceeding 7,000 ..	1.75
Over 7,000 but not exceeding 10,000 ..	2.00
Over 10,000	2.25
TOWNSHIPS:	
Population up to 2,000	1.50
Over 2,000 but not exceeding 5,000 ..	1.60
Over 5,000 but not exceeding 10,000 ..	1.75
Over 10,000 but not exceeding 15,000 ..	1.85
Over 15,000 but not exceeding 20,000 ..	2.00
Over 20,000	2.25
CITIES:	
Population under 75,000	2.50
Over 75,000 but not exceeding 200,000 ..	2.75
Over 200,000 but not exceeding 400,000 ..	3.00
Over 400,000 but not exceeding 750,000 ..	3.50
Over 750,000	4.00

There has been a lot of criticism over these rates.

May I quote figures to show that townships received greater benefits under the per capita grants notwithstanding the fact that most townships only receive a per capita grant of \$1.50 while larger urban municipalities have grants running up to \$3 or \$4.

It is estimated that the 1954 per capita grants will increase over the 1953 police, fire and 1-mill guarantee grants as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

	1953 Police, Fire 1-Mill Guarantee	1954 Estimated Per Capita Grant	Increase Amount	%
Cities	\$3,142,875	\$ 6,254,847	\$3,111,972	99
Towns	857,275	1,305,588	448,313	52
Villages	234,370	362,109	127,739	55
Townships	994,758	3,744,942	2,750,184	276
Total	<u>\$5,229,278</u>	<u>\$11,667,486</u>	<u>\$6,438,208</u>	<u>123</u>

The amount of per capita grants estimated to be paid to townships in 1954 is 9.29 per cent. of the tax levy of the townships.

The percentage of the urban grants to the tax levy is: cities, 6.56 per cent.; towns, 6.9 per cent.; villages, 6.87 per cent.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

	1952 Municipal Taxation Revenue	Percentage 1954 Grants are to Tax Levy
Cities	\$ 95,304,000	6.56
Towns	18,901,000	6.91
Villages	5,268,000	6.87
Townships	40,295,000	9.29
	<u>\$159,768,000</u>	<u>7.30</u>

Again, if you take the percentage of the total grants paid in 1953, and the percentage of the estimated grants to be paid in 1954, you will find that the percentage for the urban municipalities has dropped very rapidly, while the percentage of the total grants paid to townships has more than doubled, i.e.:

	Percentage of Total Grants	
	1953	1954
Cities	60.10	53.61
Towns	16.39	11.19
Villages	4.49	3.29
Townships	<u>19.03</u>	<u>32.10</u>
	<u>100.06</u>	<u>100.00</u>

In addition to the increased assistance to municipalities which I have just given you, I would remind the rural municipalities they will still be receiving grants toward homes for the aged, and children's protection that were inaugurated in 1949.

Further statistics to demonstrate that rural municipalities benefit more under the per capita grants:

County	Increase for Urban Municipalities %	Increase for Rural Municipalities %
Haldimand	65	171
Carleton	72	92
Lanark	68	149
Lennox and Addington	37	281
Ontario	41	127
Peterborough	81	276
Renfrew	22	482

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES
TO MUNICIPALITIES AND LOCAL BOARDS
OF ALL KINDS

For the municipal year 1953, which corresponds to the provincial year 1953-54, estimated subsidies amounted to \$138,999,000

For the municipal year 1943, which corresponds to the provincial year 1943-44, total subsidies amounted to 19,697,486

Increase in the 11-year period... \$119,301,514

May I point out that for the municipal year 1954 the new per capita grants will amount to an additional \$11,700,000, an increase over the grants they replaced of \$ 6,076,873

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES

Year	Amount	% of Increase over 1943
1943	\$ 19,697,000	100.00
1944	24,324,000	23.49
1945	36,836,000	87.01
1946	39,762,000	101.87
1947	54,958,000	179.02
1948	67,183,000	241.08
1949	77,341,000	292.65
1950	84,765,000	330.34
1951	99,198,000	403.62
1952	110,534,000	461.17
1953 Estimated	138,999,000	606.00

MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION
BRANCH

COMPOSITION

The Municipal Administration Branch is composed of the chief supervisor, 2 supervisors and 6 assistants to the supervisors, plus the necessary clerical and stenographic staff.

For the purposes of the branch the province is divided into 2 parts: those municipalities that are situate in the counties are the responsibility of the supervisor for Southern Ontario and those municipalities in the districts are assigned to the supervisor for Northern Ontario.

The supervisors are under the direction and guidance of the chief supervisor and are aided in their activities by the assistant supervisors.

SUPERVISION

The primary activity of the branch is the supervision of those municipalities under part III of The Department of Municipal Affairs Act. Municipalities under this control are municipalities which defaulted on their debts and were placed under the supervision of the department by the Ontario Municipal Board, and improvement districts which automatically come under supervision until they have matured sufficiently to warrant their independent administration.

The supervision of a municipality is very close and requires departmental approval to every action of council. Particular attention is paid to the financial activities and legal authorities for all activities of council. The main objective in the case of supervised municipalities is the successful refunding of the municipal debt and a build-up of sufficient reserves so that the municipality will be in a good enough cash position to permit it to operate without excessive bank borrowings.

IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS

While the improvement districts do not have a defaulted debt to refund, great care is taken by department supervisors to ensure that the financial structure of the municipality when erected to an independent municipality will ensure that the municipality is in a good cash position with a reasonable capital indebtedness.

DESIGNATED MINING MUNICIPALITIES

Municipalities designated as "mining municipalities" by the regulations under the Assessment Act are required by the regulations to submit all activities relating to finance to the department for approval. While the control exercised is neither as broad or detailed as supervised municipalities, the size and nature of some of the municipalities concerned pose some very complex and extensive problems. The budgets of the 32 designated municipalities and their boards and commissions must be studied in detail and the formulae as set out in the regulations applied so as to effect

an equitable distribution of the mining revenues. All licencing and debenture by-laws of these municipalities must receive the same careful scrutiny.

GENERAL ASSISTANCE

There are over 12,000 letters received annually by the department, the majority of which are enquiries and requests for advice and guidance by municipalities throughout the province. While the bulk of these enquiries can be satisfied by return mail, it must be remembered that quite a few enquiries are from officials of long standing in some of the larger municipalities and the queries posed often involve considerable research and reference work before a proper reply can be made.

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

There are a number of statutory requirements of departmental approval to various specific municipal activities which are as follows:

Road closing: All municipal by-laws purporting to close roads which were reserved in the original survey of a municipality and which lead to water, must be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council before they can become effective. Applications for approval are received by the department and before a recommendation is made the entire file is checked in detail, particularly with respect to description and vires. Other concerned departments of the government are notified and their comments and approval solicited. In all too many cases, the municipality has proceeded with a bad description and results in a delay of upwards of 6 months or more.

Considerable effort has been made in the way of publicity and education on this matter in an effort to get the municipalities to consult department officials before commencing the procedure. It has been our experience that where the department has been consulted prior to the drafting of a road closing by-law, little or no difficulty has been encountered.

Pensions: The approval of the department is required to all by-laws authorizing pensions for municipal officials under

section 386 (48) of The Municipal Act. Contracts for municipal pensions with the insurers are of necessity quite detailed and lengthy and must be thoroughly checked in every detail before approval of the Minister is recommended. There have been 200 pension plans approved by the department to date and amending by-laws are submitted regularly as employment conditions change.

Tile drainage: Municipal applications to the Treasury Department for tile drainage loans are submitted to this department for recommendation for or against the loan. In each of these cases, a financial analysis is prepared and studied before such recommendation can be made.

ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES

The department is required to answer enquiries on every phase of municipal government and advise and guide elected and appointed municipal officials throughout the province.

While the bulk of departmental activities is handled by correspondence (over 12,000 pieces in 1953, which does not include audit reports from 965 municipalities, deeds for approval, tax registration certificates, etc.) the Deputy Minister, the chief supervisor and their assistants must also receive delegations from municipal associations and organizations, representatives from foreign countries desiring to be initiated in our methods of local government, representatives from councils, boards and commissions, Members of Parliament and Mr. John Citizen, etc.

It is not unusual for all senior officials of the department to be so tied down in this respect that it is impossible to attend to the mail for days at a time, and I may add that a great number of the visitors to the department fail to observe the necessity of making an appointment beforehand. While we immensely enjoy making personal contacts, knowledge of impending visits would greatly assist us in keeping the machinery of the department going at all times.

At the request of the municipalities themselves, the supervisors must be ready at all times to give advice and guidance in the preparation of a great number and variety of by-laws. Debenture by-laws alone include the preparation of schedules, advice on interest rates, assistance in marketing debentures, preparation of municipal statistics to assist in the selling of the debentures, helping in having debentures printed, proofreading debentures and a heavy volume of correspondence in connection therewith.

Road closing by-laws entail a great deal of preparation and correspondence.

Municipal problems and complaints have to be studied and investigated, and other departments consulted.

Legislation has to be debated upon and referred to the heads of other departments concerned and recommendations made.

Regulations have to be passed and filed, etc.

In other words, the senior officials of the department are ever ready and willing, when requested by the municipalities, to give of their experience and knowledge that the municipalities and the ratepayers may obtain an ever increasing improvement in the administration of their local affairs and a foundation of mutual understanding and confidence created between the municipalities and the department.

GROSS DEBENTURE DEBT		
Year	Amount	Per Capita
HIGHEST		
1932	\$504,756,000	\$155.82
1943	281,437,000	78.61
LOWEST		
1946	214,648,000	58.10
1952	495,805,000	110.42

an increase in 1952 of \$58,228,000.

MUNICIPAL TAXATION

Municipal tax levy in Ontario in 1952 amounted to \$57.87 per person.

Per capita levy in 1939 was \$32.79.

Adjusting this per capita figure to present day purchasing power of a dollar it would be \$60.50, which would mean that the taxes in Ontario have only gone up \$2.63 per capita in a period of 13 years.

This small increase in municipal taxes is mostly due to the enormous increase in subsidies paid to municipalities, their boards and commissions by the Province of Ontario.

MUNICIPAL TAXATION

Year	Amount	%
1943	\$110,561,000	100.00
1944	110,408,000	
1945	107,035,000	
1946	115,855,000	4.79
1947	133,443,000	20.70
1948	149,324,000	35.06
1949	169,832,000	53.61
1950	188,353,000	70.36
1951	226,033,000	104.44
1952	259,847,000	135.02

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD POWERS AND DUTIES

The jurisdiction of the board is contained in the large number of public general Acts and in numerous private Acts. Among the important public Acts are:

- The Ontario Municipal Board Act
- The Municipal Act
- The Assessment Act
- The Local Improvement Act
- The Department of Municipal Affairs Act
- The Planning Act
- The Municipal Drainage Act
- The Public Works Act
- The Highway Improvement Act,
- etc.

No attempt will be made to enumerate all these powers, but it is felt that there is widespread misunderstanding of the position of the board in carrying out its various duties.

In the first place it must be remembered that in no case does the board initiate any proceeding or issue orders on its own motion.

Its function is to exercise two main kinds of jurisdiction which may be described as: (a) the judicial (b) the administrative.

"A" JUDICIAL DUTIES AND POWERS

In this group most of the important powers exercised by the board are to hear and decide disputes between:

1. *Municipality vs. Municipality*: Under this heading should be placed annexations and amalgamations, settlement of boundary disputes and all other functions involving the territorial jurisdiction of municipalities.

Falling under this heading we must also consider inter-municipal disputes in distributing the cost of conservation projects, school area expenditures and similar matters involving two or more municipalities or portions thereof.

Under this heading should also be placed probable incorporation of new municipalities and arbitrations between municipalities following some change in their status.

2. *Province vs. Municipality*: An example of this type of adjudication is the jurisdiction of the board with respect to the construction of limited access highways, closing of intersecting roads, appeals from valuation of provincial property for the purposes of payments in lieu of taxes.

3. *Municipality vs. Individual*: Under this heading come all assessment appeals, arbitrations as to compensation for lands taken, approval of special area by-laws and special rates, approval of local improvement by-laws under section 8, approval of restricted area by-laws under section 390 of The Municipal Act, references and appeals with respect to official plans, proposed subdivisions, and appeals from committees of adjustment under The Planning Act.

4. *Individual vs. Individual*: There are comparatively few of these, the most numerous being public vehicle and public commercial vehicle applications where most disputes involve conflicting private claims for certificates of public convenience and necessity.

"B" ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

By far the most important duty under this division is the approval of proposed municipal borrowings and all the powers given to the board with respect to municipal financing. Including special powers with respect to defaulting municipalities under part III of The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

GENERAL COMMENT

In some cases it is difficult to distinguish between judicial and administrative duties and under some Acts the board appears to be required to exercise both functions.

Generally speaking, however, there is a clear distinction between the judicial part of the board's work and its administrative duties, and this must be kept in mind when considering the methods and procedure adopted by the board.

Where the power being exercised is essentially judicial, the board, except in rare cases, proceeds by way of public hearing and decides upon the basis of evidence and arguments submitted in open hearing and not upon written submissions presented *ex parte* either by individuals or government departments.

All the rules relating to the reception of evidence and examination and cross-examination of witnesses, etc. which have evolved over many centuries in the hearing of contested claims in the courts in a fair and judicial manner are substantially followed, and the board is expected to judge each case on the merits and not on the basis of any actual or assumed government policy.

On the other hand, in carrying out its administrative functions, it is inevitable that the board should attempt to pursue what it considers to be a sound and conservative policy with relation to municipal financing, and it has considered that it should be at liberty to act upon information acquired either from its own knowledge and experience or from various departments of the government which would assist in protecting the interests of the present and future taxpayer of the municipality concerned.

As the province has a very important stake in the financial strength of the municipalities which it has created, the board must also bear this in mind and try to prevent possible financial difficulties which would react upon the province. Nevertheless, the ultimate responsibility for deciding whether municipalities should or should not be permitted to borrow further monies must be on the board, and the board has

on many occasions granted or refused an application although it has good reason to believe that some department of the government might have favoured a different decision.

THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS
QUIETING ORDERS ACT

Remarks: At the 1949 session of the Legislature, The Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act was passed, reposing authority in the Ontario Municipal Board to issue orders which would quiet all doubts about the locality and regularity of any municipality's status and boundaries.

To carry out the provisions of this Act, it was necessary for a department representative to visit the municipalities affected to:

1. Explain to them the aim of the department to establish beyond a doubt the incorporation date, and set out the boundaries and area of such municipality.
2. To present and explain the application forms, the by-law form and history sheet which had been prepared for their use to present to the Ontario Municipal Board when requesting a hearing to decide the above issues.

Before visiting these municipalities, the departmental librarian had to search all the records of the Department of Municipal Affairs and have the officials of the office of the Provincial Secretary, the Provincial Treasurer and the Department of Lands and Forests search their records to assemble together all the data that would assist in determining how, when and to what extent the municipality was erected.

Commencing in 1951, the departmental librarian visited:

- 16 townships in the District of Temiskaming
- 4 townships in the District of Kenora
- 12 townships in the District of Rainy River

- 9 townships in the District of Nipissing
- 16 townships in the District of Sudbury
- 18 townships in the District of Parry Sound
- 18 townships in the District of Muskoka
- 6 townships in the District of Thunder Bay
- 14 townships in the District of Algoma
- 11 townships in the District of Manitoulin

124

Of the 124 municipalities the librarian visited:

88 townships have passed the necessary by-laws and made application to the Ontario Municipal Board.

74 townships have had public hearings held by the Municipal Board.

16 townships for which the Municipal Board has issued orders under the Act quieting all doubts as to their status.

53 townships are awaiting the board's decision.

Most decisions are awaiting descriptions of boundaries that will be satisfactory to the surveyor-general.

The delay is in the interest of having the job properly done when the board does issue their order.

All municipalities that need a Quiet-ing Order that the department has record of in Northern Ontario have been visited and are included in the list.

REGISTRAR-GENERAL'S BRANCH

The growth on population and prosperity of Ontario is reflected in the growth and activities of the Registrar-General's Branch.

In 1953, registrations were as follows: births, 132,449; marriages, 45,797; deaths, 46,067; a total of 224,313.

In addition, during 1953, the branch issued official certificates for births, marriages and deaths to the number of 295,000.

Some idea of the growth is shown by the fact that there were 67 per cent. more births registered in 1953 than in 1945.

There were 34 per cent. more marriages registered in 1953 than in 1945 and there were only 16 per cent. more deaths in 1953 than in 1945, and the demand for official certificate increased 190 per cent. in 1953 over 1948.

To meet the increase in the activities of this branch in November, 1953, the Registrar-General's branch was moved in its entirety from the Whitney Building to new quarters at 70 Lombard Street.

Before this, only once since 1869 had this branch been located away from the seat of government, and that was in the 1920's when it was situated on Spadina Avenue awaiting completion of the Whitney Building. Its present quarters were formerly occupied by part of the Workmen's Compensation Board. The building was constructed in 1934 for government occupancy. To give the Registrar-General's Branch suitable working conditions, very extensive renovations were carried out, dictated by the actual needs of the branch. The resulting improvements have given the Office of the Registrar-General the finest quarters of any Vital Statistics Office in Canada.

It is hard to realize the phenomenal growth in the demand for the services of this office over the past years. In 1939, a staff of 39 handled its entire operation. Today a staff of 165 broken into 15 specialized units is required to handle the well over 300,000 applications received yearly, as well as a tremendous amount of interdepartmental work for other governmental branches, such as the Department of Public Welfare, Children's Aid, etc.

To handle the increased demand, this office has constantly improved its procedure by introducing new methods. The laminated birth certificate, the introduction of International Business Machine punch card equipment for indexing, the latest Sortergraf equipment for keeping

track of finished and unfinished files, microfilm for security of records, photostat equipment for the issuance of certified copies and continuous experiments with microcard and microfile which are necessitated by the ever-increasing amount of space required to store records are but a few of the steps taken in this direction.

Some conception of the storage problem is shown by the fact that all births for the 60 year period from 1869 to 1929 are contained in 1,279 volumes, whereas 1,155 volumes are required to record births in the 5 year period from 1949 to 1953 inclusive.

As soon as the new quarters were opened on the morning of November 12th, after a move which involved transferring over 13,500 volumes of registrations weighing over 80 tons, 700 lineal feet of loose files, 217 filing cabinets and all other mechanical equipment without disrupting service to the public, the Department of Public Works started construction of an addition which should supply expansion requirements of this office for the next 8 to 10 years, and provide lunch-room and rest-room facilities for the staff.

Because the officials of the Registrar-General's Branch were allowed to co-operate fully with the Department of Public Works in presenting their suggestions for laying out the office space in the manner best suited to their needs, a smooth-working, efficient organization has resulted which will enable the public to receive the service they expect and to which they are entitled.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

TO THE END OF DECEMBER—1953

		TOTAL
(1) GENERAL GOVERNMENT		
Offices	\$ 2,183,043.00	<u>\$ 2,183,043.00</u>
(2) PROTECTION TO PERSONS AND PROPERTY		
Fire Department . . .	\$ 1,053,894.81	
Police	29,000.00	
Court House		
Registry		
Jails		
Corrective Inst. . .		
Street Lighting ..	17,077.00	<u>\$ 1,099,971.81</u>

(3) PUBLIC WORKS		
Workshop & Yards \$	71,164.76	
Bridges	313,891.34	
Stormsewers, . . .		
Ditches, Drains .	8,958,693.59	
Grade Separations	1,006,084.01	
Sidewalks	2,805,580.06	
Roads, . . .		
Alleys, Lanes . .	5,894,293.96	
Subways, Tunnels		
Viaducts		
Shore Protection .	15,000.00	
Harbour . . .		
Development ..		
Conservation . . .		
Projects	282,000.00	
Road Machinery .	308,221.61	
Watermains	9,640,658.79	<u>\$29,295,588.12</u>

(4) SANITATION AND WASTE REMOVAL		
Comfort Stations .		
Garbage Collection \$	40,500.00	
Waste Collection .		
Disposal		
Sanitary Sewers .	8,819,183.55	
Sewage Treatment .		
Disposal	4,749,079.84	
Street Cleaning .		
Flushing	28,450.00	<u>\$13,637,213.39</u>

(5) HEALTH		
Health Offices . . .		
Clinics		
Laboratories		
Hospitals	\$ 4,112,275.00	<u>\$ 4,112,275.00</u>

(6) LOCAL WELFARE		
Welfare Offices . .		
Home for Aged . .	\$ 1,576,710.13	<u>\$ 1,576,710.13</u>

(7) RECREATION SERVICES		
Amusement Parks and Playgrounds \$	284,696.94	
Golf Courses		
Skating Rinks, . .		
Arenas	2,145,000.00	
Memorial Arenas .	70,000.00	
Swimming Pools, .		
Beaches, Baths . .	355,000.00	
Community . . .		
Centres, Halls . .	331,773.00	<u>\$ 3,186,469.94</u>

(8) COMMUNITY SERVICES		
Art Galleries, Exhibitions, Fairs .		
Libraries	\$ 368,000.00	
Markets, Museums .		
Tourist Camps. . .	200,000.00	
Housing	5,041,500.00	<u>\$ 5,609,500.00</u>

EDUCATION II		
Elementary	\$23,134,642.27	
Secondary	10,943,056.80	<u>\$34,077,699.07</u>

MUNICIPAL ENTERPRISES III		
(1) Electric Light \$	7,723,170.00	
(2) Water Area . .	6,525,977.00	
(3) Transportation	18,002,500.00	
(4) Telephone . . .	177,300.00	
(5) Other	679,198.34	<u>\$33,108,145.34</u>

Total Capital Expenditures Approved by the Ontario Municipal Board for Year Ending December 31st, 1953		
		<u>\$127,886,515.80</u>

Total Orders of the Board Dealing with Capital Expenditures	2,891
Total Orders of the Board	5,298

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF LOCAL DEBT AND GENERAL DEBT

	Local Debt	General Debt	Total
GENERAL GOVERNMENT			
1 and 2	\$ 5,348.36	\$ 2,177,694.64	\$ 2,183,043.00
Public Works	16,344,465.40	1,099,971.81	1,099,971.81
Sanitation	4,673,963.31	12,951,122.72	29,295,588.12
Health		8,963,250.08	13,637,213.39
Local Welfare		4,112,275.00	4,112,275.00
Recreation Services		1,576,710.13	1,576,710.13
Community Service		3,186,469.94	3,186,469.94
Education		5,609,500.00	5,609,500.00
		34,077,699.07	34,077,699.07
MUNICIPAL ENTERPRISES			
Electric		7,723,170.00	7,723,170.00
Water		6,525,977.00	6,525,977.00
Transportation		18,002,500.00	18,002,500.00
Telephone		177,300.00	177,300.00
Other		679,198.34	679,198.34
	<u>\$ 21,023,777.07</u>	<u>\$106,862,738.73</u>	<u>\$127,886,515.80</u>

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, before we proceed I should like, through you, to make a suggestion in all seriousness. This is a big day in Toronto. It is the day which marks the opening of the subway. I see the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has just returned from the official opening ceremonies. Perhaps, for the record, we should hear from him for a minute or two about this important event, so that in the future it will be on record that on this day, in the City of Toronto, the first subway in Canada was officially opened. I suggest that the hon. Prime Minister be given the floor for a minute or two to tell us what happened.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I think it would be beyond my capacity to tell you what happened, because, as I was saying to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), I went up there at 10.30 o'clock this morning and I have been in such a whirl ever since that I hardly know whether I am here or not. It is a marvellous thing to get on a subway at Eglinton Avenue, and go down to Front Street in 12 minutes. To describe what has taken place would be beyond my capacities at this time. Mr. Chairman, but I think I should express on behalf of all hon. members of this House our admiration for the people of Toronto. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is a former member of the city council. There are a number here. We have a former mayor, a controller, and members of the council of the City of Toronto, who have been

through the various phases of the great transportation and subway problem over many years.

This, so they tell me, is the sixth subway to be constructed in America. It is the first in Canada. It is, I think, a great Toronto and Canadian achievement to have accomplished this for a great and growing community, which is the heart and centre, a reflection of Ontario's life.

This subway, Mr. Chairman, is a modern approach to a major traffic problem. It is a modern approach to the revamping of the central part of this great city, a preliminary to the proper and good use of very valuable areas which have, to some extent, fallen below modern standards in the light of the growth of the city. As I say, Mr. Chairman, the thing which has impressed everybody is the vision, the courage and the foresight of the people of this city and their leaders over many years. I remember well—as do many hon. members of the House—the submissions to the electorate of the question of tubes many years ago. I well remember the submission about 40 years ago when the subway, at that time, could have been built for about \$5 million. But, Mr. Chairman, that does not mean anything at this time. Those people 40 years ago were faced with a totally different problem, and they were facing it with a totally different outlook. When the time came, and the question arose, the people of Toronto rose to the situation and did a great job.

As I said at noon, however, inadequately, this city, and its environments,

in York, was the birthplace of responsible government. Here was born the germ of government which made it possible to have a free and independent nation in a commonwealth of nations under one Sovereign. That system was born here. Today the people in Toronto, and in York, are faced with a great municipal and governmental problem. The experiment in which they are engaged in Metropolitan Toronto, is one which is attracting the attention of America. I know there have been various views expressed in this House on the problem. Nevertheless, what is very inspiring to us was the fact that the people, regardless of their views, are doing their best to meet the situation through the legislative instruments which are at hand. This history and experience of the past are encouraging things. These people in York and Toronto have born in them the genius for the development of government, and for the development of their community. I am quite sure, as a citizen of this province and a great admirer of the City of Toronto, I may say this great community and fine city is on the brink of much greater things and even more important developments in the future.

Vote 111, Main Office, \$2,489,000.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I am speaking on the first Vote as a matter of policy. I feel that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) came out last summer with a statement which constituted a serious threat to the poorest section of home owners in the City of Toronto, and a statement which alarmed the citizens of the City of Toronto. Bad as that statement was, it was worse when one recalls it was in direct contradiction to assurances given by the hon. Minister to this House some months earlier. In fact, it constituted, to my mind, a breach of faith with the Legislature. I have a reference here, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister's pronouncement that he was not approving the partial exemption policy in Toronto. It was, in fact, more than a pronouncement. It was in terms of a dictum. He, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar)

would not permit a continuation of the partial exemption policy unless a new vote of the people was taken.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as is well known, the City of Toronto applies a partial exemption policy with universal approval for a great many years and did it quite legally in accordance with legislation enacted in this House some years before. Last year, when we were discussing Bill No. 80 in this House, I expressed great fear that the bill might do away with the partial exemption policy. In fact, to make sure that such a thing would not happen, I moved an amendment to Bill 80 when it was before the House in Committee. That amendment of mine said that the partial exemption on dwelling houses from tax rates, except for school purposes, which now applies in the City of Toronto, should apply in each area of the municipal metropolitan areas.

In arguing against this amendment, the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs is reported in *Hansard*, 1953, page G-5, of volume 24 as saying:

For the past 3 years, the City of Toronto has been getting my permission—in fact, I just granted it again 3 days ago—in order that they may continue exemptions in the City of Toronto. Any municipality, by a vote of the people, may make that application. The hon. member was speaking a few days ago and said we were taking away the right of the people to vote. This bill says the people may vote for this, and yet the hon. member wants to bring forward an amendment which will force this onto the people without a vote.

There was one thing I do want to make clear. The exemptions will not apply to the county rate, and that might as well be understood now. The county rate has to be on the total assessment roll of the rolls of the different municipalities. In regard to the local municipality: Toronto may continue, or any municipality may continue, with the consent of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to carry out their exemptions, but that does not apply to the county.

Not being very sure of this promise, I pursued the question further, and on page H-1 of the same volume, the hon. Prime Minister rose and said:

—but that is the right of the City of Toronto, and it is not the desire or intention of this government to interfere with that right in either of these municipalities.

Even if a change were made, it will be at the instance of the City Council of the City of Toronto and not by this government nor by the Area Council.

Further, on page H-2, the hon. Prime Minister says:

I would like to say to the hon. member that his amendment is quite irrelevant in view of what I have said, and while I am in agreement with what he, in general, says in his proposed amendment, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary and it is irrelevant and I am sorry that it is not acceptable.

HON. MR. FROST: The right has not been interfered with.

MR. SALSBERG: Now, Mr. Chairman, after these assurances in the House, the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs came out on July 9th with a statement which was reported in all the newspapers and on the radio. I am quoting from the *Star* of July 9th. The heading is "Put 'Partial Exemption' to Vote—Dunbar." The story then reads as follows:

Partial exemptions under which nearly 90 per cent. of homes in Toronto are taxed, will not be recognized by the province for municipal taxation next year, Hon. George Dunbar, Minister of Municipal Affairs, stated today.

He said the question of continuing the exemptions by the city would have to be put to a vote of the people.

That, Mr. Chairman, was in complete contradiction of everything he had said in the House earlier, and it raises two very important questions. The first is the right to interfere with the continua-

tion of so important a measure as partial exemption, and the second concerns the question of trust in a statement made by an hon. Minister of the Crown to hon. members of the House. Here is a Minister who, only a few months before, gave every necessary assurance that he had no intention to interfere. And in July, he comes out with this dictum that he will not allow it any more. His action aroused such an outcry—and, fortunately for the people, he made the announcement in the middle of the federal election—that it threatened some of the Conservative federal members with an unfavourable reaction. The hon. Prime Minister, much wiser of course, and sensing the danger of the threat to the Conservative candidates of Toronto, came out and said that nothing would be done and that everything would go on as before.

HON. MR. FROST: When did I say that?

MR. SALSBERG: I am not quoting the hon. Prime Minister word for word. But it is generally recognized in the City of Toronto that it was the intervention of the hon. Prime Minister that saved the situation and nullified the dictatorial position taken by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I raise this subject not because I like criticizing the hon. Minister, but because it is important for the future. We must realize that an assurance given in this House by a Cabinet Minister is a serious thing. We have a right to expect hon. Ministers to live up to such assurances. If an assurance given in March is going to be broken in July, it becomes impossible for any municipality to proceed with long-term planning. Or, for that matter, it applies to each individual member of this House.

I rise to protest the actions of the hon. Minister, first, his action in interfering with the continuation of the partial exemption policy in Toronto, and secondly, with his frustration—

HON. G. H. DUNBAR: When did I have anything to do with that?

MR. SALSBERG: —at everything he led the people at large to believe in, as a result of his statement in the House. I think this must not be the practice in the future. A statement given by an hon. Minister, or an assurance, should be reliable.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Now, let us get a few facts about this. The people of Toronto voted on this partial exemption question. The Municipal Act states that any municipality may vote for partial exemption. Toronto and New Toronto were the only municipalities in the Province of Ontario to take advantage of that.

When they came to re-assess in 1949, they came to me and said it was too late to have a vote of the people to raise the exemption when the assessment was raised 10 per cent. They asked if I would give permission, and they would say it was on the "say-so" of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and they would have a vote next year by the people of Toronto. That was in 1949. Why should I have that power? It should not be there at all, but in order to help Toronto out, so they would not be "stuck" with that 10 per cent. when the assessments were raised, and they wanted to raise the exemption 10 per cent. on the understanding it would also be put to a vote of the people, I consented.

When the hon. member for St. Andrew says I was going to stop exemption, that is ridiculous. I have no power to stop exemption. The only power I have is to stop the 10 per cent. by refusing to sign.

The people of Toronto voted on it originally, but they did not vote on the extra 10 per cent. which they promised to do.

Each year they came to me, and I kept asking them, "Why not take a vote of the people? Why shoulder me with that responsibility? Are you afraid of the people, and you think you are sure by coming to me and getting my permission?"

I want to assure the hon. member for St. Andrew that as long as I am Minister of Municipal Affairs, that will never be

changed, because there is no person on the city council clever enough to make a "goat" out of me, and say that I am cutting off the 10 per cent., and then getting up in council the next day and saying, "We were all in favour of the whole thing, but Dunbar cut it off." But Dunbar did not cut it off.

MR. SALSBERG: That is what you assured us in July.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: You know that was for one year. They let me down flat, I should never have allowed my name to be there at all.

MR. SALSBERG: Let us have the facts. How did they let you down?

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): They promised to have a vote of the people.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, they promised there would be a vote by the people.

MR. SALSBERG: You are not being let down. You are letting them down.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: You just want to make a big "fuss."

MR. SALSBERG: While the hon. Minister is in a hole and trying to climb out—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I am in no hole at all.

MR. SALSBERG: The fact is that it was only a few weeks after, that the city solicitor told the board that the Provincial Department of Municipal Affairs has agreed to permit a continuation of partial exemption without a vote of the people.

I realize, the way you handled the situation, aroused the indignation of the entire community, and there was an outcry against it, and you finally agreed to let it continue.

If the hon. Minister thought a new vote was necessary, he could have found a way of conveying that through normal channels to the administration, but that was not done.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Does the hon. member think it was not done through proper channels?

MR. SALSBERG: No.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Then I say that the hon. member is not speaking the truth.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know; I am not in the civic administration now.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member is not speaking the truth. There is an alderman of the City of Toronto sitting in this Chamber, who can prove it.

MR. SALSBERG: If we are to have the facts, let us have the letters you wrote in June and July.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I would not trust the hon. member with any letter.

MR. SALSBERG: I not asking the hon. Minister to trust me.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The member for St. Andrew might burn them.

MR. SALSBERG: All I am asking is this: in March, the hon. Minister got up and assured this House, in answer to my question—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Oh, it was a question by the hon. member?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, and there was nothing done.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): There has been nothing done with partial exemption. Let us get on with the business of the House.

MR. SALSBERG: It is very big business for a great number of poor people, who own small homes.

Hon. MR. FROST: We have always looked after the "little people."

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Why not put it to a vote of the people?

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? When the present

hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was acting as Minister of Highways in the House, there was a statement made affecting the riding I have the honour to represent, concerning the building of a new bridge at the Humber, and doing away with the 5 corners at Queen, King and Roncesvalles Avenue.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I was Acting Minister of Highways, and I made that offer. I offered to have the bridge erected, and the hon. Prime Minister acquiesced. We offered to pay for the bridge, but they have not made a start on the bridge yet.

MR. SALSBERG: It is the same as the 10 per cent. The hon. Minister promised a bridge, and there is none.

MR. STEWART: I understand the hon. Minister, in good faith, made the offer to Toronto, and Toronto showed no willingness to take advantage of it.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: None whatever.

MR. STEWART: So the next play is up to the City of Toronto?

HON. MR. FROST: The offer still holds good.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister.

Agreed to.

Vote 113, Registrar-General's Branch, \$572,500.

On Vote 113:

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to have this matter become a subject for levity and light treatment. I am very serious about this, even though I was not the father of the idea in the first place, but I am ready to accept a good idea, regardless of from what part of the House it comes, and I am prepared to support it and champion it, when no one else does.

At this point, I want to emphasize the soundness of the suggestion that the \$1 registration fee for new-born children should be abolished. I do not think it

is financially necessary. It is a burdensome and troublesome nuisance which is being put upon the people. It becomes very obnoxious in the early summer every year, when hundreds, if not thousands, of youngsters who are out for the first time seeking employment or to join some athletic organization and are in need of a birth certificate, begin tramping down to Queen's Park, you could see them in this building every morning, and they were directed to the location of the registrar.

These youngsters, most of whom are from working-class homes come here, and have to carry \$1 with them to get the certificate.

I ask the hon. Minister to take it under advisement, if nothing else. Please do not reject it; the hon. Minister may find it a popular issue, and have to change his mind, so I would suggest the hon. Minister not burn all his bridges, or lock all the doors behind him.

I appeal to the government to do away with this practice, and have a birth certificate made out when a birth is registered, and sent to the family, who will take care of it, and give it to the youngsters whenever they require it.

It is a very small and paltry amount of money, for the province to attempt to realize in such a manner. Let us be grown up. We have a subway, and we have fleets of aircraft owned by this government. The hon. Minister of Highways has helicopters—

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No, he has not.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has a fleet of them.

Please discontinue this method of extracting dollars from little boys or girls, or from the aged people, who require these certificates to prove their ages, when they apply for the old-age pension.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I would like to know when the hon. member, besides reading clippings or repeating statements

by other persons, and saying what somebody else has said, will get away from that, and when will he have anything original, of his own, something that he thought up himself.

The hon. member will remember that in the committee, the member for Hamilton mentioned it, and the hon. member for St. Andrew immediately jumps on the band wagon. He never mentioned that the member for Hamilton brought it up for the first time.

MR. SALSBERG: I beg your pardon. If you were listening to me, you would have heard that I mentioned the fact that I was not the father of this idea.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister has the floor.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister should not be so nervous.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I am so nervous I can scarcely stand, it is looking at you that makes me nervous.

The hon. member for Hamilton mentioned this matter to the committee, and the member for St. Andrew immediately said, "That might be a great thing for Spadina Avenue; I may get a few votes out of it. He will never get another "bite" at it. I will take it all."

Now, the hon. member makes a speech in regard to something initiated by the hon. member for Hamilton.

MR. SALSBERG: Is it a good suggestion or not?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Why does the hon. member not use his head, and do something for himself?

MR. SALSBERG: Answer the question. You are dodging it.

MR. JOHN YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, may I express my own opinion, that I think the \$1 fee is a very reasonable one.

On the other hand, I was shocked when applying to the Soviet Embassy for a birth certificate on behalf of one

who has made an application for old-age pension, to find that the fee was almost 400 per cent. greater. It was, in fact, \$4 and I had to add 15c. for exchange.

MR. SALSBERG: That should not be. I apologize in both places.

MR. YAREMKO: I may say it also takes 7 months to get one.

Vote 112 carried.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh no, we are not through yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh no, we are not.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are on Vote 113.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very sorry; we are on 112. Mr. Chairman, it is statutory, but I want to speak on it. I am not speaking against the amount, but I am speaking about the issue with which it deals. It is my only chance to raise a vital question.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is statutory.

MR. SALSBERG: I know it is, but I want to speak on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote has been carried.

MR. SALSBERG: It has not carried at all. We are dealing with the biggest "schemozzle" this department has ever perpetrated in its history, and then I am told I cannot speak on it. That is referring to the Metropolitan assessment scheme which was put through. There is no larger "schemozzle" I ever heard of in this House than that. Here we spend over \$1 million over the last 3 years, as shown in the Estimates I have before me. The hon. Minister undertakes the Greater Toronto assessment under Bill 80—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to spoil the speech by the hon. member at all.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not a speech; it is a complaint.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member seems to be getting "all wound up."

May I point out that the assessment of the 12 neighbouring municipalities took place by virtue of a bill passed here in 1951—3 years ago. There was an assessment in Toronto some years before and it has been in effect in the city for some time.

The work of the Department of Municipal Affairs was to reconcile that situation, and to provide for assessments under the new Act, which would be satisfactory.

May I say to the hon. member that I think the assessors appointed under the Act of 1951, did a very remarkable job.

It is quite true the method of arriving at this assessment varied somewhat. That was unavoidable. If exactly the same system had been used, there still would have been variations, because of the time in which they were done. One system was used in 1948, and the other was commenced in 1951, and, of course, you would have some differences.

It is very interesting to note that these differences, upon the completion of the assessment in Greater Toronto, had really vanished into thin air. I think the council, and the assessment commissioner have felt, when looking at the results, that the differences, despite the fact this was done at two different times, were in the main, so small, that they are going ahead with the assessment. They are doing what would have had to be done anyway, that is, without incurring great expense, to re-assess the whole area, including Toronto, in common, and to do it as nearly at one time as possible.

The hon. member for St. Andrew can "beat the air" about it, and do all sorts of things. As a matter of fact, in company with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, I listened with great interest to people who were concerned with this problem. At that time, we did not have the reports from all the municipalities, but when they were obtained, and comparisons made, they were so close as to be almost equal, and there was nothing to be gained by saying or

doing anything further. It was obvious that whatever system was used, there were bound to be some differences.

I think the hon. member for St. Andrew should congratulate the Greater Toronto Assessment Board, and the Department of Municipal Affairs for conducting an equalization—because that is what it was—which I think stands out above anything of this type ever done in this province before. It really is a very remarkable job, and while there are bound to be some differences in certain things, as a matter of fact, the differences are so minute, that the Council of Greater Toronto decided to go ahead, with the situation as it was.

As I pointed out last fall, there was some heat on the part of people who misunderstood the situation, but when the figures were placed on the table, and the Assessment Commissioner went into them, there was little about them to which objection could be taken.

I urge the hon. member for St. Andrew to alter the remarks he was about to make, and, instead, to congratulate the Assessment Board, and the Department of Municipal Affairs, as I think they are well deserving of it.

MR. SALSBERG: I have no doubt the government would agree if I was to congratulate the hon. Minister for the work done by the Greater Toronto Assessment Board, and nothing would please me more than to be able to feel justified in so doing.

It is not just making an issue, but I think it is necessary that the essential features be brought to the attention of the House, if only for the purpose of avoiding such things in the future.

The prime task was to bring about an equalization of assessment—

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, and we have done it.

MR. SALSBERG: That was obviously not brought about.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no, the hon. member is wrong there.

MR. SALSBERG: The Metropolitan Council, on the demand of the outlying municipalities, had to agree to re-assess an enormous portion of the suburban area, and to—

HON. MR. FROST: It was inevitable, and would be inevitable, no matter what system is used.

MR. SALSBERG: The Metropolitan Council had to agree to the re-assessment, which would take 3 years, and undertook to repay the taxpayers for those amounts they had overpaid.

HON. MR. FROST: I would like to point out to the hon. member that there was only a difference of about 1 per cent. That is all.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know what the percentage is.

HON. MR. FROST: I am giving it to the hon. member.

MR. SALSBERG: For instance, one of the major complaints was that the Metropolitan Assessment Board did not use the same yardstick as was used in Toronto, and yet the purpose was to bring the assessment into line with what had already been accomplished in Toronto.

HON. MR. FROST: There was a very obvious reason for that, and I think when I tell the hon. member he will be able to see what the reason was.

There could have been positive uniformity in assessment, if, in 1951, the Toronto Assessment Department under Mr. Gray, who is a very able gentleman, was asked to do the work. However, I would like to point out what a great thunderstorm there would have been in this Chamber, if it had been proposed in 1951, that the Assessment Department of Toronto would step out into these 12 municipalities and do the job. That would have been utterly impossible. It would have been received with great disfavour by the outside municipalities and, I must admit I would have

been in entire agreement with their objections.

I would also like to point out to the hon. member that it was not until the fall of 1952—indeed it was not until January, 1953—that the government made up its mind about Bill No. 80. "The Cumming Report" had to come in, we had to give it consideration, and had to consider the objections which were raised.

At that time, Bill No. 80 was formulated, draughted, and submitted to this House. If we had asked the Toronto Assessment Department to do the work, there would have been the suspicion created that the whole matter was being pre-judged, that total amalgamation was contemplated, and that the suburbs were being drawn into something to which some of them seriously objected.

Even if the Toronto Assessment Department had done the work, there still would have been a variation, because in Toronto the work was done on the basis of values of 1948—I think it was—or thereabouts, and this assessment would be done on the basis of 1951 and 1952.

The hon. member can see there must be a reconciliation there. The difference was only about 1 per cent., which, I think, is a very remarkable achievement indeed. I say to the hon. member there has not been any injustice done, and if that had been performed by the Toronto Assessment Department, with the same methods and the same personnel, there still would have had to be the reconciliation which is bound to take place over the next few years.

Vote 113 agreed to.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would care to comment on the work of the Provincial-Municipal Committee which was set up some few years ago?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: May I say that committee was set up by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), not by me.

HON. MR. FROST: I shall be very glad to answer that question, Mr. Chair-

man. I think the Municipal-Provincial Committee is doing a very fine job. I know the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) will agree that it has an enormous task, one which cannot be completed in a few months, or even a few years.

Last November, I had the very great privilege of going to Winnipeg at the invitation of the Prime Minister of Manitoba, and addressing their Municipal Association. At that time I looked up the work of our Municipal-Provincial Committee here, and found that they had formed a similar committee in Manitoba, the report of which I think the hon. member should read. I suggested there that our idea was to make the Municipal-Provincial Committee a permanent and a continuing committee, and I can assure the hon. member that is something which is needed in federal-provincial relations. We should have a committee consisting of the experts in government on a civil-service level, continuously in consultation with those of the federal and other governments.

I suggested in Winnipeg at that time, that be done, and I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Thomas) that I am hopeful it will be done, because I think that is one of the very obvious solutions of our troubles. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) very properly mentioned in his reply to the Speech from the Throne, the fact that there had to be continuous collaboration and understanding between the Federal and Provincial Governments in a problem that is constantly changing, and which will constantly change.

For instance, health insurance and hospitalization are things which would bear a great deal of investigation by Federal and Provincial Governments sitting together. If we are to get a solution to such problems some day, that is the way it has to be done, and I should say, Mr. Chairman, there is a place in such an organization as that for our Municipal-Provincial Committee to conduct a continuous and running survey of the problems of the day.

That committee, at the present time, has been given the assignment of looking at the powers and functions of the Municipal Board. That, in itself, is an enormous problem. It must be remembered this committee is composed of businessmen, who come from all over Ontario; they cannot spend all their time on the committee's work. They come in perhaps for two or three days a month, and spend time in connection with these problems. The hon. member will readily see the enormity of the task they have. I think they are fine people, and are doing a good job, and furthermore, I think from the standpoint of administration, they are going to fit into a far bigger picture, because I am quite sure a Federal-Provincial Committee, which will be a continuing organization, and a fact-finding body, is inevitable.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) spoke of the need and desirability of setting up a permanent Municipal-Provincial Committee. May I ask, is it his intention to make this present committee more permanent than it is at the moment?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: The present committee?

HON. MR. FROST: I recognize, from a government standpoint, there is no difficulty, for the reason that the civil servants who are on that committee are persons we hope to have with us for many years. So that there is no difficulty there. As the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) knows, difficulties arise on the municipal side of the picture. And, by the way, whom did we appoint as president of the Municipal Association?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Whoever is recommended by them.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, we took their recommendation. If that is altered in the course of the year, the hon. member (Mr. Thomas) will readily see that you lose the effect of the study

which has been bestowed upon the subject matters under consideration by the member retiring. We have, therefore, urged the Municipal Association not to change their representatives. We have, I think, achieved this, that we have a member and an alternate, and we endeavour to keep the alternate advised, so that if the member retires, the alternative may take his place, and a new alternate be appointed.

The hon. member will realize the difficulties involved there.

One of the very useful members of the commission comes from the constituency represented by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), Mr. Grant Crawford, a very able gentleman, who is the secretary of the Ontario Municipal Association, in more or less a permanent capacity.

That difficulty is not so easily solved as some of the others, but we tried to do that by asking them not to change their members.

MR. OLIVER: In connection with that committee, Mr. Chairman, may I say it has all the ear-marks of being a committee which reports to the government. My understanding of this committee's functions was that it was periodically to report and, at some time to bring in a complete and final report, so the Legislature would be able to ascertain their recommendations and to digest them.

Under the new set-up, as visualized by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), does he foresee interim reports which will be made public by this committee?

HON. MR. FROST: There have been so far.

MR. OLIVER: I think there was a little bit of a "squib" a year or so ago, but lately there has been little or nothing. I am serious when I ask the hon. Prime Minister, in the new set-up he visualizes for this committee, is it his thought that it would act in an advisory capacity to the administration, or is it going to be, as it was first set up to be, a fact-finding committee which would report its find-

ings and recommendations to the people and to the Legislature? Which category does it fall into?

HON. MR. FROST: It is a fact-finding committee, reporting to the people. I will obtain for the hon. member (Mr. Thomas) the reports which have already been made. They are part of a series. I think that committee has a great task to do over the coming years.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) referred to "a little squib" of a report which was made. May I point out that report—I assume it is the one to which he refers—was the foundation for the unconditional-grants' legislation which was brought in here last year, and which was very far-reaching legislation. In this year's budget there is no less than \$12 million for the municipalities arising out of what the hon. Leader of the Opposition calls a "squib." If that is a "squib" I hope they do not produce any atomic bombs. That is all.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, the reason behind my question was that I was looking through the Public Accounts for the year ending 1953, and the cost of that committee, according to the Accounts, was \$23,685. I think we should have a greater breakdown for that. It just says, "Provincial-Municipal Committee, salaries \$10,736"; there are no names mentioned at all. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree we should have a breakdown.

HON. MR. FROST: I will give the hon. member (Mr. Thomas) the particulars of that.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.
Statutory Vote concurred in.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to fulfill my promise, which I always try to do, and I am going to send this breakdown over to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas).

MR. OLIVER: While we are on that subject, may I ask the hon. Prime

Minister, are there salaried members of this committee?

HON. MR. FROST: I suppose there is a secretary and staff.

MR. OLIVER: But \$10,000 for "salaries?"

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) can look that over, and I shall be glad to give him further particulars if he wants them.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: They have had a great many meetings, you know.

MR. OLIVER: I want to know if they are being paid salaries or expenses?

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): Mr. Chairman, may I clarify this? I am a member of that committee, and the members are paid no salaries whatsoever; they are paid expenses, and nothing more.

MR. OLIVER: I was just going by what appears in the Public Accounts.

MR. BRANDON: The salaries referred to in the public accounts are for employees in the Department of Statistics, and other departments of government, engaged in the preparation of work preparatory to the reports of this committee, and charged to this particular committee's work.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We should have a breakdown of some of the committees the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) is on.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. H. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply reports that it has come to certain resolutions, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Report concurred in.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the motion is put, may I be permitted to announce the Private Bills Committee will sit tomorrow morning, Wednesday, at 9.30 instead of 10 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

THE ROSS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

House in Committee on Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 17 reported.

THE HAMILTON FOUNDATION

House in Committee on Bill No. 19, "An Act to incorporate The Hamilton Foundation."

Sections 1 to 14 inclusive, agreed to.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, a question before the bill is reported. Without tossing any aspersions on the gentlemen who are sponsoring the legislation, and the people behind it, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) whether he is satisfied that the establishment of such foundations is not meant to evade in any way income or other taxes? I was not on the committee when the bill was discussed, and I repeat I am not casting any aspersions on anyone, but I confess I do not know, and I would like to know, whether succession duties, or any other taxes, will not be evaded as a result of this; in other words, if the hon. Prime Minister is satisfied that everything is in order?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might ask the hon. member (Mr. Nickle) who is chairman of the Private Bills Committee, and who drew this bill, to give us an outline of the bill itself.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): What was the question?

MR. SALSBERG: The question was whether in the opinion of the

government—and I directed it to the hon. Prime Minister who is also the Treasurer—it is satisfied the establishment of such foundations is not for the purpose of evading any taxation responsibilities, for the succession duties or any other form of taxation. And may I repeat, Sir, again—

MR. NICKLE: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first part of the hon. member's (Mr. Salsberg) question, my answer is "no."

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member (Mr. Nickle) is not satisfied that it is so?

MR. NICKLE: I am saying there is no intention to evade any succession duties in any manner.

MR. SALSBERG: The second part was not a question; I wanted to be very, very sure it would be clearly understood that I am not questioning the motives of the people behind it, I do not know them, I just wanted an assurance because, as a humble member of this House, I am not certain that it is, in the long run, going to help the Succession Duties Branch or other branches which collect money, which we want to spend for all sorts of welfare purposes.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill, as I understand it—and if I am incorrect, the chairman of the Private Bills Committee or other hon. members here can correct me—the purpose of such a foundation is to receive gifts from various persons and organizations, and then the trust itself provides for the continuation of the trust and trustees. The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg), I think, will see one of the problems in connection with charitable donations.

MR. SALSBERG: Or gifts.

HON. MR. FROST: Or gifts. For instance, if a gift is made to a hospital, the donor may feel that the character of that institution may change. The hon. member will recognize there have been cases of that sort. In some of the hospitals for tuberculosis, for example, they

have, in effect, become public institutions by reason of the change in the attitude of the public towards that dread disease, and, therefore, some of the great foundations which were formed in the past, perhaps in the eyes of the giving public today, lack the validity they had at that time.

The purpose of such a foundation or trust, I believe, is that if "John Jones" makes a donation or a gift to an institution, he may provide that the income is to go to "X" charity, until such time as the foundation thinks it is desirable to alter it to some other similar type of charity. This, I think, is machinery which is required in the modern world to meet such situations.

I have no doubt the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) knows that in the United Kingdom there are all sorts of gifts which have been made to things which were very valid in their day, but which have ceased to bear any relationship to the affairs of today. It must be remembered if a person gives a sum of money to a certain charity, it is in order that a certain type of charity be carried on; but if the public or the government takes over, as has been the case regularly, then they want their money and income from it to be used for something additional to what the government itself, 50 years from now, might do.

That is the purpose of this bill, and I would point out to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that a gift to any charity which is recognized under The Succession Duties Act is not taxable, and therefore, if this foundation satisfies the Succession Duties Departments, federal and provincial, that it is a true charity, no tax is payable.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 19 reported.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

(No. 1)

House in Committee on Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 1)."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 22 reported.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

(No. 2)

House in Committee on Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 2)."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 23 reported.

CITY OF OTTAWA

House in Committee on Bill No. 25, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 25 reported.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 51, "The Telephone Act, 1954."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) have reached a verdict, and if so, what their verdict is?

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: Mr. Chairman, may I inform the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that I think the amendments which were agreed to will be placed in the bills for third reading, if that is agreeable.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): That is quite satisfactory, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MR. FROST: Was there a motion the bill be reported, or should that be corrected in committee, and then it can be re-printed for third reading?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Here are the amendments. Everything was agreed to except these items, in Committee of the House, as I understand it, and we were to clarify the items brought up by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), and the Leader of the CCF (Mr. Grummett). If it is passed now, it will be on the Order paper for third reading, and these amendments will be included.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: The amendments should be put in now, I should think.

HON. MR. CHALLIES moves:

1 (1) That subsection 2 of section 40 of the bill be amended by striking out the article "the" in the second line, and inserting in lieu thereof the article "a."

(2) That subsection 3 of the section 40 be amended by striking out the article "the" in the third line, and inserting in lieu thereof the article "a."

2 That section 54 of the bill be amended by inserting a comma after the word "subscriber" in the second line, and by inserting a comma after the word "subscriber" in the third line.

Motion agreed to.

Section 40, as amended, agreed to.

Section 54, as amended, agreed to.

Bill No. 51, as amended, reported.

MR. GRUMMETT: There were some amendments when the bill was up for consideration before. I presume those have been noted.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 104, "An Act to amend the Conservation Authorities Act."

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 104 reported.

THE PLANNING ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 105, "An Act to amend The Planning Act."
Sections 1 to 10 inclusive, agreed to.

HON. W. K. WARRENDER moves that subsection 24, as amended by section 9 of The Planning Amendment Act, 1952, and section 6 of The Planning Amendment Act, 1953, be further amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

(2b) Where the by-law contains provisions authorized by subsection 1a, the clerk of the municipality shall, within 10 days after the by-law is

passed, send notice of the passing of the by-law by registered mail to the last known address of each person appearing by the last revised assessment roll to be the owner of land within any registered plan of subdivision or within any part of a registered plan of subdivision to which such provisions apply.

He said: Hon. members will recall I advised the House there would be an amendment, and this is the amendment as noted above.

Section 10, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 11 to 13 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 105, as amended, reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may we revert to "Private Bills," and take Bill No. 18? There should be no objection to that.

THE CITY OF ST. THOMAS

House in Committee on Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas."

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A and B agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 18 reported.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 106, "An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 106 reported.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 107, "An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act."

MR. SALSBERG: I have one question. Will this apply to buildings now under construction, but not completed?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It will apply to any buildings which are

planned and constructed after the bill is put into effect. It is not retroactive.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 107 reported.

THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT, 1952

House in Committee on Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952."

Sections 1, 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 108 reported.

MR. SALSBERG: Before this is reported, may I ask the hon. Minister if he has many instances where mothers have collected for children during the summer months and then found the children did not return to school, because it is obvious this bill is meant to give authority to the hon. Minister to discontinue payments if he is not convinced the children will return to school.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): No, this bill is designed so that we can continue payments through the summer months after we have ascertained in the month of June that the mother proposes to send the child back to school in September. The present practice is to cut them off in the summer months, and reinstate them in September.

MR. SALSBERG: I agree with it fully, except it starts off in a negative tone, "no allowance."

HON. MR. FROST: It is what is meant that counts.

THE PUBLIC PARKS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Public Parks Act."

MR. SALSBERG: I wish to take exception to subsection 3 of section 1, and I will move an amendment that subsection 3 of section 1 of Bill No. 111, be deleted and I will briefly explain why I moved the deletion of that subsection.

Subsection 3 of section 1, of Bill No. 111, gives authority to the Board of Parks Management to pass by-laws for prescribing fees to be payable for entrance into any park. I think, as do many of the other hon. members of this House who gave expression to this feeling in committee, that it is not the right principle to establish. It is one thing to give authority to park boards or municipal bodies to establish fees for exhibitions and other displays within a park, but it is entirely another thing to establish the principle of charging a fee for entrance to a public park.

While it is permissive legislation, I think we should not enact such permissive legislation, because it may be a temptation to the community on account of some financial difficulties it will encounter, to immediately establish an entrance fee to a park.

Obviously, it will affect a section of the people that can ill afford to pay admissions to parks, and it will affect the younger members of a family. I can visualize a working class family where children will be deprived of going to a park in a neighbourhood if an entrance fee is established. Let no one think lightly of this or laugh at it. It is serious.

I said a moment ago, it is a departure from what is almost a universal practice, to my knowledge, that public parks are open to all people. What we may charge within the park for admission to exhibitions etc., is entirely a different matter, but let us not depart from a very sound democratic principle. Therefore, I move this amendment.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I think there is quite a misunderstanding regarding this. The municipalities have asked that they might have the authority to set up a board known as a Parks Board to look after various recreational centres within the city, for instance, skating rinks. This Parks Board would be in control of it. There may be baths as in my city, for example, where we have swimming competitions. We have charged fees to people from Montreal,

and all over the country to have swimming competitions. Outsiders come there, and rent the swimming pool for the night.

Where they have a community centre, skating centre, or something of that nature, surely, we should not say the people should not be charged.

All we ask is that this be changed, put under the Parks Act, and that there may be not less than 3 or more than 7, as the by-law provides, members of the board, but where the board is to be composed of 5 or more persons, at least 2 shall be members of the council.

That is all. The change does not ask for a charge at all.

MR. SALSBERG: That is not in accordance with the provisions of the Act. Let me read the first section to the hon. Minister—

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): The Municipal Council has power. They are elected.

MR. SALSBERG: There is a separate clause that provides the authority of which the hon. Minister has spoken, and I have no objection to that clause.

HON. MR. FROST: We plead municipal autonomy.

MR. SALSBERG: You do not believe in that, in every respect, do you?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: Section 2 reads as follows:

The Board of Park Management with the approval of the council of the municipality may pass by-laws for prescribing fees to be payable for entrance to any park.

I am not questioning that, although on each occasion, if I were a member of a municipal council, I would object to it, but I am not objecting to this authority to charge entrance fees to swimming pools or other facilities within the park, but the following subsection is very explicit to give them the

right to charge a fee for entering the park itself. That I object to.

Amendment negatived.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 111 reported.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend The Magistrates Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 116 reported.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 117, "An Act to amend The Judicature Act."

Sections 1 and 2 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 117 reported.

THE SECURITY TRANSFER TAX ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend The Security Transfer Tax Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 118 reported.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 119, reported.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the committee rise and report certain bills with amendments and certain bills without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report 15 bills without amendment and 2 bills with amendments.

Report concurred in.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, perhaps there would be an opportunity here to deal with Resolution No. 16, concerned with the matter of expenses to members sitting on committees. I will call Order No. 16.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Resolution, by Mr. Frost:

That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to consider the question of the allowance for expenses payable to members of Select Committees sitting in the interval between sessions of the Legislature, under the provisions of section 63 of the Legislative Assembly Act.

The said committee to report to the House at this session of the Legislature, to consist of 5 members.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to that, "the committee to be composed of Messrs. Welsh (Chairman), Grummett, Manley, Janes and Weaver."

In moving this resolution, I do so for reasons which are very obvious and apparent.

Under the Legislative Assembly Act, the members are allowed expenses of \$20 per day, and mileage.

With the large number of committees of the House we have had, and are going to have, it is apparent there should be some change in the allowance for expenses. It is quite impossible for a member to stay in this city on the present allowance of \$20 per day. To those who do not think particularly of this matter, it may seem that a person should be able to live on \$20 a day, but just attempt to get room and board in this city, and see the cost involved.

I think it is apparent there has to be a change, otherwise, it will be difficult to secure members of a committee to sit.

For example, my good friend the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr.

Grummett) has served on many committees. He is a practicing solicitor, and his time is simply donated when he is sitting on a committee. The allowances he receives are not sufficient to pay his expenses in Toronto, and, as I say, he is simply donating his time. This is not in the form of an indemnity, but is an allowance, and I do not think we should ask the hon. members of the House to do the things they have to do, and to accept these positions at, not only a complete sacrifice of their own time, but having to bear their out-of-pocket expenses as well.

Resolution agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that when this House adjourn the present sittings thereof, it stands adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and that Rule 2 of the Assembly in that regard be suspended, so far as it may apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: There will be a night session tomorrow. We will consider anything on the Order paper, and the Estimates as they appear in the booklet.

MR. SALSBERG: Alphabetically?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. I would ask the hon. members who desire to take part in the Budget Debate to be prepared. There are a number of Orders remaining, for example, in connection with the report by the Committee on Reform Institutions, and the report by the committee investigating the status of the Indians, upon which the debates have to be completed, and tomorrow, we will be glad to go ahead with any of those items.

HON. MR. FROST moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.02 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Wednesday, March 31, 1954

Afternoon Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 31, 1954.

Twelfth Report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Stewart	989
Report, Standing Committee on Printing, Mr. Yaremko	989
Report, Standing Committee on Conservation, Mr. Cowling	990
Minutes, Standing Committee on Game and Fish, Mr. Wardrope	990
Report, Standing Committee on Mining, Mr. Mapledoram, Mr. Wardrope	990
Milk Industry, bill respecting, referred to committee	996
Ross Memorial Hospital, bill respecting, third reading	996
City of St. Thomas, bill respecting, third reading	996
Hamilton Foundation, bill to incorporate, third reading	996
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, third reading	996
City of Peterborough (No. 2), bill respecting, third reading	996
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, third reading	996
Telephone Act, 1954, third reading	996
Financial Administration Act, 1954, third reading	996
Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Planning Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Charitable Institutions Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952, bill to amend, third reading	996
Public Parks Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Magistrates Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Judicature Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Security Transfer Tax Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, third reading	996
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	996
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, reported	996
Report, Hydro Electric Power Commission, Mr. Challies	1009
Motion to Adjourn Discussion, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1017
Homes for the Aged Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	1017
Grand River Conservation Act, 1938, bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, second reading	1018
Cemeteries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, second reading	1018
Disabled Persons Allowances Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	1018
Community Centres Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading	1018
Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading	1018
Fire Marshals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading	1018
Ontario Hospitals, Port Arthur, bill respecting, Mr. Frost, second reading	1018
Liquor Licence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, second reading	1018
Pharmacy Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, second reading	1018
Travelling Shows Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading	1018
Royal Conservatory of Music, Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Dunlop, second reading	1018
Unveiling Plaque Commemorating hon. Robert Baldwin, Mr. Frost, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Grummett, Mr. Salsberg	1018
Recess, 6 o'clock	1024

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1954.

2.00 o'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Today we have as our guests, students from the Courcellette School, Scarborough, James S. Bell Public School of Long Branch, and the John Wanless Public School, Toronto.

We are happy and privileged, indeed, to have the students with us on these occasions, and I sincerely hope that you have enjoyed your tour this morning and learned more about our building, and all it means. Also, that you will learn more this afternoon about the way in which our province is run.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. J. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Nickle, I beg leave to present the Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Nickle, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presents the Twelfth and final Report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 31—An act respecting the Town of Oakville.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Motion agreed to.

MR. JOHN YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the

Report of the Standing Committee on Printing and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Yaremko, from the Standing Committee on Printing presents the committee's Report as follows:

Your committee recommends that the supplies allowance per member for the current session of the Assembly be fixed at the sum of \$50 and that, to meet the convenience of the members, a cheque for that amount be issued to each member of the Assembly in order that he may make the desired purchases in his own constituency.

And that an allowance be authorized and a cheque issued to each of the full-time daily newspaper representatives covering the present session of the Legislative Assembly, as nominated by the Press Gallery and approved by Mr. Speaker.

Your committee recommends that copies of the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*, *The Canadian Almanac* and the *Canada Year Book* be purchased for distribution to the members of the Assembly and also that each member be given a year's subscription to the *Labour Gazette*.

Your committee recommends that the amount of printing to be done by the various governmental departments on their own presses be kept at a minimum.

Your committee recommends that the following sessional papers be printed for departmental use and distribution:

Accounts, Public	2,300
Agricultural College, Ontario, Report ..	1,650
Agriculture, Minister's Report	2,150
Agriculture, Statistics Branch, Report ..	5,550
Auditor's Report	500
Births, Marriages and Deaths	2,650

Civil Service Commissioner, Report	350
Education, Report	1,150
Estimates	1,300
Highways, Department of	500
Labour, Department of, Report	1,250
Lands and Forests, Department of, Report	2,650
Legal Offices, Report of the Inspector ..	550
Liquor Control Board, Report	650
Niagara Parks Commission, Report	350
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, Report	160
Police, Provincial, Report of the Commissioner	450
Public Welfare, Department of, Report	650
Public Works, Department of, Report ..	550
Reform Institutions, Department of, Report	790
Training Schools	890
Toronto University, Report	225
Veterinary College, Ontario, Report	2,550
Workmen's Compensation Board, Report	2,150
Select Committee on The Cemeteries Act, Report	2,500

Motion agreed to.

MR. A. H. COWLING: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Myers, I beg leave to present the Report of the Standing Committee on Conservation, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Myers, from the Standing Committee on Conservation, presents the committee's Report as follows:

The Standing Committee on Conservation has met several times during the past few weeks pursuant to your direction. The committee has heard certain representations from a number of organizations and individuals who are particularly interested in conservation.

The committee has made certain representations to the several departments of government concerned and ask that they be given consideration.

Motion agreed to.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Minutes of the Standing Committee on Game and Fish, together with the representations made thereto, and move that they be printed as an appendix to the journals of the Legislature.

Motion agreed to.

MR. C. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Report of the Standing Committee on Mining.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Mining Committee, I feel that I should give the House some idea of the amount of work which has been done by this committee this year. It was one of the largest committees set up by the House and involved about 35 hon. members of the House. We felt at the start of the meetings, that there was too much work to be done by one Standing Committee, so we had it divided into special committees.

A special committee was set up on natural gas, and another one on mining roads. The special committee on natural gas was under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Janes), and the special committee on mining roads was set up by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope).

We have had several meetings and have tabled several reports, this being our final Report. The Report today is tabled in the House and concerns mining roads which we found to be a very interesting subject, in the north particularly.

There are certain things in the Report which we believe should be read out so the hon. members of the House will know what it is all about. As you read our Report, you will realize it does not embody only the mining department, as there is a great deal of work done on mining roads, which involves other departments.

We found, in discussing mining roads with delegations from the north, that there are a great many roads available to traffic in the north owned by great timber companies who might be interested in turning them over to the province if they could get some relief in regard to fire protection.

We also find now, while money is being spent to build mining roads by the Department of Mines, most of the work has been done by the Department of Highways, and very ably done as far as we could find out.

We also find that there will be a real problem with regards to mining roads as far as maintenance work is concerned. Therefore, I will take the liberty of reading some of the suggestions we have set out in our Report:

1. The existing regulations in respect of liability for fire on timber limits are such that the licence holder is held entirely responsible irrespective of the actual cause. It has been found that this clause has made the licence holders extremely hesitant to turn over for public use, bush roads built at their own expense. We would, therefore, recommend that provision be made in respect to the holders of licences to limits which are bisected by such roads, so that if the roads are taken over as mining access roads, they may be relieved of the onus of responsibility for fires which cannot be attributed to the fault of their own personnel.

2. It is recommended that the Department of Highways take over the responsibility for maintenance of roads built by the Department of Mines on a basis to be worked out to the mutual satisfaction of the two departments. The reason for this recommendation is that the Highways Department is equipped with material and personnel to carry on this work and is therefore in a position to do it more efficiently and more economically than could be done by any other agency.

3. Your sub-committee suggests, in view of the fact that many of the mining roads already built, or now under consideration, bisect timbered areas, making them accessible for harvesting, that the Department of Lands and Forests might justly be expected to share in the cost of such roads. In some cases, notably the areas of Hearst, Paska and Nakina, the lumber industries concerned would profit by the construction of roads which would tend to reduce railroad freight rates and bring the wood from these areas into the class of merchantable timber. It is now a fact that the product of these

areas is to a large degree excluded from the market because of the excessive freight rates. Furthermore, it is self-evident that the construction of mining roads presents a means of access to timbered areas to facilitate the fighting of outbreaks of fire.

The sub-committee makes the following recommendations concerning specific road construction projects:

A. We recommend to the government that a road be constructed from the junction of the Warren Lake and Kukatush roads to Foleyet, a distance of 18 miles, thereby opening up a Greenstone Belt as well as giving an outlet to a community which has never had access to the outside world. This, we feel should be, primarily, a mines department project.

B. We recommend a road from Foleyet on the Canadian Northern Railway to Sultan on the Canadian Pacific Railway, a distance of 48 miles. This will serve as a through link from Foleyet, Sultan, Thessalon, to Sault Ste. Marie. We consider this a suitable project for the Department of Mines.

C. We recommend a road from Hearst to Hawk Junction, a distance of 70 miles, to complete thereby the opening up of Oba, Franz, Goudreau, Hawk Junction and Wawa to the outside world, as well as bisecting the mining belt. Because of the fact that this road would be extensively used as a public thoroughfare and would assist materially in the development of larger areas, in addition to its purpose as a mining road, we feel that its construction could properly fall under the purview of the Department of Highways.

D. The construction of a road from Hornepayne to the Hearst-Michipicoten road, a distance of 35 miles. Hornepayne has a population of 2,500 people who have never had access to the outside world. For much the same reason, as in the case above, we feel that this could be considered a responsibility of the Department of Highways.

At this point I believe we should make some special mention of the fact that we had a very good delegation of representatives from the area of Hornepayne. They presented a very fine report to the mining roads committee. We found in discussing roads with them that they are staking in the mining areas to within 10 miles of Hornepayne.

Hornepayne has been established for 40 years and has a population of 2,500. It has community halls, community rinks, a Chamber of Commerce, and all the things everyone else has, but not a road. It has 200 cars with a distance of 10 miles to drive.

While it is not in the report, we find there is a private road coming from Highway 11, owned outright by a timber company, which comes within 10 miles of Hornepayne. Because it goes through private property and the timber limits are owned outright, and not under the Crown, Hornepayne has no way of getting access to this piece of road. It is very heart-rending as far as these people are concerned to know that within 10 miles they would have an outlet to Highway No. 11, yet they have been isolated for 40 years. I think the Department of Highways should give this very serious consideration.

The report goes on:

E. We recommend a connecting road from the Pronto-Preston East Dome uranium find area to Blind River, an approximate distance of 30 miles. We consider this road a Mines Department responsibility.

F. We recommend a road connecting Highway 17 with the Manitouwadge Lake mining area, utilizing private timber roads to effect a loop to Highway 11. The Manitouwadge area promises to develop into one of the great mining fields of Canada. This road would, therefore, normally be considered a Mines Department responsibility, but because of the fact that it will be required to carry heavy equipment it is suggested that a road built closer to Highways Department specifications might be required. The

appropriation of the Mines Department for this year is insufficient to build such a road. We, therefore, recommend that it should be done as a Department of Highways project.

G. We recommend a road connecting Nakina to Highway 11 at Geraldton where there are existing gold mines and where there is, presently, exploration being carried on in an iron pyrites formation. The total distance is 32 miles of which 12 miles northwest from Geraldton has been completed to the Hutcheson Lake Gold Mines, and of another 12 miles, running southeast from Nakina, the right-of-way has been cut by the citizens of Nakina at their own expense. This leaves a gap of 8 miles. Completion of this road we consider would be a proper project for the Highways Department.

H. We recommend a connection with the road from Savant Lake via Wycliffe and Valora, hooking up with Highway 17, a distance of 38 miles. Because of the general nature of service to which this road would be amenable, we suggest that it should be undertaken by the Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, we are not in favour of building roads starting nowhere and going nowhere. I think the Mining Committee has given that very serious consideration. All the projects we have suggested are tying-in links with main highways, or will be eventually. We understand this could not possibly be done in one year. We realize the tremendous amount of work it would take to do it, and we also know the appropriation the Department of Mines has for this year. Therefore, we are going to table this report, with one more project, and hope that the government will give it serious consideration, and it will be turned over to the Department of Mines for it to use its own judgment and take whatever steps the Department of Highways thinks will be necessary this year, with regard to roads.

I. We recommend the completion of Highway 101 to the Quebec border, a distance of 7.2 miles. This will open up excellent mining country and connect with the Rouyn mining district. This we recommend as a project of the Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, we, as a committee, have given a great deal of serious consideration to this problem. We have looked at hundreds of maps and have met delegations from all parts of the north. We are convinced this is a serious matter as far as these people are concerned, particularly in those parts of the province where we still have isolated districts. They see this as a means to an end, to get to the outside world.

I may say that everybody who came to see the Mining Roads Committee this year has been high in praise of the government, and the hon. Minister of Mines for the work he is doing along these lines.

We also want to pass along the same tribute to the hon. Minister of Highways, because he is the one who is contracting the roads. We also know he has the equipment to maintain the roads and the engineers to build them. Some of these will be major projects, but there are a number of small roads which could be completed in the near future, which would make a great many people in the Province of Ontario very happy.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the report of the subcommittee on Mining Roads just given the House by the Chairman of the Mining Committee, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram), is the most important report presented to this House this session as far as the northern members are concerned.

You will note it mentions the Department of Lands and Forests and its responsibility. It will benefit from these access roads as they will assist it in their fire fighting and will make available large areas of timber that can be economically logged, thereby adding to the revenue of that depart-

ment. Many of these roads proposed have been partially built by timber companies who have already spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in putting roads through their timber concessions. If this government is going to declare these roads public highways, the licencees must be relieved of responsibility of fires set by the travelling public and only be held responsible for fires set by their own personnel.

These access roads are economically essential as some timber operators are being forced to close due to transportation costs—I refer to the Hearst area and the Paska area where freight rates are such that timber operations cannot continue. Access roads would correct this situation and allow these operations to be carried on. In addition, timber dues amount to great sums. We would like to see some of this money put back into access roads in the north to develop further resources that will again enrich the people of Ontario.

It is impossible to give an exact estimate of what these mining access roads will mean to the future of this province. When we think that the Sudbury area pays \$14 million into the Federal Treasury and over \$3 million into the Provincial Treasury every year, one can visualize what possibilities new areas developed mean.

The new find at Manitouwadge Lake is an example. I have been given permission by the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) to read a letter from the vice-president of that new mine, which was sent to him the other day, to show hon. members the necessity for speed in the building of these roads. Mr. Hamilton says:

Geco Mines is, presently, the most advanced of any of the Manitouwadge area properties in its drilling. Exploration, to date, gives indication of over 10 million tons of commercial grade ore and may warrant production of up to 5,000 tons of ore per day.

We think Geco Mines will be only the first of several mines to develop sufficient ore to warrant production

in the Manitouwadge area and this area may grow in importance to something between the size of Geraldton and Rouyn-Noranda.

We would like the area to be developed on a co-operative basis, and we will approach the government, through its proper officials, for the necessary facilities for freight, power, townsite, etc.

In the mining industry, we figure that, once a decision is made to go into production, every delayed day amounts to a loss equal to the value of the production decided upon. On this basis, a day's delay in opening up the Manitouwadge area may well cost us 750 to 1,000 well-paid man days, and unnecessary delay in getting road access to the area may postpone production a year.

This area is going to bring tremendous new wealth to Ontario. But we must have no delay in building a road to it, otherwise the development will suffer. Here is an important drawback, it costs a prospector \$130 every time he flies into Manitouwadge Lake mining field. How much new mining territory can be opened up when expenses for the prospector are that costly? If we had access roads, there is no doubt in my mind vast new mineral deposits will be found.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we speak of roads in the north, we are not entirely selfish, because wealth discovered in the north helps Southern Ontario, as much of the end result of our mineral and timber wealth finds its way into the pockets of the citizens of Southern Ontario.

Remember, Cobalt built Toronto.

This government has brought Ontario sweeping, forward-looking legislation in the past. Remember the bold steps taken by former governments. I have reference to the T. & N.O. Railway—now the Ontario Northland—and the Ferguson Highway. We have ample proof of the wisdom of these bold steps in the development of areas such as North Bay, Cobalt, Haileybury, New Liskeard, Kirkland Lake, Timmins,

Cochrane, Iroquois Falls, and Moosonee, great areas of mineral, timber and farming lands.

This is no time to bury our heads in the sand. This government has always taken bold steps which have brought great benefits to the people of Ontario. We have a better Prime Minister than any who have gone before him; a man more foresighted and fair. Let's build these access roads in the north and open up more of these great areas which hold such possibilities for the future prosperity of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. MR. GEMMELL (Minister of Lands and Forests: Before the Orders of the day, I want to give the House a report in connection with a Canadian Press report of March 27th, regarding certain conditions existing in the Niagara River. This matter came up in the Fish and Game Committee of the Legislature this morning, and I promised the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) and other hon. members serving that area, that I would have a report for them on this question. The Canadian Press report says in effect, that a large mass of dead fish was blown on to the Canadian shore of the Niagara River. The Canadian Press report reads as follows:

Another large mass of dead fish was blown on to the Canadian shore of the Niagara river in the Fort Erie area by a strong wind. Conservation officials have complained that industrial wastes, dumped into the water on the American side of the river, are responsible for the death of fish.

This report has appeared in various Canadian papers under different headings, indicating that industrial wastes have created this condition. So we dispatched a biologist and an engineer to investigate the matter. Their interim

report is as follows. It was made by Mr. Millest of our department as of March 30th:

REPORT—FISH MORTALITY
IN NIAGARA RIVER
MARCH 30th, 1954.

Date of Investigation:

March 30th, 1954.

Field Investigation by:

V. R. Taylor, Biologist,
R. H. Millest, Engineer.

Report by: R. H. Millest.

Reports of large numbers of dead fish appearing throughout the Niagara River have been received by the department on various occasions since the summer of 1953. The most recent reports were received during the past two-week period from March 15th to March 29th.

A field survey of general conditions and of the extent of the fish mortality was begun on March 30th. The following information was obtained through inspections along the river, as well as through discussions with other representatives of the Department along the river and with persons investigating the same occurrence on behalf of the Department of Conservation and the Water Pollution Control Board in the State of New York.

The occurrence was closely observed for about 18 days by Conservation Officer A. R. Muma, Chippawa. His report (verbal, March 30th) indicated that the fish were almost entirely of two species only: gizzard shad and alewives. He had observed only a few other dead fish during that time. Heavy concentrations of dead fish were observed as far west as Port Colborne along the Lake Erie shore, and while these may have been carried there by an east wind, it is more probable that they died in the lake and not along the Buffalo waterfront, as was suspected.

An interview on March 30th with Department of Conservation Game

Protector, Robert Kauffman, of New York State, indicated that investigations by his department had failed to establish other than a natural cause for such a fish mortality. Their investigation of possible lethal pollution had revealed no more than traces of substances commonly considered poisonous and which were not believed to be responsible for the widespread, continued fish mortality.

A similar report was received from Mr. Donald Stevens, Associate Chemical Engineer of the New York State Water Pollution Control Board.

Conclusions:

It appears reasonable, for the following reasons, to conclude that the recent fish mortality in the Niagara River was due to natural causes:

1. Only two species of fish were found dead in large numbers—alewives and gizzard shad. If fish has been killed by pollution from either domestic or industrial wastes, other species would likely have appeared in appreciably large numbers.

2. The recurring nature of heavy mortalities in these two species has been known for many years, particularly in Lake Ontario. Their tendency to periodically "school" in large numbers is known. Such an occurrence may contribute to local oxygen deficiency, and hence mortality among those particular fish. Commercial fishermen in Lake Erie have reported exceedingly high concentrations of these fish during the past year.

3. The presence of large numbers of dead fish as far west in Lake Erie as Port Colborne, while it does not rule out the possibility of the mortality being caused by pollution, suggests that pollution is only a remote possibility in this case.

5. It is usually the case that fish mortalities due to pollution are severe and of short duration. This most recent mortality on the Upper Niagara River has taken place over a two-week period during which time

no continuing lethal pollution was found.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say, before the Orders of the day that I plan, at 5 o'clock this afternoon, to adjourn the debate which may be in progress at that time, and revert, with your permission, to the Orders of the day so that we may speak relative to the unveiling of the plaque to the memory of hon. Robert Baldwin, which is in the rotunda, just outside the Chamber. There will be many members of the Baldwin family here at that time, and it would be better if any speaking with reference to the life and work of Robert Baldwin were done in the Legislature, so that it would be unnecessary to have any speaking in the west corridor.

Immediately prior to the unveiling the House could adjourn its sittings to resume again at 8 o'clock this evening. The unveiling will take place immediately after the adjournment.

MILK INDUSTRY BILL

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare) moves that the third reading of Bill No. 68, "An Act respecting the Milk Industry" be discharged and referred back to a Committee of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

The following bills were read a third time and passed, and intitled as set out in the motions:

Bill No. 17, An Act respecting the Ross Memorial Hospital.

Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Bill No. 19, An Act to incorporate The Hamilton Foundation.

Bill No. 22, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill No. 23, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 2).

Bill No. 25, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill No. 51, The Telephone Act, 1954.

Bill No. 91, The Financial Administration Act, 1954.

Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Bill No. 106, An Act to amend the Public Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act.

Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952.

Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Public Parks Act.

Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act.

Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill No. 118, An Act to amend The Security Transfer Tax Act.

Bill No. 119, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

LABOUR RELATIONS BILL

House in Committee on Bill No. 110, "An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act."

Mr. Dent (Oxford) in the Chair.

MR. SALSBERG: I should like to ask the chairman to agree not to call this bill for the committee's consideration at this moment. The reason I make this request is because, only a few minutes ago, the various groups in the House received a four-page memorandum which goes into details of various aspects of the bill. I doubt whether any of us have had the chance to familiarize ourselves with its contents.

The memorandum comes from a responsible labour body, the Ontario Federation of Labour of the CCL, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have had no opportunity to consider it, we should give ourselves the time to become acquainted with its suggestions before we deal with the bill in the committee stage.

HON. MR. DALEY (Minister of Labour): I can only say this: that this bill and these amendments have been considered over a long period of time in consultation with many people, among them the very people who have sent this memorandum at this late date. I may say to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that the government is not prepared to delay this matter. We have compiled this, we have approved the contents, and we are prepared to go ahead with the bill.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should have time to read this memorandum. I would like to read the 5 pages before we consider the bill if this is possible.

HON. MR. DALEY: I think the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) received this as soon as I did, and I have already read it. Most of it agrees with what we have done, though it does criticize us for some things that are not included in the bill.

MR. GRUMMETT: Where did the hon. Minister receive his copy?

HON. MR. DALEY: Right here in the House.

MR. GRUMMETT: Well, we have been considering other things. I got this a few moments ago, and I think we should be given time to read it.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not think there is anything in the memorandum which opposes what is contained here. It acquiesces in what we do, and suggests other things. I am quite prepared to hold it over before it is reported and to let the hon member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) look over the brief. But he will find there is nothing in it which is opposed to what is put forward in this bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Why cannot the government agree to such a modest and reasonable request that the bill be left over until tomorrow morning for consideration?

HON. MR. FROST: We have a great deal of business before us. I set this for a time which, I thought, would allow for consideration of the bill in the light of day, instead of calling it at night. I had planned it for this date, and I think we should go ahead.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister knows that the light of day never penetrates into this Chamber. We could consider it later this afternoon, or tomorrow.

HON. MR. FROST: This was made available, as a matter of fact, some weeks ago. The principles of this matter were laid down at an open hearing, at which the press was present. I am not so sure that I did not see the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) sitting at the back of the room. I may be mistaken, in that, but but I am satisfied that the hon. member for St. Andrew read this over most thoroughly. Surely between then and now, with his great propensity for reading newspaper clippings and other matters, he must know pretty well what is in this statement.

MR. SALSBERG: The mystery of my presence there can easily be explained. I have not read this document since it was placed on my desk. I therefore went there and asked the Deputy Minister of Labour whether he received it, and I suggested that he and the hon. Minister of Labour should agree not to call the bill this afternoon because of this latest information. That is the reason I was there. I was hoping the hon. Minister and the Deputy Minister would agree to leave this until tomorrow.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, can we proceed with this? I think we have given the hon. member for St. Andrew his answer.

MR. SALSBERG: If you insist on rushing this through, and denying us the opportunity to find out what an important labour body has to say about the bill, there are a few questions which have to be asked.

In section 1, subsection 2, councils of trade unions are being introduced into the legislation, and to recognize that such a council is a suitable body for collective bargaining. This may be a very worthwhile step to take. On the other hand, it raises a great number of questions.

The Act also provides certain penalties against unions and the denial of certain rights of unions, even for the prosecution of unions for violation of some parts of the Labour Relations Act. The question arises whether, with the establishment of these changes, any violation of a unit of the council would not put in jeopardy the council and all its affiliates. In other words, to take an example, supposing the United Automobile Workers union of this country, the Canadian District Council, had one of its locals involved in a strike, the legality of which the employer or the hon. Minister of Labour would question, would the council as a whole, that is, the Canadian Council of the U.A.W., lose its right to collective bargaining?

Mr. Chairman, this is not a secondary question. It is a rather important consideration, and could create havoc in the trade union movement.

As I said before, in principle it would seem to be a worthwhile addition to our collective-bargaining machinery, but I am afraid of the consequences, about which I have spoken.

I would like to hear the hon. Minister elaborate on that, and give us assurance that no such danger exists.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, on the one hand, the hon. member said it would be a worthwhile addition, while, on the other hand, he tries to build up a man of straw, in order to knock it down.

In the first place, the relationship between the employer and the trade council can only be established by mutual agreement. If there was any difficulty, it would involve only the particular union, not the whole group—which is a member of the council, and which is a party to the agreement.

We think it a worthwhile addition to our labour relations legislation. It permits a group of trade unions to form into a council. That was done on the big Hydro development at Niagara Falls, and it worked extremely satisfactory. They negotiated an agreement as one. We have it in the printing trade and with the Typographical Union.

It does not require, if there are 15 unions, that each would have to have a certain number of representatives. That would create a whole army in order to come to any agreement. It simplifies the matter of collective bargaining on a broad scale. It was very completely canvassed in our discussions, when this was being devised, and I think the brief, to which the hon. member referred, concurs in it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I did not make it quite clear enough. Until now, a collective bargaining agency was rather clearly defined. Let us say a union of carpenters, or a union of automobile workers, was engaged in negotiations, which led to the signing of a contract. According to the provisions section of the Act, if the bargaining unit violated any part of the Act, it suffered certain consequences. Right? If, as a result of the present amendment, a joint council, or any similar body of a number of unions, was to sign a contract on behalf of a number of locals, and if one of the unions or locals violated any of the terms, or were to become involved with the department, because of the charge that they violated certain rules, would that not handicap the bargaining unit, which would be the council or the joint board?

I may say there seems to be no definition in the Act to make it abundantly clear that the penalty clause will not apply to the broader group, which will be acting on behalf of a number of local units.

HON. MR. DALEY: No. I can advise the hon. member it involves the particular union, and that union only.

MR. SALSBERG: Only that union?

HON. MR. DALEY: Only that union.

MR. SALSBERG: Let us take the example of Hydro, as was mentioned by the hon. Minister: If the carpenters' union was involved in a dispute, then the joint council, established by all the unions in the project, should not forfeit any of its rights, and should not be liable to penalties, as a result of the fact that it signed on behalf of all groups.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that is right.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

MR. SALSBERG: On section 2, the words as I read them, seem a little contradictory. Well, let me read the section as amended:

Upon an application for certification, the board will determine the unit or employees which are proper for collective bargaining, but which, in every case, must consist of one employee and the board may, before determining the unit, take a vote of any of the employees or employers—and so on.

How in the world are you going to determine who has the right to participate in a vote before you determine the unit? You say very clearly, "before determining the unit, the board may conduct a vote." Who will participate in the vote, if you have not determined the unit? It would seem to be rather confusing and confused.

HON. MR. DALEY: The purpose is to give the board the opportunity of establishing a "voting constituency," as it were, to enable the board to ascertain the wishes of the employees. There must be some method of doing it, and the board is desirous of being able to do that.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, if I read the intent correctly, I imagine it is meant to apply to certain craft groups

who may desire their own representation. But I do want to say I think it is rather necessary, to have it clearly stated in the Act, so that if an application is made by a certain group, that wishes to have separate representation, be they carpenters or plumbers, then only the carpenters or plumbers or bricklayers be entitled to vote. Then you have some definition as to who is entitled to participate.

But if you leave it before determining the unit, to have a vote, it would be possible, if it was desired, to include in the vote a group of people who would not even come under the bargaining unit, and who later on might be dropped, but who would be added to the voting group.

It does not make sense to me, unless I get more enlightenment.

HON. MR. DALEY: The matter has been very carefully considered by our own people, and the board, and with the legal counsel who finally compile the intent into language. I am quite satisfied to say I think it covers exactly what the hon. member wants. We have the definition here and I do not think the hon. member has any reason to think that both parties would be unfairly dealt with in the language of the Act itself.

MR. SALSBERG: You see, Mr. Chairman, it is not the intent I question. I think it is clear. But I question the wording which may lead to a great deal of trouble. If anybody desires to cause trouble, they could do so, the way it is formulated now.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he does not think the definition section of the original Act should be amended, so we would have a definition of "guard"—a definition of an employee who may be regarded as a guard only, and excluded from the bargaining unit.

Previously such an employee was not included in certification, but under this

new section—that is, section 8, as covered by section 3 of this bill—a guard is not included in collective bargaining.

I think the original definition section of the Statute should be amended to give a clear interpretation of what is meant by “guard.”

HON. MR. DALEY: I think you will find that section 8 of the Act will cover that. But, in any event, Mr. Chairman, it has been found necessary to deal definitely, and with a degree of positiveness with the question of “guards.”

There is a type of person who may be a guard and carry weapons to protect the plant. There is another type who may just be stationed at the gate to interview or recognize people coming in. There may be some men who would be doing menial work around the plant all day, and just step out as guard for an hour at night, or for the incoming workmen in the morning.

The board has the power to define a “guard.” I am sure it would not say a fellow who worked around the plant all day, and just walked to the gate to check up, would be a “guard,” and should not be permitted in a bargaining unit.

What is being done is giving the board the right to determine who a “guard” is, and, as the personnel of the board is, as hon. members know, representative of both management and union organizations—such large bodies as the Federation of Labour and the C.I.O. with an equal number of representatives of management—I am sure these guards can and will be fairly and impartially dealt with.

I think the wording, as we have it here, does exactly what the board, in its experience of administering for years, wanted done. I am satisfied this is a necessary addition, and as the board operates with the personnel, as I have mentioned, I am sure the question will be adequately handled under the new regulations.

MR. GRUMMETT: But might it not lead to a great deal of argument before the board? Every time the matter comes before the board, there will be a discussion as to who is a “guard” and who is not.

HON. MR. DALEY: They always have to face these things. I have said to the board: “I cannot design legislation to prevent you from having arguments; you have certain things to do, and certain things with which to deal, and there is no legislation which can be written into the books, which will make everything so ‘cut and dried’ that the board would have nothing to do, within the spirit of fairness and within its powers.” That is what its members are there for. That is why they are representative of all classes, and I think you can leave it to them.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

On section 5.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, section 5 deals with the bargaining committee, and it says, “what shall be the composition of the bargaining committee of the union,” but there is nothing in this section as to who will constitute the bargaining committee of the employer group.

What I am trying to point out is that the employer group could send a very junior official in to bargain, one who would go in simply as a man of straw, whereas the unions would send in their top-level officials. Is there no possibility of putting into this section some amendment whereby management will send only senior officials to bargain in good faith with the union?

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. members are aware, I have dealt with a great many cases of bargaining, and I have found no indication of what the hon. member says. I have found that large institutions have representatives, their personnel manager, or members of the staff, who are selected to bargain. It may be the president of the organization is not there, and I do not think there is any way of demanding that he be. In fact, in many cases

I would prefer the top officials not to be there, because we have found, from experience, that if you have the top people there and get an answer, there is no place to which you can go. But if you get a "No" answer from the representatives who are there, and you deem that answer to be unreasonable or unjust, you have some place higher up to go by way of appeal.

I do not mind telling the hon. members that we do have to do that. We have said to them, "We think this is a reasonable settlement, but if you do not agree to this, we will go to the top."

I have done that both with employers and representatives of the unions. I have stepped over the heads of the bargaining group of unions, and consulted with the president of the whole organization, on many occasions.

This is really in the interest of the unions, because we have had experience in these matters. As a matter of fact, I recall one employer's representative insisting we have two employees from each of the different employer organizations. Some of them only had two, and it would have been necessary to close the plant so these people could come. We do not think that is necessary. We think the group of employees and employers should get together, and bargain in that way. For instance, you may have the Building Trades Council, which will only have three or four people representing the group. That would apply in the same manner to the unions.

We think we are taking quite an advanced step toward encouraging collective bargaining in a big way.

MR. GRUMMETT: Do you not think the intent to bargain is rather frustrated, when the junior officials come in from the employers' group, with definite instructions from the group, and who are not prepared to alter their decision one way or the other? It delays the whole procedure. You have perhaps to cancel that meeting, and arrange another, before you

can get in contact with the higher-up officials of the employer group.

HON. MR. DALEY: I would not promise to make any intent to select the bargaining group for an employer, nor would I expect to do that for the unions. Even when dealing with the unions, I sometimes wish some other people were there, who I know, understand the situation better than those with whom we have to deal. But I do not think that this Legislature should attempt to say who will bargain for whom.

MR. SALSBERG: Why did the hon. Minister find it necessary to amend this section 12, altogether, at this time?

HON. MR. DALEY: Which section?

MR. SALSBERG: Section 5, which is really amending section 12.

HON. MR. DALEY: The whole thing follows through. In this Labour Relations Act, you cannot amend simply one section. We are making it possible for trades councils to function in a manner that be productive of agreements.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6.

MR. SALSBERG: On section 6, Mr. Chairman: In a way, that is the heart of the bill, and I respectfully suggest that it is very inadequate and does not seem to meet even the minimum requirements.

For a long while, the great cry from organized labour was that the conciliation processes had become so "bogged down" with frustrating and almost provocative situations arising.

Originally, the Act provided a certain time limit for the whole process to go through. In this section we are cutting it down from 52 to 35 days, as we have in the previous section reduced it from 20 to 15. Yet in the face of the complaints as to the actual situation, I think the hon. Minister must realize this is a disappointing step to take. The press

anticipated the announcement by the hon. Minister, and commented on it as if it were major labour legislation.

The *Toronto Globe and Mail*, in anticipation of far more changes than we are getting, gave him front-page royal treatment, as late as February 9th, in announcing the intention to bring about important changes in the Act.

Labour, in response to this advanced publicity, also said it would welcome improvement in the conciliation process.

I suggest what is now proposed will not be very helpful, because, instead of getting through the process in a given time as was established, it drags on for as long as 48 weeks, and longer.

Many unions will admit that the delay was due not alone to the department or to the employer, sometimes the unions also contributed to the extension of the time. I imagine there were instances where both employers and employees agreed to continue the conciliation, in the hope of arriving at a satisfactory settlement. Even considering these factors, the conciliation process often broke down, and created such a dangerous situation that only heroic, last-minute efforts and the showing of a maximum of self-restraint, prevented industrial disputes, which would have been of major proportions.

The situation became so serious that the Ontario Federation of Labour (C.C.L.) research branch, found it necessary to issue a special bulletin stating the recent experiences of the union. It found, instead of the maximum of 69 days, as was originally considered to be the extreme limit, cases were extended, as follows—I am not naming the firms listed, although I could if anybody wishes it. I am sure the hon. Minister has seen this document.

Here is the list of firms whose employees were involved in negotiations, which led to the establishment of conciliation boards, and the length of time required:

29 weeks; 28 weeks; 26 weeks; 25 weeks; 26 weeks.

In one case 48 weeks.

Then there were a great number of instances where the conciliation process dragged on for 26 weeks, 26 weeks, 16 weeks, 24 weeks, 23 weeks, 22 weeks, and so on.

Certainly, this is not facilitating the negotiating processes. There is something to what is said by the union leaders, that many employers fail to negotiate in good faith, and fail to make substantial offers to their workers, in anticipation of getting a better deal from a conciliation board. They merely go through the motions in the first stage, of meeting, and making their own offers—often very inconsequential offers—knowing they will be rejected. They can then apply for a conciliation board. Then the merry-go-round starts in earnest, extending, as you have already seen, for as long as 48 weeks, in some instances. There have been instances where it dragged on for more than a year. I do not know how the Labour Research Department missed that, but we do know that it existed.

In the face of this demoralizing and provoking break-down of conciliation, the amendments do not offer any serious or basic solution. It is certainly disappointing, in the face of all expectations and promises. As the brief begins—and that is all I had the opportunity of reading—of the Ontario Federation of the C.C.L. which was placed on our desks, they take no exception to the amendment, but emphasize its inadequacy.

I suggest something more than this is required, and I raise this point for consideration: Whether the negotiating process would not be stepped up if it were known that after a conciliation officer has tried to bring about a conciliation and has failed, the unions then are free to take whatever action they desire? If they desire to take action let them take it. If they do not, and both parties agree to go to the department asking for a conciliation board, then, of course, the board should be established.

After the efforts of a conciliation officer have failed a conciliation board may be appointed, but only if it is requested. If no request is made, they

should be free to take whatever action they desire.

Many employers, knowing the union would be free, might, of course, speed up negotiations, and make offers which would result in an earlier settlement.

While I am on my feet, I am questioning—I am not too certain about it, and I want to say I am not very sure whether it is right or wrong—whether the hon. Minister should have the right to refuse a conciliation board, when asked. You see, that puts tremendous power in the hands of the hon. Minister. I cannot visualize a situation where the hon. Minister's refusal to set up a conciliation board could help the process of negotiations.

HON. MR. DALEY: It makes them free.

MR. SALSBERG: It could, that is true, but on the other hand, the hon. Minister could also use that power in a manner which would be very disadvantageous to the workman. Frankly, I am not prepared to place such wide powers in the hands of a Progressive Conservative Minister of Labour, and I do not apologize to the hon. members who support the government for saying that.

I am wondering whether we would not accomplish more if we made it clear that if the two parties to negotiations failed to arrive at an agreement, a conciliation officer should be designated to enter the situation, and carry on to the best of his ability, in an effort to bring the two parties together. If he failed, then the two parties would be free, unless they applied for a conciliation board, but they should not be obliged to request a board, as is now the case.

These are a few of the observations I wanted to make on this very vital part of the bill. Before I sit down, I want to make it abundantly clear, that I am very unhappy, very disappointed, very resentful of the fact that the government did not give the unions a chance to discuss these opinions which I am humbly trying to discuss now, before a Committee of the House. I am also

very resentful of the fact that the government did not even want to give us time until tomorrow morning to acquaint ourselves with the written opinions by such an important body as the Ontario Federation of Labour of the C.C.L. about this very important matter.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, this is a definite, earnest, and sincere effort on the part of myself and the Department of Labour, to reduce to the greatest extent possible, conciliation, but to do what the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) indicates he would like done would be actually to do away with the Act, have no Act, and let everybody do exactly what they wanted to do.

That is one way of looking at it. But if you want to have good labour relations, to establish a process of bringing the parties together, insisting they continue to negotiate, and negotiate in good faith, you must have an Act.

You hear so much from the opposition—I do not mean the official Opposition, but generally those who always seem to consider the employers in this province are simply terrible people, who spend their entire time trying to grind down the workers, but that is not so. Actually, the relationship between employer and employee in this province, generally, is good. They both have a great understanding of each other's problems.

Many times when I sit down in negotiations with people, I hear an employer say, "Well, we know what these boys are up against. They have to do something. They have to get something for their workers. How are we going to do it?" They give us their position, telling us that it is difficult to do what they are being asked, but I have never heard in all the negotiations I have taken part in, any attitude indicating that any employer is trying to beat his workmen down. I want to make it very emphatic that such a condition does not exist.

I do not say there is not the odd case where some individual employer has built up a resentment against organized labour. There is. If there were

not, we would not require labour legislation at all. However, that is fast disappearing and today employers and employees are working in an atmosphere of understanding, the employer trying to maintain his business to meet the competitive markets, and to pay his men as much as he thinks possible; and organized labour endeavouring to improve conditions in matters of health, safety, and wages, and to maintain a high standard of living.

There is conflict there, but in my experience, it has not been an antagonistic conflict; it has been a desire on the part of both to get the best they could out of the deal. That is why they are able eventually to wind these things up. I can not order someone to do something, all I can do is assist the two parties, who apparently at that stage need assistance, to bring disagreements into agreement, and arrive at the best possible solution the industry thinks it can meet, and the union thinks it can afford to take.

I say, in agreement with the hon. member for St. Andrew, that there are many times when conciliation has been stretched out, but I would say in examining the whole situation, the reason is as much on the part of organized labour as it is on the part of the employer. I could get data and details to substantiate that statement, but I do not think it is necessary at this stage. I do say there are cases when, in my opinion, after discussing it with my conciliation officer, and reviewing the whole situation, if I could say to these parties, "Now I am not going to appoint a conciliation board. You people settle this, or the union will be free to use whatever economic strength it wants to exert." If I could do that, I think it would eliminate a great many conciliation boards.

I want to make it abundantly clear that I am not going to drastically refuse a board, but I think there are many instances, when either on the employers' side or on the union side, the employer feels, "If we had a board here, it would give us a little less than this," and the union feels, "If we had a board, we

might get a little more," and I believe a great many of these cases would be settled quicker. I could illustrate by letters that high (indicating) that we have a very competent staff. I have had men write very congratulatory letters to me, when these men have been out on the job, about the work the conciliation officers have done.

I think they should actually be assisted to say, "Now let us complete this, because I do not think I can recommend a conciliation board to the Minister, and if I do, I doubt if he will appoint one."

That is the crux of this bill. In no way, do I consider it a minor amendment. I said, in the early stages, as soon as it was possible for me to know that I was definitely going to bring something in, that neither the employers nor employees had indicated to me in any brief, such as this one we received today, that there were any drastic or basic changes needed. There are amendments, and I presume that as we progress and administer, we will find for practical purposes, that there may be other amendments required some day. But after a very careful examination, with my own people whom I consider "tops" on this continent—because in this industrial province, we have had more experience—I think we have very competent people with whom to work, and their advice I accept to a great degree. I am satisfied the amendments which we have here are worthwhile, that they will improve the Act, that they will not destroy the basic principle of establishing a method to develop good labour relations and conciliation services, and I could argue for every one of these amendments. But, as I point out, a great many of them are required because of the change in one, to simply bring the Act into line.

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): In section 7, subsection (b), the hon. Minister has in a general, but brief way, dealt with the provisions of this subsection, which are to the

effect that the hon. Minister has the right to refuse to appoint a conciliation board if he deems it advisable.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would give us specific illustrations of just when he would refuse to appoint a board? Under what circumstances would he take that step? As I understand it, prior to 1950, he possessed this same power. In the 1950 Act, it was taken away, and now he is reversing the previous decision, and bringing back this right to refuse to appoint a conciliation board.

HON. MR. DALEY: At the time I had that authority, I do not think I ever refused to appoint one. But experience has shown me and my officers it is necessary. As they come in from these assignments, and they give me the story of what has happened, how close they were to a settlement, and sometimes it is just a very minor thing on one side or the other, which will cause them to ask for a board. I know the officers have had that experience, and I reiterate again they are men about whose work I have received bales of complimentary letters. Had they the knowledge that I, as Minister, might not appoint a board, but could say to them, "I will not recommend a board," I think in half an hour, if they re-canvassed the situation, they could settle this dispute.

When they come and tell me these things, I can see the need of this provision. Personally, it would make more work for me. I would have to look carefully into what has been done, and I might decide there should be no board. I think we would only have to refuse a few, and the attitude would change.

The hon. member for St. Andrew indicated the 10 or 12 boards which have taken what appears to be a great length of time. That is true. But he did not say anything about over 1,000 cases of conciliation last year, 600-odd of them settled by conciliation officers in "jig time." The others are the bad ones.

MR. SALSBERG: I wanted to leave something for the hon. Minister to say.

HON. MR. DALEY: The hon. member for St. Andrew is very kind. Those are the facts: out of over 1,000 cases, 10 or 12 are cited as having taken an extremely long time, and if I were able to go into the circumstances of each one, I think I could justify the statement that the delays were unavoidable, under the circumstances. Probably one side or the other requested a delay.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is proposed in section 7, to cut the time allowed from 7 to 5 days in which parties can make nomination for conciliation boards? I would like to ask the hon. Minister what his experience has been with the legislation presently on the Statute Books? Have there been many occasions in which the parties did not nominate within the 7 days, and if they did not, what is the practice followed to complete the picture?

HON. MR. DALEY: That is a fair question, and a difficult one too, because, to be frank with this House, I will say we can write any number of days in there. If they do not comply with them, the first thing we have to do is write to them to find out why they did not. We then advise them we have not received their nomination, and ask them if they would look after this, and so on. Often, we are advised that the man they want to represent them on this case is not available, but will be back in a week, or they give some similar reason.

What can we do? In order for the conciliation time to be cut, we require the co-operative effort and the desire of both parties to work with us to bring it about. Sometimes, a group will come into my office and endeavour to settle a dispute. One side—particularly organized labour—will say, "We want this settled, and we want it settled by tomorrow night—or else." I have said on many occasions, "Well then, you might as well leave right now, because I have no guarantee that by tomorrow night at 5 o'clock, I will have a settlement, and if I do not have it by 5 o'clock, you will stay here until we get it."

That is the only way we can do it. I cannot say "You can wind up." You might as well say we can wind up this argument in the next 5 minutes. It is a matter of co-operation and a desire to do the thing, and all I can say is that my department and my officials are earnest and sincere and do the best they can to help these matters progress.

MR. OLIVER: Does the hon. Minister possess, and if he does possess, has he ever exercised, the authority of making an appointment where they failed to nominate?

HON. MR. DALEY: If they do not nominate a chairman, I do.

MR. OLIVER: Has the hon. Minister ever done that?

HON. MR. DALEY: I have done it promptly, yes.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8.

MR. SALSBERG: What penalty is provided against an employer who refuses to abide by an arbitration decision?

HON. MR. DALEY: Arbitration decisions are binding on both parties.

MR. SALSBERG: Suppose an employer refuses?

HON. MR. DALEY: I suppose it would eventually result in prosecution. One party or the other would make application for leave to prosecute, and then it would be a matter for the courts.

MR. SALSBERG: Has the hon. Minister instituted any such prosecution?

HON. MR. DALEY: I do not think so. I do not recall any.

Section 8 agreed to.

Sections 9 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

MR. SALSBERG: I wish to ask a question on section No. 18. Section 59 of the Act is now, I think, being amended. This section now seems to leave the power open for an employer

to provoke a strike. The section, as it reads in its amended form, says:

Where a trade union or a council of trade unions calls or authorizes a strike or employees engage in a strike which the employer or employers' organization concerned alleges is unlawful, the employer or employers' organization may apply to the board for a declaration that the strike is unlawful and the board may make such a declaration.

What I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that unless the amendments are only for the purpose of providing for the council arrangement, I am afraid this section is leaving the door wide open for some provocative action on the part of an employer. Hon. members know that this can easily be done. It is not impossible to antagonize a group of workers. Their lives can be made rather difficult if an employer desires, and, because of that provocation, a cessation of work may result. It is then open to an employer to seek a declaration that the strike is unlawful. In other words, this is not sufficiently safeguarded. What I should like to know is this: Whether this is part of the old Act, with changes to accommodate the councils, or whether it is new.

HON. MR. DALEY: The present Act requires that before a strike can be considered legal the organization must have gone through the procedure as set down in the Labour Relations Act, and if it appears that they have not followed those regulations, they may be considered to be on strike illegally.

People come to me very often and say: "That is an illegal strike, is it not?" I may, in my own mind think that it is. I may be sure it is. But I am not the one who declares it to be so. If an employer thinks his men are on strike illegally, he makes application for a declaration by the Labour Relations Board, and this Act gives the board power not only to make that declaration but to refuse to make it if the evidence as submitted indicates such a course. There is nothing really new in this, but

it clarifies the situation so that the board has its policy more clearly defined.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Would this be taking away authority from the hon. Minister and giving it to the Board of Conciliation?

HON. MR. DALEY: Oh no. They have had this authority. But people have been asking me as Minister if a strike was legal or not, and I have refused to pronounce on this question. I may have a group of people, who are on strike illegally, in my office, endeavouring to settle a dispute. People say: "Why are you dealing with these people? They are on strike illegally." But until an employer has made an application to the board and obtained a declaration from the board saying the strike is legal or illegal, I do not pay any attention to whether a strike is legal or not, because I have always felt that my obligation is, to the extent to which this is possible, to settle disputes and bring people back to doing business.

MR. SALSBERG: This question of illegal strikes is a subject which has not only escaped clear definition, but has been terribly misrepresented.

HON. MR. FROST: I can say on that matter that there were some legal strikes—the Hollinger strike, for instance—for the reason that the Conciliation Board proceedings were not carried through. In that case, I believe, under the Act as it was, the company had the right to go to the board and have the strike declare illegal. The company did not see fit to do this, so the hon. Minister of Labour quite properly and rightly treated the strike as a legal strike, and dealt with the people, and with the parties. His decision was, simply, that until an application had been made to the board to declare it illegal, he was going to consider that these were people who were entitled to be on strike. That is a proper decision. The hon. Minister of Labour does not make a decision arbitrarily that a strike is illegal. He waits. If there is an application to the board, and the board makes at least a quasi-judicial adjudication, he would govern himself accordingly.

The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has no need to worry on the grounds that the hon. Minister or the government passes upon these things alone. The case of Hollinger is exactly in point.

Sections 18 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

MR. SALSBERG: On section 24, subsection 2. I wonder if I am right in thinking that subsection 2 deals with the problem of decertification? I see it deals, rather, with proof of membership. It seems that wide discretionary powers are taken in determining the proof of membership. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Labour could enlighten us on this subject?

HON. MR. DALEY: The board, of course, has rules and forms of procedure, which have developed over a period of time, under which it requires certain proof of membership should be produced. The board requires cards, and evidence of membership. I think that is right. I do not think that this section changes the procedure already in force to any extent. This becomes a matter of procedure, as adopted by the board, for determining who is representing who. It is customary for the board to require that receipts, submitted as evidence in connection with union funds, shall be signed by the man, and countersigned. The board requires evidence of payment of dues. It has inspectors and examiners who check all these things to avoid difficulty arising later on. If they do a thorough job at the time of the organization's certification, and if nobody is taken in who should not properly enter, subsequent trouble is minimized.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Labour is undoubtedly aware that there has been a great deal of apprehension in the trade union movement over the increasing tendency to decertify unions. The Labour Board has come in for a great deal of criticism because of this trend, and much of this criticism has come from Conservative quarters. The question occupied the attention of delegates, and was a centre of discussion, at the A.F. of L. convention this year. Delegates charged that this epidemic of

decertification, in most instances, was engineered by anti-union employers, who created conditions which would justify them in applying for decertification. I may say that there is a very definite move in this province and elsewhere—perhaps this applies more to other parts of Canada than it does to Ontario—for the establishment of company unions. These have received encouragement from certain government agencies outside Ontario, and have also received a great deal of support from certain employers. Despite all the hon. Minister has said here about the employers' attitude toward unions, the fact still remains that there are many who are unalterably opposed to any form of trade unionism. There is increasing concern over this in the ranks of the trade unions. I think the president of the A.F. of L. has given expression to this concern, and he is by no means a radical—I refer to Mr. McArthur.

In view of these criticisms and in view of this grave concern over the decertification process, I am wondering whether this amended clause, which deals with this point of decertification and proof of membership, should not be referred first to the trade unions for an opinion before we proceed further at this stage. After all, the government might change its mind. The government did change its mind two days ago on the Milk Industry Act. I appealed to the government at least to make a statement on this question and the record will show that I raised a number of points in connection with that legislation, if only for the sake of giving the government a chance to make replies to representations on that question. But the government members sat as silent as sphinxes. But today, they came back with a request that the bill be withdrawn before its introduction for a third reading. That, Mr. Chairman, indicates some advance, though it took the government a couple of days to withdraw the bill. It may do the same thing in this case. I am not giving up hope. This section is so important and people are so concerned about it, that, perhaps, the government will agree not to proceed further until it has learned

the opinions of the unions of the province concerning it.

HON. MR. DALEY: In answer to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) I can only say that the "great epidemic" of decertification, which he speaks of, actually amounts to 7 cases in the last year, where unions were dissolved at the request of the employees themselves.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister knows how these dissatisfied employees are created. Anyone who has ever had any connection with trade unions knows that dissatisfaction can be created if it is so desired.

HON. MR. FROST: Has the hon. member for St. Andrew never heard of another union intervening and wanting to take over?

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, I have heard of that.

MR. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, there are many sections in this bill which are to be commended since they tend to speed up the process of agreement. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour if it is not possible for him to appoint an additional officer in his organization whose duty it be to go round and find out what is causing delay in the settlement of a dispute wherever he sees conciliation breaking down.

I repeat, that, perhaps, if we had some official who could watch what was going on, he could serve a useful purpose by intervening, with some action on his part, whenever negotiations between an employer and representatives of employees got bogged down. Has the hon. Minister ever considered appointing such a man, whose duty it would be to act in, roughly, the same way as a traffic policeman, who stands at a corner and gets things going? The hon. Minister of Labour himself may be too busy to perform this function and I am wondering if he would appoint one of his officials to carry out this duty in the way I have suggested.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not suggest a speed-up.

HON. MR. DALEY: In theory the hon. member's suggestion might sound very good. But actually, from practical experience, it would be impossible, because this is a tremendous province. We have conciliation going on at the Head of the Lakes, and in the eastern and western sections, and we would have to have a referee at each game.

The thing to remember is when you are dealing with labour relations, and it gets into a conciliation, and sometimes past that, in endeavouring to negotiate settlements, and that sort of thing, you are in the "big league," and are playing with the top people.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): That is why you want an umpire.

HON. MR. DALEY: All the "kidding" and everything is gone. You are down to business, and you are dealing with skilled people in handling these matters.

In closing my remarks for the day on this question, I am going to say I am very happy with the results of the Labour Relations Act over the years which I have been Minister, and which now total 11. It has been amended a couple of times to meet the changing conditions, but, in general, as I have indicated the other day when speaking on this matter, the results in this province with its tremendous increase in industrial activities, and with the changing tempo of labour organizations, we have had very excellent results, and statistically our record is better than any other place.

This Act is the result of very careful consideration, which has extended over a period of 8 months. And we even had a record player to record our conversations between the various groups, so we could go back over them, and see what the arguments were, for and against.

There has not been an argument mentioned on any question, nor any briefs presented by labour or management, which we have not taken apart and thoroughly examined, and decided that

if we did a certain thing, what would be the result, and if we did not, what the result would be. Everything has been very, very carefully examined, and I think at this time, while it does not give labour everything that it desires, it certainly does not give management all the things they would like to have included in it. I may say that the Bar Society has also made recommendations about certain things.

Actually, we have carefully, and without regard for either party, endeavoured to bring about a labour Act which does what it was intended to do, and that is to continue good labour relations.

Bill 110 reported.

HON. MR. FROST moves the committee rise and report a certain bill without amendment.

Motion agreed.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report a certain bill without amendment.

Report concurred in.

THE BUDGET

—The Acting Speaker in the Chair.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without portfolio):

REPORT TO LEGISLATURE—1954

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES

Introductory

It has been my privilege to present to the Legislature each year a review of the activities of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the calendar year preceding the one in which the Legislature meets. This year I propose to continue this practice, and as well to review the highlights of the commission's achievements for the 10-year period from 1943 to 1953.

Ten Years of Unprecedented Progress and Prosperity

In August 1953, the Progressive Conservative Party completed 10 years of

administration of the government of this province. During that decade the citizens of Ontario experienced growth and prosperity of a truly remarkable character. Ontario's population increased from slightly less than 4 million to almost 5 million people. The number of our manufacturing establishments increased by about 800 and the number of those employed was increased by 65,000. During the same time, the gross value of production in manufacturing establishments was more than doubled in dollar value. The value of our mineral production was almost doubled during the 10-year period. Retail sales were increased three times in dollar value and personal income doubled. The physical volume of agricultural production in the province, as measured by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics Index, rose from 89.4 in 1943 to 119.2 in 1952. The net value of forestry production, which stood at \$37.1 million in 1943, reached \$88.6 million in 1951, the last year for which statistics are available. The number of employees in Ontario's leading industries increased by nearly one-third between 1943 and 1953 and the wages and salaries paid to them in 1953 were more than two and one-third times those paid 10 years earlier.

In reviewing these indexes of production, employment, and prices, we must remember that 1943 was not a year of business stagnation but one which saw Ontario's industry at or very near the peak of its World War II production. The astounding growth and prosperity of the following decade is to be attributed mostly to enterprise of our industry and our workers, farmers, and business men; to the magnificent resources of farmlands, forests, minerals, hydro-electric power, and transport facilities which are our heritage; and to the very favourable economic conditions with which North America has been blessed. Nevertheless, the honesty, efficiency, and vision of the Progressive Conservative administrations under Prime Ministers Drew, Kennedy, and Frost have played vital roles in our economic development.

*Solving Hydro Problems Left to Us
by Former Administration*

The government newly formed in 1943 had to devise good policies to counteract the bad policies of the former administration. For example, policies affecting the development of Ontario Hydro were particularly troublesome. Many of you will recall clearly how the repudiation of the so-called Quebec contracts had placed a strain on the relations between Ontario and Quebec. There is ample evidence in the official records of the commission to show that contract repudiation was a bar, for example, to joint development of the Ottawa River. You will also recall the strained relations which existed between the Liberal Administration of Ontario and the Federal Government.

Considering how unanimously the citizens of Ontario now urge the development of the International Section of the St. Lawrence River, and considering also the tremendous growth in demand for power during the past ten years, it is difficult to understand how a Liberal Prime Minister of Ontario could write to the Prime Minister of Canada: "This province is simply not interested in the production of any more power . . . I have on various occasions ventured the opinion that the St. Lawrence Waterways project could not be justified on economic grounds."

MR. SALSBERG: When was letter written?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: 1938. The political ineptitude and short-sighted fumbling of the Provincial Liberal Government made the period during which it was in control the darkest hour in the whole history of Ontario Hydro. Their lack of appreciation of Ontario's potential strength stands out in sharp contrast to the vision and energy with which Hydro affairs are handled today. The Provincial Government and The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario work closely with all power interests, private and public, in Quebec, Manitoba, and the United States. A signal achievement of 1953 was the placing in service of tie lines at Sarnia and Detroit between

Ontario Hydro and the Detroit Edison Company. This was followed early this year by completion of arrangements for an interconnection in the vicinity of Cornwall between the Niagara Mohawk system and our Southern Ontario system. Co-operation and assistance have characterized relations between the governments of Canada and Ontario in the discussion of national and international problems, as evidenced in the St. Lawrence River Development Act of 1952 and the Act to Facilitate the Development of Power of the Niagara River passed in 1950. The Provincial Government, with an abiding faith in the future of the province and the Dominion, has anticipated tremendous industrial growth, the largest in the history of the Province of Ontario, and made provision for adequate supplies of electric power from new sources to meet the requirements of this growth.

Hydro Doubles its Size in 10 Years

In 1943 the Hydro enterprise, conducted by Ontario Hydro and its member municipalities, was already one of the world's largest electrical utilities. Yet, during the past 10 years, even this giant has grown almost out of recognition. For every kilowatt of dependable peak capacity available to the commission in December 1943 there were 2 kilowatts in December 1953. For every circuit mile of high-voltage transmission line in service at the end of 1943 there were 2 miles at the end of 1953. Matching every \$1 invested in Ontario Hydro's plants at the close of 1943 there were more than \$3½ at the close of 1953. For every farm customer served in 1943 the commission served 2 farm customers in 1953. In fact, by almost every measuring rod, Ontario Hydro in 1953 was twice the size of Ontario Hydro in 1943. In other words, the whole growth of the 30 years prior to 1943 was equalled during the phenomenal 10 years between 1943 and 1953. This rapid growth has posed many problems. Expensive engineering difficulties of great complexity have had to be surmounted. During a large part of the period, manpower and

materials were in short supply, but thanks to the energy and vision of the Provincial Government and the management of Ontario Hydro the problems have been solved and the difficulties largely overcome.

Engineering Achievements

The major engineering achievements that have enabled us to cope with the enormous increases in demands suggested by the growth I have sketched may be summarized as:

1. The integration of the commission's systems into two extensive grids or power networks, one for Southern and Northeastern Ontario, the other for Thunder Bay and Northwestern Ontario.

2. The full development of every substantial water - power resource within feasible transmission distance of Ontario's populated area—with the important exception of the International Section of the St. Lawrence River.

3. The supplementing of hydro-electric generating capacity with large fuel-electric plants.

4. The standardization at 60 cycles of the 25-cycle system serving a large part of Southern Ontario.

5. The inter-connection for mutual security of the Southern Ontario system with neighbouring power networks in Canada and the United States.

6. Constant planning and research to increase the efficiency and economy of service and to make available to the commission's customers every advantage to be gained from the advance of science and technology in the atomic age.

Systems Amalgamated and Inter-connected

In 1943 there were 3 separate systems in the southern part of the province and 6 in the northern. In 1944 the 3 southern systems were integrated into the Southern Ontario system. At the same time, centralized control of the flow of power was established through

the power supervisor's office in Toronto. Since then, the 6 power systems in the north have been progressively amalgamated until they have become 2, the northwestern and the northeastern divisions of the Northern Ontario properties. There is not, at the present time, any physical connection between these divisions, although early last year they were consolidated for financial and administrative purposes. An inter-connection between Otto Holden Generating Station and North Bay Transformer Station does, however, provide for the transmission of power between the northeastern division and the Southern Ontario system. Thus the most efficient and economical use is made of the water held in storage and of the power available within a great triangular area with its apex at Abitibi Canyon on the north, and its base stretching roughly from Windsor on the west to the junction of the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence Rivers on the east. Surpluses of power may be transferred at will as they are required. The long-range planning of the commission envisions the eventual extension of its power grid or network, to include the northwestern division. The idea that the mining districts of Kenora near our western border, the farms of Prescott and Glengarry "down east," our most northern generating station at Abitibi Canyon, and our most southerly, the J. Clark Keith at Windsor, could be bound together by one integrated network of systems, would have startled the early planners of Ontario Hydro, yet such a development is certainly possible.

Rivers Developed

In 1943 the commission was generating no power on the Aguasabon or Mississagi Rivers. The waters of the Ottawa flowed turbulently through the narrows at La Cave, down the rocky valley at Des Joachims, into the broader reaches of Chats Lake below Chenaux, and on to the mighty St. Lawrence, its tremendous power harnessed by the commission only at Chats Falls. In 1943, on the Niagara, the commission was diverting for power purposes all

of the water permissible under existing international agreements.

Within the second half of this decade the upper Ottawa has been exploited to the full by the commission's aggressive programme of construction. The Otto Holden Generating Station at La Cave, and the stations at Des Joachims and Chenaux on the Ottawa, have a total dependable capacity of 710,000 kilowatts. The capacity of all the commission's stations on the Ottawa is now 854,000 kilowatts, as compared with 162,000 kilowatts in 1943.

In addition to the development on the Ottawa, the last 10 years have seen the construction of Stewartville Generating Station on the Madawaska, George W. Rayner Generating Station on the Mississagi, Aguasabon Generating Station on the river of the same name, and Pine Portage Generating Station on the Nipigon. The capacities of these four stations total 212,700 kilowatts. The commission is now adding 2 units of 60,600 kilowatts capacity at Pine Portage. On the English River, the planned development at Manitou Falls will have a capacity of 34,500 kilowatts by 1956.

The capacity of Ontario Hydro's developments on the Niagara River is now being greatly increased. Under the Niagara Diversion Treaty of 1950, power developments in Canada and the United States share the full flow of the river in excess of 100,000 cubic feet per second, in the daytime hours of the tourist season from April to October, and in excess of 50,000 cubic feet per second in the remainder of the year. These arrangements provide the commission during the larger part of the year with more water than was available under earlier agreements, while at the same time preserving the scenic beauty of the Falls. In order to make the most effective use of the available flow, the commission decided to build a huge new generating station, the Sir Adam Beck-Niagara No. 2, and, in conjunction with it, a pumped-storage reservoir to conserve the energy from the flow that becomes available only at night or at other times of low demand. The capacity

of the commission's Niagara River and DeCew Falls stations in December 1957 will total 1,603,000 kilowatts, or 941,000 kilowatts more than in 1943.

Fuel-Electric Generation

The commission's total resources to meet the peak demand in December 1953 amounted to 3,565,100 kilowatts, or almost double the capacity in December 1943. In recent years, fuel-electric generation has come to be an important factor in the commission's power resources. In 1953 the Richard L. Hearn Generating Station and the J. Clark Keith Generating Station provided about one-sixth of the commission's dependable peak capacity.

Summary

The programme of generating station construction that I have sketched has been on an enormous scale. Since 1945, the addition of 15 new generating sources has been authorized and of these 13 are now in service. Work on the other 2, Sir Adam Beck-Niagara No. 2 and Manitou Falls, is proceeding rapidly with a view to both being in full operation in 1956.

Other Developments

Keeping pace with the great expansion of generating stations, there has also been a tremendous programme of construction of transmission and transformation facilities. For every circuit mile of 115- and 230-kv line in operation in 1943 the commission had nearly 2 circuit miles of similar line in 1953. In total, there were nearly 8,300 circuit miles of high-voltage transmission line in 1953. The physical maintenance of this extensive transmission network is a major undertaking. The commission has made use of modern devices for improving the efficiency and reducing the cost of this maintenance operation. Of particular importance has been the use of the helicopter patrol for the inspection of transmission lines. This has reduced both the difficulty in reaching and inspecting lines in normally inaccessible country and the cost of line inspection because of a reduction in the

man-hours involved. The chemical treatment of transmission rights-of-way for the control of brush growth has been both more economical and more effective than manual operations. Over 8,000 acres were so treated in 1953.

Research and Planning

Research has been continuously undertaken with a view to evaluating and improving the performance of electrical equipment and the stability of structures. Improvements have been made in insulation, methods of grounding, and the preservative treatments given to wooden poles and structures of various kinds. The development of new techniques of construction is a matter of perennial interest and importance. Outstanding among the research achievements of the past 10 years have been the development of electronic and physical devices for the location of faults in transmission lines and the use of sonic waves for the testing of concrete structures. Recently, high-speed sequence recorders and a working model of an operations recorder have been developed. These will make for more effective analysis of the performance of equipment during system disturbances.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies), is that an original development of Hydro?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes, in our own Research Department. In fact, the equipment that was perfected in our own laboratory is sought after by others and we are glad to let them have the use of it.

Extensive use has been made of hydraulic scale models for the study of problems affecting the design and operation of hydro-electric developments. These models will assist in reducing construction costs and providing solutions to engineering problems of the St. Lawrence power project as they have already done for the Niagara. The great benefits of the commission's research programme accrue not only to this province, but through the activities of other interested public utilities, to other provinces and countries.

Planning of the commission's systems has been made the function of a separate division of the commission's engineering branch. This division seeks to anticipate the needs and problems of the expanding system, prepares Estimates, and controls construction costs. The major emphasis in planning at the present time is placed on providing capacity for rapidly growing loads and on incorporating into the Southern Ontario system new sources of 60-cycle power as the frequency standardization programme proceeds. Because the two are so closely related, advantage is being taken of the present situation to introduce basic changes in the system of supply to heavily industrialized areas. The main feature of these changes is the establishment of large switching stations outside the crowded industrial areas. Through these switching stations power pooled from several generating sources can be delivered by radial lines to terminal stations located near the loads.

Frequency Standardization

The frequency standardization programme, particularly in its industrial aspects, is about to enter a most interesting phase as the area of operations draws closer to the City of Toronto. The part of the programme already completed indicates that the whole programme will be a much greater task than was anticipated at the outset. Instead of the 697,000 domestic customers of the original Estimate, the programme now requires the standardization of 794,000, and on the average, each customer has, not 2.7, but nearly 4 frequency-sensitive items. The number of commercial customers has similarly increased from 72,000 to 94,000 and the number of power customers from 14,300 to 17,000.

The reasonable allowance for load growth made by the original estimate has proved equal to only half the actual growth. No allowance could have been made in the 1947 Estimates for the reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar, which in 1953 was equivalent to 72.7c. in 1947 currency. Furthermore, the unprecedented expansion in produc-

tive power and production that marked the years of intense wartime activity has been continued through the past 8 years at a rate that our most optimistic economists could not foresee. Expenditures on frequency standardization up to December 31st, 1953, amounted to some \$160 million; of this amount approximately \$24 million represents inventories of materials and equipment for future standardization work. From the beginning of the frequency standardization programme to December 31st, 1953, an amount of approximately \$650,000 has also been spent on the standardization of rural distribution facilities.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) mind if I were to ask what in his opinion will be the final amount, approximately?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Chairman, I should be very glad to answer that, but I cannot guess the future, I do not intend to make any guess whatsoever.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) says he cannot guess what it would cost. Has there been no Estimate compiled as to what it will cost to complete this changeover?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I believe the Chairman made an Estimate, and at the same time he qualified it with respect to the difficulty of telling what would happen.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): But the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) ought to be as courageous as the Chairman.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Well, I am not quite. I think he said something over \$400 million.

MR. SALSBERG: Did the hon. Minister say \$400 million or \$440 million?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: We have a stock expression when referring to figures. We do not call them Estimates any more, we are beginning to call them "guesstimates." So I would not want to make a guess.

MR. OLIVER: It certainly was a "guesstimate" in this case.

Administrative Changes

I will now turn to some of the most important administrative changes during 1943-53.

1. RURAL

In 1944 the farsighted policy of Ontario Hydro brought about the consolidation under one rate structure of the then existing 120 rural power districts of the province. The virtues of this policy are proved in the outcome. The total mileage of rural primary line in 1953 was more than twice what it was in 1943; the number of rural customers has risen about $2\frac{1}{2}$ times while the total energy consumption in 1953 was nearly 6 times that of 1943.

2. MUNICIPAL WHOLESALE RATES LEVELLED

The generous co-operative spirit of Hydro's member municipalities has helped to level the cost of power to municipal electrical utilities. In 1942 the cost of power to municipalities ranged from \$16 to \$90 per horsepower. In order to reduce this wide spread, the Ontario Municipal Electric Association supported a resolution recommended by the commission authorizing a levy of up to 5c. per horsepower on all power delivered to municipalities, the levy to be used to reduce the cost of power in those municipalities then paying in excess of \$39 per horsepower. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is significant. In 1943 there were 63 such municipalities. During 1944 the number was reduced to 30 and in 1948 to 3. In 1952 and again in 1953 not a single municipality required assistance from the fund. At no time in the whole 10-year period did this gesture of co-operation cost the municipalities in excess of 2c. per horsepower purchased.

A further step in the direction of leveling out variations in the wholesale cost of power was the inaugura-

tion in 1951 of a revised costing procedure designed to make possible a more equitable division of system costs. Prior to 1951, a municipality served under a cost contract was charged according to (1) the cost of the generation, transformation, transmission, and distribution facilities used in serving it and (2) its peak power requirements.

The costing procedure now in use employs pooled system and division costs and takes energy requirements (measured in kilowatt-hours) into account, along with peak load requirements (measured in kilowatts). Thus, along with operating economy and security, the consolidation of systems has brought an improved costing system and more equitable wholesale rates.

REGIONAL OFFICES

Some decentralization of the commission's administration and operations became imperative as the hydro enterprise expanded. In 1947, the commission established 9 regional offices in key centres. Their staffs are responsible for day-to-day business as it affects the commission's municipal, industrial, and rural customers. Their intimate knowledge of the local situation enables them to analyze problems and to provide guidance and service in the most expeditious way.

COMMISSION EMPLOYEES

The cordiality that has marked its relations with customers has also marked the commission's relationship with its own staff which now numbers nearly 20,000 employees, 12,000 of whom are classified as regular staff. Contributory schemes for pension, insurance, and hospital and sickness benefits have been developed in co-operation with the employees' representatives.

St. Lawrence Power

Further progress was made during 1953 toward our goal of deriving power from the St. Lawrence but before discussing it, I want to clarify a point about

which there is some confusion in the public mind. For many years the development of navigational works to provide a seaway and the development of power on the International Section of the St. Lawrence have been closely associated in public discussions and international negotiations. Under legislation of recent years, however, the two phases of this project have been separated. The Government of Canada retains full responsibility for the seaway or navigation project. The Government of Ontario is primarily concerned with the power project on the International Section of the river.

A year ago I said that 1952 had been marked by a great step forward when the International Joint Commission gave approval to the project to develop the St. Lawrence for power. I said that Ontario, through its agency The Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, was ready to act just as soon as the Federal Power Commission in the United States named the entity to work with Ontario Hydro.

On May 20th, 1953, the Canadian Government proclaimed the International Rapids Power Development Act. This Act, passed in December 1951, authorized Ontario to join the appropriate entity in the United States in the construction of the power project. Proclamation of the Act forestalled any claims by opponents of the power project that Ontario did not have full legal authority to go ahead with the power development. The Governments of Canada and the United States also announced the establishment of the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers to supervise construction of the proposed power development.

During the summer of 1953 the Federal Power Commission announced it would grant to the Power Authority of New York State a licence to develop power on the St. Lawrence in conjunction with Ontario Hydro. Early in November, however, a restraining lawsuit, opposing New York's participation in the project, was filed in the United States Court of Appeals. The suit was brought by the Pennsylvania Coal Pro-

ducers Association, the Lake Ontario Land Development and Beach Protective Association, and the Public Power and Water Corporation of Trenton, New Jersey. The last-named had applied unsuccessfully for a licence to participate in the power development.

Also in November—and this is important—President Eisenhower designated the Power Authority of New York State to act as the United States' agent for the power development and the Secretary of State promised our Minister for External Affairs that every effort would be made to get an early decision from the courts.

Last January the Court of Appeals upheld the granting of a licence to New York's Power Authority. The defeated appellants announced their intention of taking advantage of all further delays allowed by law and of carrying their case to the Supreme Court of the United States. We must, therefore, anticipate a 4- or 5-month extension of the already tedious and costly delay which has prevented the start of construction.

Despite this delay, much preliminary engineering work has been done. An early end to the legal difficulties facing New York State would permit construction to be started this year. The recent naming of two engineering firms to direct construction of the New York half of the power project is encouraging.

The topographic surveys on which preliminary designs have been based were made many years ago. Since the spring of 1952, field parties have been bringing the earlier surveys up-to-date. Foundation investigations and surveys of materials suitable for concrete aggregate were begun during 1953. Essential information for hydraulic studies, for the construction of three large hydraulic models of sections of the river, and for the design of the dams and powerhouse is being assembled.

During the past year a competent staff has been collected to plan the rehabilitation of the municipalities to be affected by the flooding. By the time construction begins the commission will have compared its ideas with its New York

counterpart and will be able to submit definite proposals as a starting point in evolving plans acceptable to the municipalities concerned. An over-all plan for the area is also being studied which includes the relocation of a section of No. 2 highway and the Canadian National Railway's main line. The Department of Highways is at the same time planning a neighbouring section of the divided arterial highway which will eventually link Montreal and Windsor.

Ontario Hydro Looks Ahead

The achievements of the past decade and the reasonable prospect of developing power on the St. Lawrence do not permit Ontario Hydro to relax. The future power requirements of this province must be met. The prospect of an economical large-scale supply of natural gas for industrial and residential use is most welcome. In planning its large fuel-electric generating stations the commission wisely made provision for simple modification permitting the use of natural gas as a fuel instead of coal.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the chairman of Ontario Hydro announced early last November the completion of arrangements with the Federal Government under which Ontario Hydro will co-operate with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited in a feasibility study on the development of an atomic reactor for the generation of power. Ontario Hydro sought the opportunity to undertake this work as a protection for its future power supply. The general direction of the work will be shared by Dr. R. L. Hearn, the commission's general manager and chief engineer, and Dr. W. B. Lewis, vice-president in charge of research and development, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. Dr. Hearn, as a director of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, has been in close touch with developments in the atomic energy field. You may be sure that Ontario will reap the benefits of atomic energy as soon as they can be made available.

Conclusion

In closing this review of the tremendous growth and development of Ontario Hydro between 1943 and 1953 as well

as the principal events of the past year, it is a pleasure to record on behalf of this House and the citizens of Ontario our sincere appreciation of the splendid services performed by the skilful and conscientious staff of the commission under our general manager and chief engineer, Dr. Richard L. Hearn, and our two assistant general managers, Dr. Otto Holden and Mr. A. W. Manby. It is also a pleasure for me to pay a personal tribute to our chairman, Mr. Robert H. Saunders, and my fellow commissioner, Mr. W. Ross Strike, who continued during 1953 to devote their great energy and ability to the commission's business. The commission is deeply appreciative of the co-operation and advice it has received from the various departments of the Provincial Government, and in particular, from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his office. May I add a personal word of congratulation to the hon. Prime Minister, who has now held the office of Provincial Treasurer of Ontario longer than any previous incumbent, and has very ably, successively and successfully, presented 11 annual budgets to this House.

MR. J. P. ROBARTS moves the adjournment of the discussion.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to request permission to revert to Orders of the day, so that we may speak in relation to the unveiling of the Baldwin plaque. I notice, however, that the clock is a little on the fast side, and that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), whom I suggested be here at 5 o'clock, is absent from the House. That being the case, sir, perhaps I could call second readings. There are some items of a non-contentious nature with which we might utilize the remaining few minutes.

HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION ACT

HON. MR. WARRENDER moves second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Grand River Conservation Act, 1938."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CEMETERIES ACT

HON. MR. WARRENDER, in the absence of Mr. Phillips, moves second reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

DISABLED PERSONS ALLOWANCES ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Disabled Persons Allowances Act, 1952."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW moves second reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Community Centres Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

HON. MR. FROST, in the absence of hon. Mr. Porter, moves second reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

FIRE MARSHAL'S ACT

HON. MR. FROST, in the absence of hon. Mr. Porter, moves second reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act to amend The Fire Marshal's Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ONTARIO HOSPITAL, PORT ARTHUR

HON. MR. FROST, in the absence of hon. Mr. Porter, moves second reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act respecting certain lands in the City of Port Arthur occupied by the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves second reading of Bill No. 132, "An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PHARMACY ACT

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves second reading of Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act of 1953."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TRAVELLING SHOWS ACT

HON. MR. FROST moves second reading of Bill No. 134, "An Act to amend The Travelling Shows Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ROYAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC, TORONTO

HON. MR. DUNLOP moves second reading of Bill No. 135, "An Act respecting the Royal Conservatory of Music, Toronto."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I ask you now to revert to Orders of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

UNVEILING PLAQUE TO HON. ROBERT BALDWIN

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, it will be the pleasure and privilege of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself to unveil, on behalf of the members of the House and the Govern-

ment of Ontario, a plaque commemorating the life and work of hon. Robert Baldwin, whose picture hangs at the head of the stairway outside of this Chamber.

In honouring hon. Robert Baldwin, I wish to make reference to his family, who have made a great contribution to Canada from the very beginning of our modern history—if I may put it that way—starting with the formation of the Province of Upper Canada in 1791.

The original Baldwin was Robert Baldwin of Summerhill. He was the grandfather of the man whom we honour today. He, like many other great men, was an Irishman, and migrated to America in 1799 with his family. It is interesting to reflect that those were different days and there were different issues which were as pressing as we think issues are today. The terror of that day was not the atomic bomb, but it was Napoleon Bonaparte, whose forces were expected to land in Bantry Bay. Robert Baldwin used to barricade his house at night, and arm his servants against the possibility of such a landing. I think that feeling was pretty general, not only in the southern part of Ireland, but on the coast of England.

Coming to Canada, he brought his family. The hon. William Warren Baldwin (1785-1844) was one of them. It is his son, the hon. Robert Baldwin (1804-1858) whom we honour today.

The distinguished Baldwin family is now numerous in Ontario, and it has kept up its interest in, and contribution to, the public service. It is always difficult to choose outstanding members of a great family.

We have in the gallery to my right, descendants of the original Baldwin; and descendants of hon. Robert Baldwin we also have sitting under the gallery at my left. One distinguished family member is Warren Baldwin, who was a member of this Press Gallery for many years, and is now the representative of the Southam Press in the Press Gallery at Ottawa. We have here, Mr. Hamilton Cassels, Q.C., who has a very distinguished record, not only in the field of sports at the University, but as a leading lawyer

and counsel in Ontario. Among the things which distinguish him is the fact that he is the General Counsel for the Presbyterian Church in Canada, which in itself is a great accomplishment.

Mrs. A. F. Barr, a great-granddaughter; Mrs. John Lash, also a great-granddaughter, Mr. Peter Lash, a great-great-grandson, I believe; Mrs. Walter Berle, a great-granddaughter, and her daughter, Mrs. Powell, a great-great-granddaughter; Mr. Herbert Wilcox Garwood Baldwin is a grandson, and his brother, I believe, is the head of the Baldwin clan in this country.

There are others here whom I am unable to mention because I have not been successful in getting all the names, but I believe all the family has been invited and is probably present today.

I might remind you, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, when we unveil the plaque, that a few feet from where we will be standing, is a memorial containing the names of several nursing sisters who gave their lives in the first Great War. Among them is that of Nursing Sister Dorothy Mary Garwood Baldwin, who was killed in action at Apalle, in 1919, in an incident, which is very familiar to many of us here—when that great hospital was bombed. She was a great-granddaughter of hon. Robert Baldwin; and her father, another Robert Baldwin, lived in Paris, Ontario.

I am going to ask that the members of the Baldwin family, after the unveiling of the plaque, will please attend at your office, Mr. Speaker, and there sign the visitors' book which is a record of distinguished visitors to this Legislature. We will, indeed, be proud and honoured to have their names inscribed on the records of this House.

In referring to the work of hon. Robert Baldwin, one of those who contributed to the development of responsible government in Canada, may I refer to a radio broadcast I made on the 9th May, 1950, when I officiated at the opening of Mackenzie House, substituting for Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, then Prime Minister of Canada, who was prevented from attending by reason of illness.

There are things which contributed to what I am going to say. One of them was that on such an occasion, for the purpose of honouring William Lyon Mackenzie and dedicating his home, the honours would be done by one who is said, at times, to be a "Tory Premier of Ontario." But I can say perhaps it was because I am a Progressive Conservative that this opportunity presented itself. Afterwards, Mr. Mackenzie King graciously wrote to me approving what I said, which he had heard over the radio. I have asked his literary executor, Mr. Fred McGregor, if I might use a sentence or two from that letter today, and he kindly consented.

I was particularly pleased when I was informed that you had consented to perform the official opening, but more pleased than ever when I listened over the radio to the words of your address.

I think I can say that, in the course of my public life, I have aimed at substituting conciliation and understanding for perpetuating antagonisms in matters that have long since passed into the realm of history.

Those were Mr. King's words, and I might say his letter, which was written two months before his death, is one which I value very highly. I am glad, indeed, that what I said on that occasion met with his approval, because I was substituting for him. I should like to read these words, because I think they relate to what we are going to say and do here today.

In my radio broadcast, I said:

We are not here today to weigh the merits of the controversial figures of those days—the zealous reformer, Mackenzie; the Governor, who had but little training for his complicated task; nor indeed those moderates, who probably represented the majority—Baldwin, LaFontaine, Hinks, Morin, Draper, Ryerson and others.

We are concerned today with the broad principles and what was accomplished out of it all.

In 1834, when Mackenzie became the first mayor of the then little City of Toronto, the scene was vastly different from today. The perspective was not the same.

War with the country to the south, in which French and English had united in the common defence of this land, was still fresh in men's minds. Indeed, the American Revolution, with all of its controversy, was still within living memory.

Political parties had not taken upon themselves the traditional forms which were to dominate the political life in ensuing generations. Lord Elgin's biographer remarks, "There was no real political life; only the pale and distorted reflection of it which is apt to exist in a colony before it has learned to look within itself for the centre of power."

About that time a famous statesman spoke despondently, referring to Upper and Lower Canada, of two nations warring in the bosom of a single state.

Upper Canada was very new. The stream of Loyalists from the States had been joined by the great immigration from the old land, which peopled what is now the Province of Ontario.

It was with that background that the men of that day groped for a method of government which would develop the nation then faintly envisaged. It matters not now who was right or who was wrong in the controversies of those times. What matters is what they achieved.

From it all came responsible government. From it came a working partnership between the French and English communities. To those things the men of those days devoted themselves. As a result, they brought into being the idea of responsible government, which was to be the cornerstone of the British Commonwealth of the future.

On the foundations laid by the men of the 1830's—Mackenzie, the Governor, Baldwin, LaFontaine, Hinks, Morin and the rest, Macdonald and his great lieutenant, Cartier, and those

other fathers of Confederation, working through the ensuing 30 years, in 1867, were able to build the Dominion of Canada, which became a pattern for the British Commonwealth of Nations and, indeed, we believe, a pattern for world government in the tomorrow.

That is the background in which we should view the man we honour here today.

Robert Baldwin was a moderate. It can be fairly said that he sided neither with the Governor and his advisers, because he recognized that there were great reforms and changes to be brought about, nor did he side with the zealous Mackenzie, whose methods, he felt, could not contribute to the solution. Baldwin was a moderate who felt that reforms had to come about by way of understanding. This was his position in the revolution of 1837.

As a result of the investigation of Lord Durham, the union of Upper and Lower Canada was proclaimed on February 10, 1841, and the elections were held shortly afterward. Lord Sydenham invited Robert Baldwin to head the government forces for Canada West. He accepted, but made the public pledge that government of the united provinces would be carried on in accordance with the principles of responsible government. Baldwin felt that he could not continue in office until this principle was accepted, and accordingly, resigned. The first Baldwin-LaFontaine ministry did not take office until the 16th September, 1842. In the meantime, Louis LaFontaine was defeated in Terrebonne, and Baldwin, in one of the first great moves to bring about understanding between the two basic races in Canada, offered him a seat in the fourth riding of North York, to which he was elected by a very large majority.

In the course of these troublesome times, Baldwin himself was defeated in Hastings in 1842. He ran in the second riding of the County of York and was again defeated. It then became LaFontaine's opportunity to

reciprocate Baldwin's kind act. Several French-Canadian members offered him their seats. Baldwin accepted the offer of Mr. Borne, the member for Rimouski, to which constituency he was elected on January 30th, 1843. Thus, we have the great example which laid the foundation for Confederation a quarter of a century later—a constituency in York County electing Louis LaFontaine and the riding of Rimouski electing Robert Baldwin.

The first ministry resigned on November 26, 1843, over the question of patronage. LaFontaine and Baldwin maintained that the principle of responsibility of the executive to the representatives of the people was not being fully recognized. The resignation of the LaFontaine-Baldwin ministry was no ordinary event—the whole principle of responsible government was staked upon the issue.

When Parliament was dissolved in 1847, the second Baldwin-LaFontaine administration was returned to office and lasted from that time until the retirement of these two great leaders.

On June 30, 1850, Robert Baldwin, then only 46 years of age, tendered his resignation and retired to Spadina, where he died a few years later. LaFontaine resigned in 1851, then only 44 years of age, and died some dozen years afterwards in retirement.

From the work of these two great men, who, I said yesterday, started Canada on the path of nationhood, both of them young men, showed to the people of these days, that it was not necessary, in the words of Lord Durham, that two nations should war in the bosom of a single state. They showed that they could live together with and among themselves. Since that time, French and English, and now other races, have been living and growing up together. We have come to know and esteem one another; minorities are respected. While individual racial and religious characteristics are preserved and, indeed, encouraged, we are united in our national ideals, and with what wonderful results. I believe we can say humbly

that we in Canada provide an example to this perplexed and dangerous world, where the lack of understanding among races is one of the fundamental difficulties. Canada has provided the answer. In these past years, and in this year, 1954, we are continuing the development of this ideal. Our province had declarations contained in statutes and had enactments which are not oppressive, but come from the hearts of the people. We have provided that there shall be no discrimination in our province on the grounds of race, colour and creed.

Today, we are armed with the experience of our fathers and their faith. We believe that our experience in Canada can be the experience of others. We believe that we are on the right road to orderly world government, to the abolition of armed conflict and to the betterment of the conditions of human life.

Today, in honouring Robert Baldwin, and unveiling a plaque which is placed here to his memory, we are honouring great ideals which have resulted in the formation of our country and the creation of free and independent nations with the British Commonwealth under one Sovereign. Responsible government, toleration and understanding are the foundations of all of this. We therefore are contributing to the world ideas and ideals which can contribute to and solve the difficulties mankind faces in these perplexing and dangerous days.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure this afternoon to join with the hon. Prime Minister in honouring the life and memory of Robert Baldwin and to welcome to this Chamber those who come after him and who have made, in their way, a great contribution to the life of this country of ours.

Robert Baldwin lived well over 100 years ago. He was, in those days, a great reformer. He was one of the architects of responsible government in this country and he lived at a time which called for great decisions on the part of public men. Anyone who has read

history at all will know that this is so. The days in which Robert Baldwin lived were days in which Canada was either going to be made or unmade—days in which the decisions that these great men took had the power to weld this country into one unit and reach her present greatness. I was much impressed, as were all hon. members, with the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister concerning Robert Baldwin and others of his day, pointing out that they laid for us the great foundation on which we have been able to build. In other words, that the people of this country, though they may be of different race, can live in harmony together.

If Canada has anything to offer the world, it is this example of how different races can live together in harmony, and plan together to enhance the greatness of the country in which they live.

Certainly, in that picture the name and the work of Robert Baldwin stands out, and that is one reason why we honour that name today. I often think that we, in this day and age, have no very real appreciation of what men like Robert Baldwin were up against in the early days of this country and it is to the everlasting credit of such men that, when decisions of supreme importance were to be made, they made them, and 99 times out of 100 the decisions were in favour of Canada and of welding this country into one great unit.

Another point which might be stressed this afternoon is the fact, as the hon. Prime Minister himself emphasized, that as far as the great political work of Robert Baldwin was concerned, it was accomplished before he had attained the age of 50.

To me, it is a remarkable thing that in this young country a man could have made such a mark for himself, and could have contributed so much to the building up of this country, and have done it all before he was 50 years of age. I certainly join with the hon. Prime Minister in honouring the memory of Robert Baldwin, and saying, with the one voice of all of us here this afternoon, that in that life well-lived, and in the lives of those who have des-

cended from that great man, Canada has indeed been richly blessed.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be able to join with the hon. Prime Minister, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in paying honour today to one who was a great leader in our country a considerable number of years ago. Today, looking back on that period, we do not ask ourselves to what Party Robert Baldwin belonged; all we recognize is that he was a man who belonged to Canada; who belonged to Ontario; a man whose sole endeavour was to build up the country he loved. We owe much of what we possess today to Robert Baldwin.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the man we are honouring at this time was a statesman. Too often those who engage in work on behalf of the state today are politicians, not statesmen. I think we ought to recognize the fact that this man, Robert Baldwin, was an outstanding statesman; a young man who contributed much to the welfare of Ontario, and to the welfare of Canada as a whole; a man who left his mark; and we are very pleased indeed to see so many of his descendants here, and to know that they can look back with a great deal of pride and respect to a forefather who was an outstanding Canadian.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, there is little that one could add to the very eloquent and moving address of the hon. Prime Minister, on the life of Robert Baldwin and his place in the history of Canada. If I do rise, sir, it is for two very specific reasons; first, in order to make certain that the record will speak clearly of the unanimity which prevails in the House—and I believe outside this House—in paying tribute to the memory of one of the great architects of this country; and, second, because I have the privilege of representing a riding where the name of Baldwin is very well known. I think the only street in Old Toronto which bears the name of "Baldwin" is within a block of where I was raised. The first explanation of

the life and place of Robert Baldwin was given to me, and other children, in the Lansdowne School, Spadina Crescent, by one of the teachers. She told us that Robert Baldwin lived on Spadina Avenue, and pointed out that it was on the corner of Spadina and the present Baldwin Street. We, of course, were very much impressed by this information.

I have learned, since then to understand that history is not merely a recording of facts, but an interpretation of events, and when it comes to historic interpretation, of course, there is room for a great deal of interpreting.

Some people argue that perhaps "The Little Rebel" was more correct than others—and when I speak of "The Little Rebel" I am referring to William Lyon Mackenzie, to whom the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) referred as the "zealous champion of responsible government." I think that history will record him forever as "The Little Rebel," the man who headed that movement. However, that is a matter of historic interpretation. The fact remains that Robert Baldwin, like so many others, recognized that the easiest course is not always the most correct nor wisest. It is always easier to conform with, and abide by, the leadership of the powers that are in the saddle of authority and government. Robert Baldwin, like so many others, questioned, disagreed, and fearlessly raised public questions, which resulted, in the long run, in the establishment of a united country and responsible government. It is that position that I am sure, he will occupy in the annals of history of this great and growing country.

The references which the hon. Prime Minister made to his role in uniting the two national groups, to me, is extremely important. Mr. Speaker, you know, I believe, that I am of an immigrant family, and I assure you that those of us who come from immigrant families are proud of the country that is our home, and eager to see it grow and flourish, and become the pride of all who live in it, and those who are to follow. We may

disagree in how this is to be accomplished, but all of us feel the loyalty and the love for the country that is ours. We proudly pronounce that. It is therefore another great credit to him that he made so important a contribution to the uniting of the two nations in a single state.

I think we should recognize that Canada is a bi-national state. We speak sometimes of this "great nation," and, generally speaking, I think it is correct. Scientifically, however, it is more correct to say that this is a great country, a great state, in which are united two nations, plus the other groups who have come and are merging with the population of the country as a whole. And we should always try to attain that co-operation; that basis of understanding for joint effort on the part of all for the welfare of every section of Canada.

I am very, very happy, and I consider it a privilege to have the opportunity of

joining with the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. House Leader of the CCF group, in paying tribute to the memory of Robert Baldwin, and to his descendants, and in that way, I think, to all those who, with Baldwin, made their great contributions to the growth and the development of our city, our province, and our country.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I ask you to declare it 6 of the clock, and we might then move into the rotunda and unveil the plaque. May I add, sir, that when the House reconvenes at 8 o'clock, I shall be moving that you do leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, so that we may consider the Estimates of the Department of Planning and Development, followed by those of the Department of Public Welfare.

Being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Wednesday, March 31, 1954

Evening Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 31, 1954.

Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	1027
Estimates, Department of Planning and Development, Mr. Warrender	1027
Estimates, Department of the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Welsh	1047
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. T. D. Thomas, second reading	1055
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1062
Corporations Act, 1953, bill to amend, reported	1062
Child Welfare Act, 1954, held	1062
Ontario Fuel Board, bill to establish, reported	1063
Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, reported	1067
Municipal Franchises Act, bill to amend, reported	1067
Gas Pipe-Line Act, 1951, bill to amend, reported	1067
London Foundation, bill to incorporate, reported	1068
Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, bill respecting, Mr. Oliver, second reading	1068
Election Act, 1951, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	1068
Voters List Act, 1951, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	1068
Controverted Elections Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	1068
Unemployment Relief Act, withdrawn	1068
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1069

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1954.

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 65, Department of Planning and Development, Vote 114, Main Office, \$65,500.

HON. W. K. WARRENDER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased at this time to present my Estimates to the House after a year and a little more of tenure in office, of the Department of Planning and Development.

I should like to start with the Community Planning Branch of this department.

COMMUNITY PLANNING BRANCH

Planning Areas: Of the 30 new planning areas defined in 1953, 6 were joint planning areas, 4 were subsidiary planning areas within joint planning areas previously defined, and 20 more were single, independent planning areas. In addition, the boundaries of a joint planning area previously established were redefined to accommodate the definition of a new joint planning area.

Including the 30 new planning areas defined in 1953, there were 159 planning areas of all types at the end of the year, embracing all or parts of 238 municipalities which together contain a population of 3,440,000 persons, or 77 per cent. of the total in the province.

Official Plans: Nine new official plans were completed and approved in 1953, bringing the total number of official plans in effect in the province to 47. In addition, 55 amendments to existing official plans were approved during the year. The population of the 47 planning areas having official plans now totals 2,298,000 persons, or 51 per cent. of the population of the province.

Areas of Subdivision Control: During 1953, 18 additional municipalities, comprising 3 cities, 4 towns, 3 villages, 7 townships and 1 improvement district, enacted by-laws designating areas of subdivision control.

As of December 31st, 1953, such by-laws were in effect in 146 municipalities with a population of 1,890,000 or 42 per cent. of the total population of the province.

Plans of Subdivision: Of the 6,875 applications for approval of plans of subdivision submitted up to the end of 1953, 1,211 were received during 1953. This represents a 35 per cent. increase over the figure for 1952.

In view of the rapid development of land in many parts of the province, I am pleased to report that, through the co-operation of developers, surveyors, planning boards, municipal authorities and others concerned, the standard of design and the provision of services on new

subdivisions have consistently improved in accordance with the accepted principles of good planning.

Street Names: The street name index maintained by the branch covering 23 municipalities in the Metropolitan Toronto area continues to operate successfully in preventing the duplication of existing street names in the process of registering plans of subdivision. It is also being used by some of the municipalities concerned when a proposal to change the names of streets by by-laws is under consideration.

Zoning By-laws: The volume of restricted area (zoning) by-laws upon which the branch is invited to comment continues to increase. In many cases, the branch is given the opportunity to consult with the municipality while the by-law is in preparation, and in almost all cases copies of by-laws submitted to the Municipal Board for approval are referred to the branch as to their fulfilment of any conditions which may have been imposed in the approval of plans of subdivision or as to their conformity with any existing official plan.

During 1953, 469 by-laws were examined, compared with 398 in 1952. To the end of 1953, more than 1,500 zoning by-laws or amendments to zoning by-laws were reviewed by the branch since it first undertook this function.

Committees of Adjustment: The following disposition was made of the 452 decisions submitted by the 15 committees of adjustment in the province in 1953:

Approval granted	355
Referred to Municipal Board	19
Appealed to Municipal Board	28
Returned to Committee of Adjustment	35
Action pending at end of year	15
	<hr/> 452

This compares with 343 decisions received in 1952 and brings to over 1,000 the total number of such decisions submitted to date.

Applications are made to committees of adjustment when, in view of the special circumstances relating to a parcel of land, the enforcement of a zoning by-law without adjustment is considered inadvisable. This device strengthens the zoning by-law by making

it adaptable to special needs and circumstances which could not be foreseen when the by-law was passed.

These committees are performing a very valuable service to their communities. In each instance they must examine the application submitted to them in the light of the owner's rights and interests as well as those of his neighbours and the general welfare of the community as a whole.

Miscellaneous Activities: In discharging its responsibility of encouraging and guiding municipalities and groups of municipalities in carrying out planning in their local areas, the branch has engaged in the following activities in 1953:

1. The issue of 14 publications, consisting of pertinent extracts from the Statutes and articles on various aspects of planning;

2. The attendance by members of the staff of the branch at many planning board and council meetings. Also, many day-to-day consultations were held in the department with municipal officials;

3. The convening of 3 planning conferences for the purpose of discussing problems relating to the planning of suburban areas, the subdivision of land, zoning and the co-ordination of the activities of various provincial and local agencies concerned in community planning;

4. Continued co-operation with the University of Toronto in planning matters, particularly in regard to the graduate course in town and regional planning being conducted by the university;

5. Continued assistance, with the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Presqu'île Park Commission, in the direction of a general survey of lands included in the park.

Future Activities: In the year before us, we propose to increase our activities relating to the development of more comprehensive planning programmes on the part of local authorities in order that they may be of greater service to

their respective communities. We shall continue to assist planning boards, municipal authorities and other persons engaged in planning functions in making more effective use of the instruments of planning available to them under the provisions of The Planning Act.

As examples of the type of assistance which we expect to have available, may I mention 2 activities which will take place in the very near future. First, on April 5th and 6th, more than 100 Ontario land surveyors from all areas of the province will attend a course in subdivision design convened by the Community Planning Branch. This is a continuation of our activities of last year when a similar 2-day conference on subdivision analysis was held in November, attended by 130 members of planning boards and their staffs.

The second activity concerns regional planning. This is a matter in which there is now wide interest. As reported in the House on March 3rd last, an Eastern Regional Planning Conference will be called early in June. By meeting on the larger regional basis we hope to gain a better understanding of some of the problems which demand more than local consideration.

We have now arrived at the point where local planning boards, where constituted, are actively assuming their responsibilities. The role of the province is to provide the leadership, guidance, specialized information and overall co-ordination which the local boards require. With help they may be eminently successful in performing a vital service to their own communities and to the province. It is the responsibility of the Community Planning Branch and myself, as Minister, to ensure that the necessary guidance and support are available and that no local planning effort shall fail for the lack of them. The resources necessary to accomplish this are comparatively small, but experience has shown that there is no field in which a small investment will yield such large financial returns, as well as returns in the form of better public health, safety, convenience and welfare.

HOUSING BRANCH

I will now report on the activities of the Housing Branch.

As stated in the Prime Minister's Budget Speech, the general level of residential construction in Ontario in 1953 rose above that for 1952 by 30 per cent. for starts and 28 per cent. for completions. In spite of this improvement, however, the problem of the housing shortage remains with us. There is still an acute shortage of adequate housing accommodation and serviced land for families in the low and middle income categories. It is also true that the standard of much of the housing that is available is of inferior quality. As private enterprise alone has not yet been able to cope with the problem, your government has continued to render assistance under the Housing Development Act of 1948 and amendments thereto.

During the past year, repayments on account of the 14,680 second mortgage loans have almost without exception continued to be made on the due dates. Under the contract these loans are repayable in equal annual instalments over a period of 20 years. Up to February 28th, some 3,480 loans had been paid in full, of which 1,104 have been discharged during the year.

The Housing Branch in 1952 facilitated the purchase by the Township of Larder Lake of 85 war workers' houses from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation by advancing the sum of \$110,500 to the township. I am glad to report that the township has met all payments as they have fallen due and has repaid \$54,500 to the end of February, 1954.

Grants to the Toronto Housing Authority in respect of Regent Park North were continued on the same basis during the past year. In my report last year I reported that a total of \$548,000 had been contributed on the basis of \$1,000 for each dwelling unit completed. During the year an additional 102 units were completed so that the total grant made by the province to date stands at \$650,000. It is expected that the project,

comprising in all 1,274 units, will be completed during the ensuing fiscal year.

As in past years, the main activity of the Housing Branch has been to participate jointly with the Federal Government through its agent Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, under the provisions of the Housing Development Act and of the National Housing Act. In regard to these federal-provincial housing projects, it will be sufficient to say that we are still making available to urban municipalities with a housing shortage 3 types of joint housing projects: (a) land assembly projects, (b) fixed rental housing projects, (c) subsidized rental housing projects.

It has again been apparent that the lack of serviced land for residential building purposes is a major obstacle in overcoming the problem of the housing shortage. Our land assembly projects have been designed to help overcome this problem. To date 22 municipalities have signed agreements which in the aggregate will provide some 9,316 lots for sale at reasonable prices to private individuals and builders. A number of these lots have already been sold and houses constructed on them. The 22 municipalities, and the approximate number of lots to be provided in each, are as follows:

*Arnprior (43), Amherstburg (31), Atikokan (565), *Brockville (1,100), Guelph (203), *Kenora (255), Kingston (492), Kitchener (960), London (379), *London Township (850), Lindsay (58), Midland (32), *North Bay (55), Ottawa (665), Owen Sound (38), Peterborough (1,770), *Renfrew (46), *St. Thomas (280), Sarnia (1,200), Stratford (122), Stamford Township (57), Trenton (115).

Negotiations are being had with another 6 municipalities which, if completed, will provide another 5,323 land assembly lots. These municipalities are: Barrie (13), Cobourg (850), Cornwall (1,280), Hamilton (2,000), Kingston (800), and London Township (380).

In my last report I stated that, although federal-provincial housing projects had been initiated in many municipalities throughout the province, we had been unable to make any progress in the Toronto area. I expressed the hope at that time that with the creation of the Metropolitan area, many difficulties we had encountered would be overcome. During the past year a number of concrete steps have been taken to try and relieve in part the housing shortage in Greater Toronto area. Land has been acquired in 3 municipalities within the Metropolitan area, namely Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough, to a total of 2,288 acres. Surveys of the properties and initial planning are now being carried out and it is estimated that eventually some 9,000 serviced lots will be made available.

I would like now to express both my appreciation and that of my department to the honourable member for Rainy River for the complimentary remarks made by him on seconding the motion of thanks for the Speech from the Throne in respect of federal-provincial partnership activities in Atikokan.

We are still making available rental housing projects to urban municipalities having a population of 5,000 and over who desire this type of housing project. To date construction of rental houses in 25 municipalities has been arranged; these are as follows:

Amherstburg (25), Arnprior (25), Brockville (80), †Dunnville (25), †Fort William (122), Fort Erie (28), Galt (50), †Goderich (51), †Guelph (70), *Hamilton (496), Kenora (25), †Lindsay (20), †Midland (30), North Bay (54), Owen Sound (40), †Port Arthur (40), †Prescott (10), Renfrew (30), Smiths Falls (24), †Stamford Township (70), †Stratford (40), †Sault Ste. Marie (100), St. Thomas (40), Trenton (25), and Windsor (325).

Altogether the agreements provide for the construction of some 1,845 rental houses and of these 1,275 have already been constructed and occupied. Negotiations are continuing with another 9

*Agreements signed during the year.

†Rental projects completed during the year.

municipalities, namely: Barrie (25), Galt (50), Hamilton (250), Napanee (21), Orillia (25), Preston (25), Prescott (25), Stratford (45), and Windsor (104) which, if completed, will provide for the construction of another 574 rental houses.

The majority of the rental houses that have been constructed under the joint federal-provincial housing partnership to date were on a full-recovery basis, so that the province can expect to recover its investment in full from the rents collected over a period of 50 years. The average rents in our full-recovery projects vary between \$60 and \$65 per month inclusive of payments in lieu of taxes. In our subsidized projects the average rents are appreciably less and average from \$47 to \$52 per month inclusive of payments in lieu of taxes.

During the last few weeks, as was announced by the hon. Prime Minister in his Budget Address, we have also been approached by the Toronto City Council to redevelop the Regent Park (South) area as a subsidized rental housing project of some 960 units under the federal-provincial housing partnership.

All our rental housing projects are being administered by local housing authorities consisting of 5 public-spirited citizens of each community who are not members of municipal councils and who give freely of their time to administer and manage the rental houses in their own areas. In my last year's report I stated that this was a new experiment for us in Ontario, and I am now glad to report that the experiment is proving a great success. During the past year an excellent record of rent collection was maintained in all our rental housing projects and no vacancies occurred.

Up to 31st December 1953, the province had contributed \$3,892,963 as its share of the total expenditures on housing projects.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Was that for one year?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: No. That is from the commencement of the joint partnership scheme.

It is anticipated that total expenditures for projects under our present agreements and those in the negotiation stage, as I have already referred to, will total \$9,233,037. With this in view, a sum of \$10 million has been placed in the Estimates for the ensuing year.

The Conservation Branch of this department is concerned with organizing conservation authorities under The Conservation Authorities Act, appraising the conservation problems of the watershed after the authority is established, and directing and assisting in the work as required by the authority.

Since the Act was passed in 1946, 15 authorities have been established, including 20 watersheds, with a total of 256 municipalities and an area of 10,505 square miles. The latest authority to be established includes the Rouge River, Duffin Creek, Highland Creek and Petticoat Creek, which now brings all that area encircling Metropolitan Toronto from the Etobicoke River to Duffin Creek under organized authorities.

Three other watersheds are presently considering the formation of authorities, one of which is in Northern Ontario, and to make it possible for such areas to organize, I am recommending that the Act be amended at this session.

The past year has seen the completion of important projects on three of our rivers and the commencement of a new one. The completed projects are the Fanshaw Dam on the Thames, the Deloro Dam on the Moira and the Luther Marsh Dam on the Grand. These, together with the projects on the Thames, Etobicoke and Ausable previously completed, bring the expenditures on flood control and increased summer flow projects to \$7,394,873. A new project which has been commenced since I last reported to this Legislature is the Conestogo Dam on the Grand, at an estimated cost of \$5.4 million. For all these works this government has contributed 37½ per cent. for some and 75 per cent. on others. On three the Government of Canada has also contributed 37½ per cent.

The second most important work is reforestation. This is carried on, where large areas are concerned, under an agreement between the authority and the Minister of Lands and Forests. Nine authorities have made such agreements. During the past year, 7,600 acres have been added to these forests, which brings the total to 17,788 acres and an expenditure up to the present of \$440,000. For such work this government pays half the cost of the land and plants and manages the forest for a period of 50 years.

During the year there has been interest and considerable activity in acquiring and developing recreation areas for the people of the authorities. The fringe areas acquired for the Fanshaw Reservoir bordering the lake of that name have been developed into a beautiful park. The Grand Authority has acquired an area near Elora known as The Gorge, so that this wooded canyon, which is unique in Southern Ontario, may be preserved and protected. The Ausable Authority has done preliminary work for acquiring The Pinery, a 4,066-acre tract of woodland with $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles of Lake Huron beach, which is still the same as when the white man first saw it. Other authorities are also considering acquiring smaller recreation areas. To expedite the development of such needed areas where authorities have been established, I have recommended an amendment to the Act which is being submitted during this session.

In addition to the three major activities already mentioned, the authorities carry out a programme of general conservation including farm ponds; the rebuilding of old mill dams; little valley studies, in which a group of farmers in a small valley are encouraged to practice the control of soil and water erosion on their farms; the loan of tree-planting machines for private reforestation; woodlot protection; and a programme of public relations and education including lectures, radio, movies, school activities, field trips, and stream improvement competitions. Towards this general conservation programme, the government contributes dollar for dollar with the authority.

When an authority becomes sufficiently active to justify the appointment, a member of the Conservation Branch technical staff is assigned for work on the watershed, as a full-time or part-time fieldmen. At present 7 such men have been assigned to the Ausable, Don, Ganaraska, Grand, Humber, Moira, Napanee, Saugeen and Upper Thames Authorities.

From the brief report which I have given you of the work of the Conservation Branch, it will be seen that the people of our province have appreciated the new approach to conservation which the Authorities Act provides and are eager to help themselves in carrying out this important work.

THE TRADE AND INDUSTRY BRANCH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Function: The Trade and Industry Branch was established in 1945 to promote the economic growth of the province through the development of its trade and industry. The branch provides municipal and industrial statistics; advises manufacturers about the establishment or expansion of their industries; assists them to select suitable industrial locations, obtain raw materials and develop their domestic and export trade. The branch serves manufacturers in the mid-western United States through its new office in Chicago, Illinois; and those in Great Britain and Europe through the Trade and Industrial Department at Ontario House, London, England.

Activities, Industrial Development: The branch since 1945 has co-operated in the establishment of over 600 new Ontario manufacturing industries. During this period over 1,500 expansions or branch plants of industries already established in Ontario were built and in many of these the Trade and Industry Branch was of assistance. These new industries and branch plants were not confined to the large industrial centres. Each succeeding year a greater proportion of the new industrial plants are located in the smaller municipalities spreading the industrial growth across the whole province.

Since 1946 over \$2.7 billion has been invested in Ontario in new and expanded manufacturing industries; manufacturing production has increased from \$3.7 billion to \$8.9 billion annually, and employees in manufacturing have increased from 498,000 to 635,000.

The year 1953 was a record year in Ontario's industrial development. Records are not entirely complete but it is known that 136 new industries came to Ontario, 32 from Great Britain, 49 from the United States, 4 from West Germany, 4 from other European countries and 47 from the other provinces in Canada. In addition over 500 major expansions to existing industries were built and 30 manufacturers from other parts of Canada and abroad bought substantial interests in established Ontario manufacturing firms.

In 1953, preliminary Estimates indicate that new capital investment in manufacturing industry equalled or exceeded the record total of \$492 million reached during 1952. It is also estimated that during 1953 the number of workers employed in manufacturing increased by 35,000 reaching a record total of 635,000. Gross value of manufacturing production increased from \$8,398 million to \$8,867 million—the highest value ever reached by Ontario's manufacturing industries.

Chicago Office: The steadily growing demand for information on the industrial opportunities in Ontario and the increasing requests for service on branch plant establishment from manufacturers in the mid-western United States made it necessary for the Trade and Industry Branch to open an office in Chicago in May of last year. This office is presently in contact with approximately 300 active prospects and in 1953, 30 new Ontario industries were established by manufacturers from these States. It is expected that as a result of the opening of this Chicago office—the first industrial development office to be established in the United States by any Canadian province—an increasing number of new industries will come to Ontario from that area.

Municipal Industrial Promotion: The municipalities of Ontario are playing an increasingly important part in promoting the industrial growth of the province and are looking to the Trade and Industry Branch for leadership in planning for and attracting new industries to their communities.

During 1953, in order to support this municipal effort, the branch sponsored 4 intercounty municipal industrial promotion conferences at which 76 municipalities were represented by 240 delegates. In March 1953, the fourth industrial promotion conference—municipalities of Ontario—was held, to which 325 delegates came from 117 municipalities all over the province. Between January and March 1954, it is planned to hold 11 regional conferences. Consultants from the branch are continuing their frequent visits to Ontario municipalities to act as advisors on industrial development, to conduct conferences or to accompany manufacturers interested in establishing new industries.

Information Services: The branch prepares and publishes resource information, statistical reports and promotional literature. The branch issues an annual industrial review which is now recognized as the official record of industrial development in Ontario. In it are listed the new industries, branch plants or expansions built in the province during the year. Some 3,500 copies were distributed upon request during 1953.

Industrial Research: The branch sponsors the Department of Industrial Research Services of the Ontario Research Foundation which provides scientific and technical information based on laboratory research to industries in Ontario. In 1953 the department handled 4,452 inquiries. Of these 1,828 required technical information only, 1,619 involved the services of field engineers and 1,005 required laboratory research.

The Trade and Industry Branch plays a very active part in the administration of the International Trade Fair.

In association with the trade and industrial departments of the other 9

provinces the branch participates in the activities of the Provincial Governments of Canada, Trade and Industry Council which held its annual conference in New Brunswick in September, 1953.

IMMIGRATION BRANCH

Another responsibility of the Department of Planning and Development is the operation of a moderate immigration programme assisting those coming to our province from Great Britain. In this regard may I mention that at least 52 per cent. of all immigrants coming to Canada settle in Ontario; January of 1954 shows 55.6 per cent. of all newcomers were destined for Ontario. Last year assistance and information was given by our offices to over 20,000 intending immigrants.

Our offices at 12 New Burlington Street, London, England, provide specific information about Ontario on working and living conditions, employment opportunities, etc. Last year (1953) this office had 5,324 personal interviews and 15,214 queries by correspondence.

The Toronto office gave establishment assistance to about 5,000 British newcomers and a proportion of other nationals. Also continued on a more thorough scale was the normal function of co-operation with, and co-ordination of the efforts of other agencies working in the immigration field in the province. The cost of these services to our new citizens averaged less than \$10 per person.

The industrial immigration plan has been active, particularly in the case of the aircraft industry, banks and hospitals. In some cases employers sent representatives to England to secure skilled help through our offices. During the year approximately 300 immigrants were placed through this service.

The National Employment Service still has a unit in our Toronto office and their facilities are available to us throughout Ontario.

A very wide range of trades and professions are represented in these newcomers. They include doctors, engineers, physicists, machinists of every kind,

draughtsmen, nurses, physiotherapists, stenographers and many others.

Currently demands have been registered for specialized female workers in several fields where acute shortages exist. Hospitals and institutions are actively recruiting much needed nurses and assistants. The current school teacher shortage is under discussion from a standpoint of assistance through British immigration.

A survey of available manpower as related to our future needs indicates that shortages for a volume of skilled workers may not occur rapidly, but a constant demand will exist in most fields. The numbers of young people coming out of our schools, colleges, and universities are sufficient only to replace normal losses through retirement of our senior citizens and losses in our labour force for other reasons.

It is the undertaking of the Immigration Branch to fit our manpower needs to expansion, seasonal shortages and surpluses and to augment our human resources on a longer-term-basis; so we can meet our commitments and maintain balance in our future population. Keeping in mind the province's basic economic need for domestic consumers.

RESEARCH COUNCIL OF ONTARIO

The Research Council of Ontario has continued to expand and consolidate its activities during the year 1953. The work of the 8 committees of the council composed of some 275 people representing the provincial and federal governments, universities and industry, have become more and more effective. They are increasing the co-ordination and exchange of research information. This is particularly effective in bringing together provincial and federal government research people.

During the year 1953, the Research Council finished its survey of research work that is being carried on in the interest of the province and has submitted a report of their studies and recommendation to the Provincial Cabinet. During the past year the value

of the scholarships given to university graduates has been increased. These scholarships continue to play a most important part in the post-graduate training of young scientists.

The co-operative committee on water and air pollution set up by the council in the Sarnia area, representing both industry and government, is doing a very excellent piece of work towards the solution of the pollution problem.

The Industrial Research Services established by the council and functioning under the auspices of the Research Foundation has been of great assistance to small industries in the province.

In several instances projects supported by the council have reached the stage of pilot plant trials in order to obtain sound information in regard to commercial development.

In general, the council is satisfied that progress in its research activities is satisfactory, but it is aware that in such matters progress of necessity must be slow. Looking towards the year 1954 the council realizes that, with the tremendous growth of research organizations both in Canada and other countries it is most essential to develop closer co-ordination between provincial and outside research groups. At the same time it is satisfied that whatever expansion takes place within the province should be largely in the field of practical application.

In the current year the RCO is assisting research in special projects recommended by its advisory committees, principally in the fields of forestry, fisheries and wildlife, mines and metallurgy, agriculture, and industrial waste.

Grants-in-Aid: At the Ontario universities the assistance totals \$188,000; at the Ontario Research Foundation \$260,000, which includes \$85,000 for the foundation's extension of technology to small industries; and in government departments \$40,000.

*In 1953-54 estimated to be \$60 million, as compared with about \$3 million for Ontario (both figures excluding research in medicine, national defence, and private industry).

Group Research: In co-operative research with industry the council expended \$19,000. This was mainly on two sizeable projects, one on pollution in the Sarnia area, the other on spruce forests in the Thunder Bay area.

Scholarships: 64 science students were assisted in post-graduate training at a cost of \$50,000. By encouraging the additional training needed for research these scholarships are of great future importance.

Scientific Liaison: This year meetings of the council were held in Ottawa with the National Research Council, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. These agencies perform the bulk of our federal research for civil purposes. The object of this liaison, which the council plans to increase, is to improve the exchange of research information between federal and provincial scientists.

Recommendations: A tabulation of research expenditures made by the Research Council last year emphasized the very considerable amount of research done by our federal government.* To profit by this research the council urged that the province expand developmental or pilot-plant research. If much of the research findings now available are to find practical uses the gap must be bridged between the laboratory stage and the application in industry or resource management.

There is one more aspect, and that is Ontario House in London, England, which confines its activities solely to the province itself, as clearly defined originally in the British North America Act.

It is primarily a clearing house for all specific information regarding the province, advising and directing people on trade, commerce, immigration, tourism, and many other matters. Supervision, as I say, is under this department. The Agent General is the senior official, representing the government,

and accredited to Her Majesty's Government.

Broadly speaking, the work divides itself into 4 main divisions, for which separate departments are established: Trade and Industry, Immigration, Public Relations and Administration. The Trade and Industry Department works in close harmony with the Trade and Industry Branch in Toronto, and the Immigration Department has its link with the Ontario Immigration Branch. The practice is for the other governmental departments, such as Agriculture, Mines, Lands and Forests, Labour, Health and Education, to deal directly with the Agent General on many problems concerned within the departments.

Mr. Chairman, it has been drawn to my attention today by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly), that some time ago he sent to Ontario House a large number of maps showing the mineral development in the Province of Ontario, and that Major Armstrong, the senior official in Ontario House, has received literally hundreds of replies from those who received such maps. I have a sample of them here, and on looking through them I find replies from the United Kingdom, many European countries, and even countries in South America.

I should like to pay tribute to the cartographer in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Kelly) department, and employee who has turned out the first mineral map of this kind in the history of that department. With that map, Mr. Chairman, and through the good offices of Ontario House in London, England, we are helping to keep Ontario to the fore.

In conclusion, may I pay tribute to my staff, the directors and those who serve under them, for the great assistance they have given me during the tenure of office since I was sworn in on January 20th, 1953. Without their help I know I could not have contributed what I have to the department. I have

learned a great deal, and I must confess the longer I am there the more I realize I have a great deal to learn, and I want at this time to pay tribute to those who have given so much help to me.

On Vote 114, Main Office, \$65,500; agreed to.

On Vote 115, Community Plannings Branch, \$120,500; agreed to.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Community Plannings Branch, I want to compliment the hon. Minister for the very excellent survey made in our district, and I was wondering if he would enlarge for a moment, and enlighten us, on the plans he is making for the new town site in the Manitouwadge mining site.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: Mr. Chairman, I cannot be too specific, because I do not know too much about it. I have promised, and our staff has agreed, to go into the Manitouwadge area this spring, as early as possible, to size up the situation and see what is required.

The hon. members will recall that we went into the Atikokan area where some work had been done in the vicinity of Steep Rock, and we were able to catch that in time to prevent some rather wild developments. We have it under control now.

When we go into the Manitouwadge area, we hope to size up the situation completely, and assist the people to establish, perhaps not just 1 town site, but 2 because I understand the area is about 70 miles long and 10 miles wide.

So whatever is required we will give our attention, and if we can be of any assistance, we certainly will give it.

On Vote 116, Conservation Branch, \$263,000.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): On Vote 116 can the hon. Minister tell us how many River Valleys Conservation surveys have been made in the last year.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition is speaking of this year only?

MR. OLIVER: The past year, yes.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: None in 1953, I am informed, but there is one coming up this year.

MR. OLIVER: Where is that?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: The Rouge, Highland and Duffin creeks.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on 116, the Housing Branch. I think, Mr. Chairman, we are obliged to face the hard facts of life, that despite all the minor and ineffective "stabs" taken at the housing problem, basically the crisis in housing is as serious as it ever was, indeed, in some areas, it is more critical today than it ever was.

I listened as attentively as I could to what the hon. Minister had to say about the Housing Branch activities, and I gathered that since this work was begun, and this branch was established—somewhere around \$9 million has been expended—I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the trouble is the government does not appreciate that this is a crisis that demands unusual, energetic and dynamic action, instead of "doodling."

I know you are participating in the Regent Park development. I know the government has also entered several of the smaller areas of the province, but what are we to think of a situation, which is admitted, in the Greater Toronto area for instance, to be more serious than it ever was?

The president of the government-owned Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation admitted that the Toronto housing crisis is worse than it ever has been, despite the enormous building carried on by private enterprise, and despite the Regent Park development—which is important in itself, but nevertheless is simply a drop in the sea of housing requirements in this city. The situation is not only expressed in the physical hardship—which, of course it is—but it threatens us with the most

evil social consequences. This is now recognized in our city. I am not in a position to know whether the situation is the same in other parts of the province, but certainly in the City of Toronto. All authorities—all people who are actively in touch with the Departments of Housing and Family Welfare—agree that we are on the verge of a tragedy in our family life, insofar as enormous sections of the public are concerned.

Let me, Mr. Chairman, quote one such generally-recognized authority, who spoke, it seems to me, with well-chosen words, when she said—and I am quoting Miss Florence Philpot, of the Toronto and District Welfare Council, who spoke as recently as the 16th of this month. She said:

No one in this room—

addressing the annual meeting of the Toronto and District Welfare Council—

—can be complacent about the number of families who are housed in basements and other sub-standard accommodations, where there is not proper ventilation, refrigeration, toilet facilities or privacy. We have ample opportunity in the Welfare Council, and it is now known to this community, that there is a direct relationship between over-crowded conditions, lack of privacy, lack of opportunity for entertainment and the breakdown in family life.

Miss Philpot has felt the same undesirable conditions are related to juvenile delinquency and social deterioration of the individual, and is costly in terms of family and individual life.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this person whom I quoted, who is a very highly-regarded person in her field of work, is not just "sounding off," nor issuing idle alarms, but she is convinced that tragic consequences are developing as the result of the crisis in housing.

More than that it has been recognized in the Greater Toronto area, that due to the housing crisis, and the enforced overcrowding, the loss of life in fires is becoming seriously shocking. A little

while ago, toward the end of 1953, there was a fire which spread like lightning in one house in the eastern part of the city, and the coroner's inquest jury decided the fire was started in a home in which 5 people lost their lives, "due to over-crowding of tenants in this house; 25 people living in a 9-roomed frame dwelling."

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, this is tragic, and this is challenging to all of us—25 people crowded into a 9-roomed frame house.

These are some of the consequences of a lack of adequate housing, and over-crowding.

In Scarborough, another one of the Greater Toronto communities, a fire swept through a one-roomed home, and two small children—a boy and a girl—died in the fire. Actually it was not a house, but a garage. This family, whose husband was a member of the armed forces overseas when the tragedy struck his home, was compelled to move into a garage because there was no other accommodation. When the fire started, it spread like lightning and killed two small children.

I could go on and cite cases of this character, but I doubt whether it is necessary. It is sufficient to say the crisis is acute. We are not overcoming this matter, but according to the general opinion, we are not even holding our own in regard to housing.

I suggest with all due respect to the hon. Minister, who is a young man and undoubtedly is desirous of making a contribution and doing all he can—that neither he nor the government will make any appreciable advance, so long as they display the present lackadaisical attitude to the housing crisis. They approach the housing crisis as just another one of the problems of government. Government has the problems of highways, by-ways, rural telephones, homes for the aged, and housing is just another one, which they have placed in the same category. So long as it is approached in that manner, we will get nowhere very fast and the index of tragedies will rise very sharply.

Now, what is being done about it? The Ottawa Government is, in my opinion, definitely not doing enough. No government is, as a matter of fact. The latest legislation enacted at Ottawa—I suppose the newspapers which support the Ottawa Government will not mention this, and I doubt whether the papers supporting this government will mention it, because it is a fact that their respective governments will be criticized, and so I think the government is quite safe, even if I continued saying what I am about to say. Some papers will print what I have to say, if they can say that I was deliberately prevented from speaking, and that I was being sabotaged—they will print that.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: What about the *Tribune*?

MR. SALSBERG: What I want to say is the latest legislation enacted in Ottawa will not help the situation, because its net result is an increase of interest rates for financing housing, and as a result houses will cost more under the latest Ottawa legislation, than they do even at the present time. The total cost will be greatly extended.

What seems to be overlooked in both Ottawa and Queen's Park is this elementary fact that there are houses people can buy today and tomorrow, provided they have the money to buy them. But the bulk of the population which has the most serious need of housing, cannot afford to buy houses for \$10,000, \$15,000, or \$20,000.

You can buy \$25,000 houses in Toronto now very easily, that is true, but the average working man cannot afford it. He has not the money.

The way to tackle and solve the problem is to undertake a large-scale low-rental housing scheme for families which have not the money for the down payment, nor are their earnings sufficient to meet the payments which are required of them, even if they purchased with a low down payment.

For that group of the population, the neediest group, we must provide low-rental housing. The hon. Minister did

mention some low-rental housing project, and I would appreciate it if he would enlarge upon it when I am through. I hope he will understand that while I heard him, I nevertheless feel, his reading the speech from the back bench, did not quite convey all the information which I am sure he is able to impart. If he would not look into his notes, but just speak, man to man, so to speak, we will have a better understanding.

It is true you have some low-rental housing, but not enough, and surely not in Toronto. That is one group of housing accommodation we need, the low-rental housing. That means government financed. The second need is for a low interest rate of money.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Is the hon. member talking about subsidized rental?

MR. SALSBERG: To go back to the low rental housing proposition, I speak about low-rental housing, even if it means subsidization.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: All right.

MR. SALSBERG: Right. If they cannot pay for it, let the government subsidize, and it will save us money in reformatories, jails, hospitalization—

MR. HANNA: And race tracks.

MR. SALSBERG: And race tracks, Mr. Representative of the Race Track Commission, since he brought it up.

The second need in overcoming the housing shortage is low interest rates for mortgage money to purchase houses. There is no use saying that a working man who may have put aside \$1,000 that if he buys a house at present prices of \$15,000, and because he will have 20 or more years to pay for it, that it will eventually belong to him. But the interest rate will be $5\frac{3}{4}$ or 6 per cent. and more, especially if he needs a second mortgage. Interest charges will eat him alive, and he will find that he cannot spare that money.

What we need is low interest mortgages. This province had gone into the second mortgage field and then stepped out of it. I know the hon. Prime Minister has, on a number of occasions, explained that Ottawa as much as made him get out of the field, I confess and I may be duller than most hon. members of the House, but I could never figure it out, and I am still of the belief that if the government desired, it could enter the second mortgage field tomorrow, and lose no money on it, if we granted second mortgages at the low interest rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 per cent. at the most.

If we were to provide such financing, then we would begin to get places. Not doing that, of course, we only nibble at the problem. We are not solving it.

Only recently, the Canadian Congress of Labour told the Ottawa Government that half the wage earners cannot buy a home. Union asked for subsidies. That is true, with the result that little bits are done here and there.

As I said, the government nibbles at it, a few houses here, some arrangements with a community there, but nothing substantial is being done, and the crisis is not escaped. We cannot escape it, it is with us.

I know the government has gone into the land assembly field. That is better than nothing, but it is not good enough. For two reasons. First, I would respectfully suggest that the land assembly proposition in North York is too far from the city. I do not know how the hon. Minister will explain it, but I have examined this project quite impartially, and I have the feeling it is so far removed from the city centres or from the areas of industrial activity that it will be a hardship on people who may find themselves obliged to go out there. There is no industry there, and the subway, as you know, does not go above Eglinton Avenue.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: We have the answer for that.

MR. SALSBERG: I would be very glad to hear it, but I have not found

an answer. And whatever answer the hon. Minister may have, it would not provide the transportation and the movement of people from miles outside the northern-most extreme limits of the city to places where they will earn their livelihoods.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): May I ask a question?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes.

MR. STEWART: I have been very attentive here this session, and I think every one of the hon. Ministers who spoke, has revealed something about our way of life. I would like to ask the hon. member for St. Andrew if he knows of any province or any other country that has better living conditions, and better opportunities, than we have right here in the province of Ontario? Everything which has come before the House this session, the hon. member has spoken of in terms of condemnation. Does he know of any better place?

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Chairman, my answer to the question of the hon. member is this: the government has 70-odd members out of 90—

MR. STEWART: That is not the answer. Do not "duck" the issue.

MR. SALSBERG: And all the hon. members seek opportunities to praise the government. I am here as one of the Opposition, whose task it is to pressure the government into doing more than it is doing in every field, particularly the fields of human welfare, and housing is one of them.

MR. STEWART: Where is there a better place than here? Where? Name it. The hon. member cannot and he knows he cannot.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member does not have to act as if he were a high school lad, "You cannot"; "I can." Do not act like that.

MR. STEWART: The hon. member knows there is no gas chamber in Ontario.

MR. SALSBERG: Let us be adult. Let us be grown up. We are tackling an important social problem. Of course this is a great province, and this is a great city. What does that have to do with it?

The fact, however, is that the crisis of housing is more severe in this town than in most other large centres in the province. The hon. member (Mr. Stewart) represents a riding in Toronto where it is also critical. I am not denying some accomplishments of the government in housing. I acknowledge they have done a little bit here and there, but I maintain this is just nibbling. In face of the crisis, it is "doodling," when action is necessary.

May I say this: there was a time when the Conservative Party in this Legislature, had men with some social vision, who recognized the housing problem earlier than many hon. members now in this House.

I have here a very interesting old document. I know the hon. Prime Minister is interested in "old documents" and I will let him look at it. It is the report of the Housing Authority established in Toronto before the First World War. The hon. members will like this, if they will wait a minute. They do not know how good it is going to be.

This is the report of a company established as a result of legislation adopted by the Legislature during a Tory regime, as a result of the interest which the late Mr. W. J. Hanna, the then Provincial Secretary, took in the housing situation. He is the one who introduced legislation which led to the formation of the Toronto Housing Company. Here, for the hon. members who get a little impatient with me and think I am criticizing for nothing, let me read what Mr. Hanna said in 1913, in a foreword to this report. He said:

Canada should do more than banish the slums. The old countries are doing that. Society is responsible for the slums and society must pay for their removal, which will

require something in the nature of a surgical operation on the body politic.

But better housing has a far wider application than the slum problem. It means better living conditions for the great masses of wage-earners, and will bring with it a toning up of our whole social and industrial system. Enabling legislation will be necessary in every province. We, in Ontario, have made a beginning, and the results set out in this pamphlet, obtained under an Act passed this year, would indicate that we are on the right track.

I agree with the statement that every Canadian workman of steady habits should be able to own his home. The advantage is as much to the State as to the individual, for the home must always be the starting point for strengthening and elevating the social conscience and the national life.

(Signed) W. J. HANNA

The Provincial Secretary's Office,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

I must say, the hon. Prime Minister I know would like to look at this "old document." If I were to have said this, without saying these were Mr. Hanna's words, I would be accused of uttering almost subversive thoughts. The State is responsible. Why, of course, the State is responsible, and Mr. Hanna recognized it in 1913—40 years ago.

I will conclude by saying that the land assembly plan may have some merit, but I am afraid the Toronto scheme will take it too far from the areas of industrial and social activities for the people for whom it is intended.

Secondly, I am afraid that the land assembly scheme falls short of a very important element, in that the assembly is handed over to private builders. I must say that a chorus of cries against profiteering in housing seems to be rising throughout the country now. One

of the labour organizations of Toronto, only a couple of days ago—the A.F. of L.—had a meeting of the vice-presidents, and, according to the press, they claim that profits on small homes are altogether too excessive. They deny that labour costs are mainly responsible for the high prices of new homes, and say that as much as \$3,000 and \$4,000 is made on a single small house.

There may be some hon. members here who are in the building construction business, and they can correct any statements which have been made by me on the basis of what other responsible people have said.

In conclusion, I want to appeal to the government and say, for goodness sake, stop looking upon housing as just one other problem. I appeal to the government, the hon. Minister immediately involved, the hon. Prime Minister, and the entire Cabinet, to take some emergency steps. I think it would be excellent if the hon. Prime Minister were to issue a statement now calling an emergency conference of federal, provincial and municipal representatives from the Toronto area to deal radically with the housing crisis. I think the people would welcome that, the people would applaud that, and as the result of such energetic action, more than these picayune efforts will be made.

We need large-scale efforts, we need large-scale construction, we need a special effort in the direction of low-rental housing on the one hand, and mortgage money at low interest rates for those who want to buy a house, but cannot otherwise afford it, on the other hand.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: I want to say a few words to the hon. member who has thrown in several extraneous matters to colour the issue. We are not "doodling" along in the field of housing. This is not a "picayune effort," as the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) states. I think we are doing a tremendous job. I am prepared to admit that in the Metropolitan district of Toronto there is an acute housing shortage, but

throughout the rest of the province there is no acute housing shortage and Mr. Monsur himself made a statement to that effect. Figures show that in 1952, in all of Canada, there were 83,246 starts in that year. There were 30,016 starts in the Province of Ontario. In Canada in 1953 there were 102,409 starts and in Ontario 38,873. I got those figures from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. There has been a very gratifying increase from year to year, showing that we are gradually catching up with the housing shortage.

Furthermore, so far as the Toronto area is concerned every hon. member here knows we spent a lot of time dealing with Bill 80, the Bill which brought into effect the Toronto Metropolitan municipality. One of the great motivating factors behind that bill was that there were no large tracts of land in the City of Toronto where we could build houses. As a result of the Metropolitan Bill, we were able to begin to assemble lots to relieve this acute housing shortage in the metropolitan area, and already we have assembled nearly 9,000 lots, and we are going to get several more acres of lots in the near future which will still further relieve this housing shortage.

We could do nothing about this before the Metropolitan Bill was passed, except quietly assemble lots in preparation for future building. But in other parts of Ontario we have not been "doodling around." We have been extremely active in co-operation with the Federal Government. I may say that our relations with the Federal Government have been extremely good. And we are getting things done. As an example I want to point out to the hon. member for St. Andrew that there are 33 municipalities with which we have agreed to undertake housing projects. Nine municipalities are expected to enter into agreement. We have undertaken to provide leasehold projects in 1,845 municipalities. The number of housing units under expected agreement is 1,695, and so on.

SUMMARY

Number of Municipalities covered in this report—69.

Total Population—3,252,900.

Municipalities in which we have agreed to undertake housing projects

Amherstburg, Arnprior (2), Atikokan, Brockville (2), Dunnville, Fort Erie, Fort William (2), Galt, Goderich (2), Guelph, Hamilton, Kenora, Kingston, Kitchener, Lindsay (2), London, London Township, Midland (2), North Bay, Ottawa, Owen Sound, Peterborough, Port Arthur, Prescott, Renfrew, Sarnia, Smiths Falls, Stamford Twp., Sault Ste. Marie, Stratford, St. Thomas (3), Trenton, Windsor	Total	33
--	-------	----

Municipalities expected to request a project

Barrie, Brantford (L), Cobourg (L), Cornwall, Napanee, Orillia, Port Hope (L), Toronto, and Metropolitan Toronto (L).	Total	9
--	-------	---

(L)—Land Purchased.

Municipalities in which we have undertaken to provide rental projects and number of units in each.

Amherstburg (25), Arnprior (25), Brockville (80), Dunnville (25), Fort William (122), Fort Erie (28), Galt (50), Goderich (51), Guelph (70), Hamilton (496), Kenora (25), Lindsay (20), Midland (30), North Bay (54), Owen Sound (40), Port Arthur (40), Prescott (10), Renfrew (30), Smiths Falls (24), Stamford Twp. (70), Stratford (40), Sault Ste. Marie (100), St. Thomas (40), Trenton (25), Windsor (325)	Total	1,845
---	-------	-------

Number of Rental Units on expected agreements

Barrie (25), Hamilton (250), Orillia (25), Galt (50), Stratford (45), Toronto (1,000), Windsor (300) Total	1,695
--	-------

Total Rental Units	3,540
--------------------------	-------

Municipalities in which we have undertaken to provide land assembly projects, and approximate number of lots in each

Amherstburg (31), Arnprior (43), Atikokan (565), Brockville (1,100), Guelph (203), Kenora (255), Kingston (492), Kitchener (960), London Twp. (850), London (379), Lindsay (58), Midland (32), North Bay (55), Ottawa (665), Owen Sound (38), Peterborough (1,770), Renfrew (46), Sarnia (1,200), Stratford (122), Stamford Twp. (57), St. Thomas (280), Trenton (115)	Total	9,316
--	-------	-------

Land assembly lots on expected agreements

Barrie (13), Brantford (700), Cobourg (850), Cornwall (1,200), Hamilton (5,200), Metropolitan Toronto (11,400), Port Arthur (220)

Total 19,663

Total Land Assembly Lots 28,979

I think that is a good job which has been done. It must be remembered that every time we relieve the housing shortage in a municipality we help those people who are living in poor accommodations to move into better accommodations which is being vacated.

May I make one other point? The hon. member for St. Andrew talked about setting up a certain committee composed of federal and municipal representatives. We cannot go to municipalities and insist they come into a deal with us. We make it known to them that we offer our joint services. We say: "Come in with us if you want land assembly plan or a rental plan. We will help you set it up." We are glad to do that, and the figures show we have been doing it.

The hon. member for St. Andrew intimated that this land which we took up in North York and other places is too far out for the convenience of the workers who will live in the new houses there. In answer to that, I would tell him that we could not get land in other parts of the city. As I intimated a while ago, all the land in the City of Toronto is taken up. It is already held. The land within the northern perimeter of the city has been bought up by certain persons who are holding it for high prices. We did not want to feel that we were paying prohibitive prices for this land, so we went further out, and took up land at prices were believed to be reasonable. Sometimes we paid as low as between \$600 and \$800; sometimes as high as between \$1,400 and \$1,500 per acre. These we thought to be reasonable prices. We are making that land available for about \$250 a lot. In that way we hope to keep final prices within reach of people's ability to pay. If we could get any closer to the City of Toronto itself and buy land at reason-

able prices, we would do it, but viewing the future at long range, and bearing in mind that Metropolitan Toronto is expanding rapidly and will need large residential areas, we have taken up this land which is outside the high-priced area and we are holding it for the people who will need it in the very near future. But we could not do that until the Metropolitan Bill went through. I could go on to answer the hon. member for St. Andrew further, and give many more details of what we have been doing in the field of housing. But from what I have already said, I think the hon. member should retract his statement that we have only been "doodling" and have not accomplished anything for the people of this province.

MR. OLIVER: In assembling all land for housing development, the hon. Minister has, under the Planning and Development Act, the power of expropriation.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: That is correct.

MR. OLIVER: Have you used that power to any extent?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: Mr. Chairman, I have used that power on two occasions. The first, as I mentioned a while ago, was at Atikokan. We faced a situation there where we wanted to develop a large area of land, and where a certain interest was standing in our way. We could not get on with the job because of the prohibitive prices being asked for land. I signed an expropriation order in that case. We stepped in and got a difficult situation under control, and we are now planning that area for a population of between 20,000 and 25,000 people, within the next 8 to 10 years. That worked very well, and everybody was apparently satisfied except of course the particular interest concerned.

The other occasion where I used the power of expropriation under the Housing and Development Act, was at Scarboro where we filed against 1,800 acres in the township. Since that time we have had persons coming into our

office negotiating agreements with us at reasonable prices. But I must still confess there are a considerable number out there who have not yet come to us, and offered to settle on some reasonable basis. We are still hoping we may negotiate in the near future. Those are the only two occasions on which I have used the power of expropriation. Since that time we have been able to assemble a great many more acres of land in the province on a negotiated basis.

MR. SALSBERG: To follow up this question of expropriation. It is a fact that the method of expropriation was resorted to in the Greater Toronto area when it affected certain farmers. If we are using it where farmers are concerned, why are we hesitant to employ the expropriation tactic against land speculators whose land is much closer to the city? Why are they a privileged group?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: They are not a privileged group. If you expropriated any given area, the price is going to be established by the market price in that area. The market price has definitely been established in this case. If we expropriate, and go to the Municipal Board, we would find that the price for the land is already established, and we do not want to pay what, in our opinion, are prohibitive prices.

MR. BEECH (York South): In view of the apparent reluctance on the part of private enterprise to get into the limited dividend housing field, I wonder whether the department might consider doing it?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: I cannot say we have considered this, Mr. Chairman, but we are willing to co-operate with all those who might wish to enter this field, service clubs and so on.

Vote 116 agreed to.

Vote 117:

Salaries \$22,500

MR. OLIVER: On Vote 117, are we spending money to bring immigrants out now?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: No, we are not spending money, Mr. Chairman. What usually happens is that people in London, England, go to Canada House where they have to be documented and so on, they have to indicate whether they wish to come to Ontario. The usual procedure is to send them to our branch on Burlington Street and there we find out what their skills are, if any, and we try to have them placed in Ontario before they reach here. We make no contribution to their fare, but when they get here, if they need a little assistance we provide the odd train fare, or perhaps a meal or two to help them get to their destination.

MR. SALSBERG: Do we still carry on a publicity campaign in the British Isles?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: Yes, there has been some publicity carried on, I would not say directly. But we try to point out the advantages of coming to Ontario. We are still getting 52 per cent. of all the immigrants who come from the British Isles. They seem to like it here, too.

MR. SALSBERG: I am glad that is so.

MR. T. D. THOMAS: I am glad, Mr. Chairman, to think they are doing a good job at Ontario House. But this morning I was browsing through the Public Accounts for the year ending 1953 and I came across some items appertaining to the salary and allowances of Major Armstrong. It seems that he receives a living allowance of \$2,500, a representative's allowance of \$4,500, travelling expenses and subsistence of \$1,506, and salary of \$10,000, making a total altogether of \$18,670. This is much more than the Prime Minister of Ontario is getting, and I wonder whether the hon. Minister would tell us whether the hon. Prime Minister is getting too little or whether Major Armstrong is getting too much.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: Major Armstrong gets \$10,000 basic pay. He is living in London, England, and like others over there, gets representative's allowance and expenses for travelling. Major Armstrong, who is Agent-General over there, has to make a great many journeys, not only in the British Isles, but in Western Europe, and his travelling expenses are quite high.

Vote 117 agreed to.

On Vote 120. Trade and Industry Branch, \$136,500.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 120 may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) relative to an article in the *Star* of the 27th of March? It is a report of a speech of Dr. Faludi on "petroleum." The doctor enumerated the advantages of this new zoning plan they had in mind, and I notice in particular one statement in which he said that when the new set-up is working, two municipalities in a zone vie for an industry, the province will decide on the site.

Is it intended to go that far, that the province will decide where an industry is to go?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: No, that is not correct, Mr. Chairman. We do not decide where any industry goes. As I indicated in my remarks a while ago, we try to assist them, we try to guide them, but we do not direct them into any particular municipality.

I might add that, if and when this new regional set-up materializes, it will operate only in an advisory way; it will be used only to guide industry into an area. But certainly I want to state emphatically that we do not now, and will not, say to any industry, "You must go into this area or that area", because if anything went wrong, they would come back and say to us, "You directed us into that spot; the conditions are not advantageous for our particular industry, and we are going bankrupt. Now, what are you going to do about it?" So, as I say, we guide them, but we do not direct them into any particular area.

MR. SALSBERG: On Trade and Industry Branch, I should like to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) that I think the time has come for that branch to expand and to reverse its objectives. What I mean is, that until now the emphasis has been on attracting industry from other countries or other parts of Canada into Ontario. Primarily, however, the objective was to get industry from outside of Canada.

I suggest that we should utilize our Trade and Industry Branch to open markets for Canadian agricultural and industrial products, rather than to emphasize predominantly the attractions we have to offer to industry, because the economic conditions in the country, and in this province, I think, dictate some such change in the approach to the task of this branch.

I remember 6 or so years ago when I visited Ontario House, we discussed this problem. At that time Mr. Armstrong and his staff told me that they could sell a lot of Ontario products in Britain, if the British Government would only let them; in fact, they had a few displays of Ontario products, but it was no more than a show; the people could not buy. Today, I think the possibilities are a bit better than they were, and I would suggest the department begin working in the direction of creating markets, in other words, emphasize everywhere the things we have to sell, and the things we can buy in exchange.

We have discussed in this House, on numerous occasions, the effects of the economic recession on our people here, particularly in agriculture. That is a serious problem. Frankly, I would like to see the Ontario Trade and Industry Branch in the British Isles concentrate on campaigning for Canadian cheese, Canadian bacon, and other Canadian farm products to be sold, rather than to spend so much time attracting perhaps another branch factory here.

I think, furthermore, that the activities of this branch should be extended to the Continent, and, indeed, to wherever there is a likely opening for

trade and exchange of commodities between Ontario and other areas of the world.

Mr. Drew came back from the British Isles last fall, I believe, and he said that he could not find an ounce of Canadian cheese anywhere in London, when he went shopping for cheese. If that is the situation, then it is, of course, very bad. I know there was a sale of cheese recently, but the reason I am bringing up this example is to emphasize what is most important insofar as our economic picture is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, that is true, also, of our industrial products. When the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) was in Europe—and I was hoping he would give us a word picture of his impressions of the European scene, and especially with an eye to benefitting the Province of Ontario—from what I read, he was very much elated over the possibility of another branch factory locating here. That is perfectly all right, but that is not the main thing. We have factories here which are partially or completely idle because they have no markets for their products. That is the situation, and the need is to find markets for agricultural machinery, for textiles—and there are countries we could sell textiles to; I do not mean Britain, but other countries—for our agriculture products, and so on. That should be the policy to be followed in the department.

Some hon. members may find it a little far-fetched, and may think: "We have never done it before." I suggest there is quite a hangover from the old colonial days when the idea was to put up posters in Europe showing barns with lots of cows in front of them, big tractors and Belgian horses, and suggest the people come and pick up land in Canada. That is still all right, but that is no longer the essential requirement. An office in Chicago may be of some value, it may attract another branch factory. Frankly, I would sooner see more British branch factories open here than American. It is not because I am anti-American, may I say, before somebody rises and says, "You

do not like the United States." I do like the United States.

HON. W. GRIESINGER (Minister of Public Works): But they do not like you.

MR. SALSBERG: The fact is, we are now paying to the United States from this province in interest rates and dividends every year, more than this province is spending on welfare services to all our people. Do hon. members know that?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: My department has no control over that.

MR. SALSBERG: No, but it does not stand in the same relationship with the British Isles and other countries. In short, what I suggest is that this branch be not closed, nor even reduced. I should like to see it expanded, but I should like to see the emphasis placed on selling and trading and exchanging Ontario products for products of other countries, who are ready and anxious to deal with us.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister (Mr. Warrender) give us a little more information about the Chicago Branch? This is the first time we have had an Estimate for that, is it not?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: No, last year was the first.

MR. NIXON: How much did you spend last year?

HON. MR. W. K. WARRENDER: \$25,000.

MR. NIXON: Just the same amount. Who is the head of that branch?

HON. MR. WARRENDER: We have a man by the name of Mr. Harry Slay. He was a member of our staff here in Toronto, and we persuaded him to go over there. He did not wish to do so, he did not want to live there, because he was well settled here with his family and his mother. However, we persuaded him to go there, and open the office, and he has done a splendid job, has become pretty well acquainted

with people over there, and rather likes it, so we are hoping to keep him on another year or so. In the meantime, we are endeavouring to train a young man to take his place.

The office was opened in May of last year, and as I indicated in my few remarks, we have had many calls and enquiries about Ontario, and we have actually taken a very active part in the settling of 12 rather large industries here from the midwestern states, and we think it is doing extremely well, and it certainly should be carried on.

Vote 120 agreed to.

The Chairman, Statutory Vote, Housing Branch, \$10 million.

Statutory Vote agreed to.

ESTIMATES—DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARY

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Estimates of the Department of the Provincial Secretary, as hon. members are all aware, this is not a revenue-producing department, in the sense that a great many of the other departments are. However, I am very happy to say that we had the best record this year, from a revenue-producing point of view, and also in the volume of business done, in any year in the history of the department since its inauguration.

The revenue this year amounted to \$1,267,000. The anticipated revenue for the month of March is about \$41,000, making a total for the fiscal year in excess of \$1,300,000, representing an increase of \$400,000, or 3.6 per cent. over 1953.

The increase in the number of companies reflects directly the progress and the growth of this province.

This year we incorporated 3,455 companies, which is an increase of 1,342 over the number incorporated last year, which was 2,113.

Our forecast of revenue this year was \$790,000. Due to one or two very large companies, with very large capitalization, which came to the province of Ontario, in competition with the other provinces, and with the Dominion, and

with various states in the United States, our revenue exceeded our forecast by a very large sum indeed. The incorporation fee of one of those companies amounted to \$50,135, and that of another amounted to \$50,270. When these companies complete their organizations, it will result in over 100 companies coming to the Province of Ontario, being subsidiaries which also will be incorporated here.

Our expenditures this year were \$1,526,000, an increase of \$87,000 over the previous year. This was due largely to the increase in commission fees, which cost us in the neighbourhood of \$100,000. Our expenditure forecast for next year is \$1,365,000, which is a decrease of \$100,000. At the present time, in spite of the work which has been piling up in the office, we have actually less people on the staff today than we had at this time last year, and, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity of paying tribute to the very, very efficient, hardworking staff we have in the office of the Provincial Secretary.

One of the responsibilities of that office is civil defence, and, with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words on this subject.

The expenditure on our post-conversion programme to date—by which I mean to February 28th—amounted to \$769,901, of which the Dominion of Canada are paying one-third and have paid \$164,000; 26 counties in Ontario are completely standardized; 3,313,680, or 71.3 per cent. of the population, live in these counties.

Fourteen of the remaining counties and districts have been surveyed. That will leave only in Southern Ontario, the Ottawa Valley, the City of Ottawa, Cornwall, and Northern Ontario.

I think it might be of interest, Mr. Chairman, if I give a brief outline of how this work is done.

Due to the co-operation of the Federal Government, we were able to obtain from the Department of National Defence, originally two lorries. These are actually travelling machine shops, and any of the service people will know

what they are, when I say they were lorries used in the heavy-duty section of the Ordnance Corps. We man these lorries with our own technicians, and our own drivers, and we are responsible for their maintenance and insurance. Any major breakdown is looked after by the Department of National Defence. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the success of this programme is, to a large extent, due to the co-operation of the Federal Government in making these vehicles available to us.

When we started, we organized two survey teams, which consisted of technical people. They go into a town, and with the co-operation of the local fire department, make a complete survey of the installations, including those of industry. When they leave a town, they know exactly how many fittings there are, the size of them, and where they are to be placed, and this information is passed on to the company which produces the necessary fittings for that particular job.

Then the actual working crews come along. In the meantime, the survey has been shifted to another site, and when the working crew comes in, with the co-operation of the local fire department, they put in the installations, and it really does not take very long to do the job.

The City of Hamilton, as the hon. members are aware, is a very highly-industrialized city, as are so many other towns in Southwestern Ontario. Our survey people moved into Hamilton some months ago, and completed their work, then the actual installing people moved in, and the job now is practically completed. It is a big and an important job.

Our thinking, departmentally, on civil defence is completely at variance with some of the other countries, particularly the country to the south. It has been our opinion, and is the opinion of the government, that this money which is voted, is for self-defence, as well as civil defence. We must have our facilities in this country organized to meet any eventuality which may occur. To do that successfully and efficiently, we feel it has been absolutely necessary

that any fire equipment we have should be available for use in any part of the province.

Originally, we had 149 different types of hose connections, which were not interchangeable. The City of Toronto for instance, would be unable to receive assistance from any of the towns along the lake. It has been the feeling of the department that in any system which was set up to combat any disaster which might occur, it was absolutely essential that our fire equipment should be able to be used anywhere, and be made available to any municipality which needed it. That is the reason this programme was undertaken, and the reason we are pressing it on to completion as rapidly as is possible. And that is the reason today why the other provinces in the Dominion of Canada are following in our footsteps, and the movement is spreading to the United States, and in the course of the next few years, I am sure we will see that various states of the United States have done the same as we, because it is a primary thing which must be done.

We have always thought that in an attack, there are two major factors. Of course, there are others, but two major ones. One is fire, and the other is panic. This is what we are endeavouring to do as regards fire. We are enlisting and training volunteer firemen as rapidly as possible. We have a fair amount of equipment, which has been loaned to the various fire brigades to enable them to train auxiliary firemen without interference with their regular work in any way.

As regards panic—and that may be one of the great dangers we will have to face. Anybody who was in Europe in the early days of the last war, knows what a very great danger that is indeed—we have our roads mapped and planned, through the efforts of our provincial and municipal police. We know where we are going to get the large number of auxiliary officers required for traffic control, and we are training these men as rapidly as possible, because in the event of an emergency, that will be very important. I think the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr.

Cathcart) will agree they had a slight example of what could happen, at the time of the Sarnia disaster, and that was a very slight example, indeed.

MR. CATHCART (Lambton West): It was a big example.

HON. MR. WELSH: Just multiply that a thousand times, and the hon. members will see there would be chaos, unless rigid and rapid controls could be exercised over our traffic.

We have gone further, I think, in this matter than any state or province on the continent, because it was felt it was an essential step.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to speak at any great length about the other activities of this branch, in which it has been engaged. There are a great many of them. But there is one thing I do want to say in all sincerity to the hon. members, that within the past year, we have had a complete change, not only in our thinking regarding civil defence, but in regards to the methods which resulted in this change of thinking.

At the time the Americans dropped the bomb on Hiroshima, that bomb, pound for pound, was 25 times stronger than all the T.N.T. bombs which had been developed by any nation in the world. It increased by 25 times, the potential destruction.

The bomb the Americans dropped in the Pacific not so very long ago is 1000 times more powerful. In fact—and I do not think I am committing any breach of security in saying this—it not only destroyed the island upon which it was dropped, and blew the island to “smithereens,” but it created a crater in the floor of the ocean where the island had been, 175 feet deep.

To illustrate the danger of potential destruction we are facing, if one of these bombs today, of a size which can be carried by our enemies, were dropped on the City of Toronto, for a radius of 3 miles from the zero point of the dropped bomb, there would be absolute destruction, with not only no survivals, but no buildings left standing. For the next 4-mile radius, the destruction

would be about 50 per cent., and for a 3-mile radius beyond that, the damage done would be considerable.

I do not like to speak about these things. I have never been one who liked to disturb people or create panic, but I think the time has come when we can no longer bury our heads in the sand, and say “It cannot happen here,” because it can happen here.

As the hon. members know, we have only one potential enemy in the world—one potential enemy. We are not preparing to attack anyone, but this potential enemy of ours is building long-range bombers, with a very heavy weight-carrying capacity. They should have no fear of attack, but I leave it to the judgment of the hon. members of this House as to why they are devoting a great deal of their expenditures on armament, to this one particular type of aircraft.

I can say this to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you, to the hon. members of this House, that in spite of all the radar screens we can build, in spite of all the ack-ack defences we can set up, in spite of our ground observer crews, some of those bombers will get through. I do not think any Russian, in his right mind, would pick on a city like Toronto upon which to drop a bomb, when there are so many more important targets available, within easy reach, which would destroy homes and cripple industries. In fact, I do not think there is potentially, any city in the Province of Ontario which would offer such a target. But, the hon. members must remember this, that the pilots never go out on a bombing raid with only one objective in view. They have a couple of alternate targets, and if, for any reason, they cannot get to the original target, they are supposed to attack one of the alternative targets, and, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that we have some “dandy” alternative targets in the Province of Ontario. In fact, we have one in Toronto, and there are others in Hamilton, Windsor, Kitchener, and many other places.

There is one way only by which we can defeat the enemy and that is by not

being passive, but active. Civil defence must go on to attack, and the way they can do that is this; one of these bombs with a potential destruction, we will say, of 100,000 lives and 5 acres of industrial plants—and I put that figure very conservatively indeed—but we can help beat him by attacking in this way; if we can reduce the casualties he causes, and the amount of destruction caused by fire, or by other means, we are on the attack, and wars are only won by attacking.

That is why, in presenting these Estimates now, Mr. Chairman, while the amount of money in our civil defence Estimates is very reasonable indeed, when we consider the results we are obtaining from it, we are spending, I know, more in this province than any province in the Dominion of Canada—and our efforts at the present time, must be to see that steps are taken to prevent panic and fires, and that we be well organized, and we hope by another year, that will be achieved. Then we can go on to other things.

I do not want to take up the time of the House, Mr. Chairman, in elaborating on these, but as we come to the hydrogen bomb, we changed our emphasis. We put the emphasis on the work done by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) because the welfare problem becomes more important with the new conception of what might happen to us.

Mr. Chairman, I would like every hon. member in this House to give serious thought to this very vital subject, and not only give thought to it, but lend his best efforts, because in the final analysis, the greatest defence we can build up in this country is the moral and the spiritual strength of our people in adversity.

Vote 124, Main Office, \$251,200.

Vote 125, Salaries, \$18,500.

On Vote 125.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the welfare of the page boys in this Assembly, who have been away from school for 7 or 8 weeks. What provi-

sion is made for continuing their education?

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, that is a matter in which I think every hon. member of this House is interested. These boys are chosen for their academic ability, in the first place. They are all extremely good students in their classes. When they come in here, arrangements are made for their education to be continued, by their attendance at classes in the mornings, and I think I am safe in saying that their experiences here are not only very valuable to them, but their education is not being handicapped in any way.

MR. THOMAS: Who provides the teacher, the Board of Education of Toronto?

HON. MR. WELSH: No, Mr. Chairman. We provide the teacher, who is, of course, paid by the board.

MR. THOMAS: What is he paid, Mr. Chairman?

HON. MR. WELSH: The teacher receives \$50 a week for his services.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, do you take anyone the Board of Education sends, or do you request a certain individual?

HON. MR. WELSH: This arrangement is made through Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, have you any idea who the teacher is at the present time?

HON. MR. WELSH: Yes, the teacher at the moment is a Mr. Davies.

Vote 125 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 126, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and Chief Election Officer, \$53,700.

Vote agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 127, Session requirements, \$499,700.

MR. SALSBERG: On Vote 127, item 8, "Legislative Committee for Art

Purposes." I have a personal interest in this item. The amount of \$6,000 is voted.

I have been interested in the Art Committee since I became a member of this House. In fact I succeeded in getting a motion through the Art Committee many years ago which was finally approved by the House to purchase annually two or three paintings which were works of Ontario artists. The motion also provided that the Ontario Society of Artists be asked to select the two or three paintings of the year which we should buy, and that we add them to our provincial collection, and build up an impressive collection of Ontario works, which we would use for exhibition here and elsewhere in the province.

That motion was, as I said, carried, and I know that for a few years such paintings were purchased, then the item began disappearing, and of late I do not know what has happened. The last I heard of it was a couple of years ago when the pictures which were purchased were done by an attendant, whose personal hobby was painting, at the entrance to a large hotel, as I understand it, one of his works was purchased. Then another picture which was purchased, I think was done by a former attendant in this Chamber. That is all very good, and I am in favour of encouraging amateurs, although I say the original intention was to get the Society of Artists to select outstanding works of art. Certainly there are, in some instances, outstanding works by people who are not members of the Society, I think in particular of a very fine work done by Mr. Greenaway. One of his paintings was in the office of the Speaker until the hon. Prime Minister snatched it from him, and took it into his own private chamber. Generally, however, I think we are on the safe side if we ask the Ontario Society of Artists to select these works of art.

My question to the hon. Minister—and I deliberately extended the question so he would have time to consult with the members of his department—is how many paintings were purchased this year, last year, and the year before last, and from whom, and for how much

money, or have we discontinued the practice which I had hoped was to be a permanent feature of our government?

HON. MR. WELSH: In reply to the hon. member for St. Andrew, the amount expended last year under this item was \$3,200. Some of this was for a portrait of a former Prime Minister, and the rest was for the purchase of one or more—I am not sure how many—pictures, which are hanging in these buildings at the moment.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): What did you pay for the portrait?

HON. MR. WELSH: The expenditure for that portrait was \$1,500, and the balance, \$1,700, was expended on other paintings.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister is not able to tell us at the present from whom the other paintings were purchased?

HON. MR. WELSH: I think—in fact I am reasonably sure—Mr. Chairman, one of these was a seascape purchased from Mr. Greenaway. I do not remember who the other one was.

Vote 127 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 128, Queen's Printer, \$110,200.

MR. SALSBERG: As regards the Queen's Printer, I feel very dissatisfied with the way the reports come through. I do not want to be considered disagreeable on this question—

MR. COWLING: The hon. member is.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very much concerned, even if some member of the "carrier boys' section"—I call them that, because they always say, "Carried," "Carried"—so the carrier boys—may not be dissatisfied.

I feel the lack of printed reports which are important for records and for studying activities of the departments of government, because they are so late in coming through.

My pet theory for a long while was that this delay was due to the fact that most of the printing orders were being channeled into a few select print shops, and if we were to extend the area to which these orders were given, the result would be better and faster service.

The hon. Minister told me publicly here, and privately, that such is not the case. If it is not, I would like to know what it is. Why is it that some reports are delayed in printing for almost a year and a half? I do not want to mention them or single out any one department, but there are some reports which were tabled a year ago, and are not yet printed. Last year's report was now tabled and the one before that is not even in printed form. I think it is a handicap for all hon. members of the House, as well as people outside, who have occasion to refer to the annual reports.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Andrew was kind enough to ask that question before, and I thought at that time I had cleared the matter to his entire satisfaction, but apparently I did not.

When a report is tabled, there is a certain definite number, very small, which is set, and which are printed. If any additional copies are required, the printing is done at the request of the department. If any particular department wishes to have additional copies printed, that is done, but they pay for it. Regarding copies which are printed originally from the tabled report, we receive the necessary instructions for the printing of them, from the Printing Committee of this House.

MR. SALSBERG: I can show the hon. Minister reports which were approved by the Printing Committee a year ago, and the number of copies to be printed was clearly indicated, yet the report in question is not printed. Some departments do manage to "come through" in a reasonable time, within 6 or 8 months, but when reports are a year, and a year and a half, and two years late in coming out, I suggest it is

a serious matter, and a justifiable cause for complaint.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The same patronage was followed about 100 years ago, which was going on then.

MR. SALSBERG: If it is "patronage," we should stop it, and give it to the union printing houses which are doing a good job, and turn it out faster.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The Queen's Printer does a good job.

MR. SALSBERG: The King's Printer, or the Queen's Printer, has had orders years ago, and they are not here yet.

HON. MR. WELSH: I have great difficulty in accepting that statement. I would like it to be more specific. I do not like to attempt to answer a generality, because 99 times out of 100, it is not true. We all make mistakes. We are only human.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister should not put me "on the spot," because he knows I spoke to him privately about certain reports. He knows also what answer he gave me, and why I am not mentioning the department. The hon. Minister knows that what I say is absolutely true.

MR. NIXON: If I am not out of order in bringing this matter up, in the report presented to the House from the Committee on Printing, there was a recommendation that several hundred copies of the report from the Select Committee on Cemeteries should be printed. I do not notice any reference to the Committee on Indian Affairs or on Reform Institutions or any of the other Select Committees which were working during the recess, and I was wondering if the hon. Minister could give us any information on that.

HON. MR. WELSH: In reply to the hon. member for Brant, the Committee received a request from the Chairman of the Cemeteries Committee that a certain number of copies be

printed, and I can assure him that will be done.

Vote 128 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 129, Civil Defence Committee, \$240,400.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): On Vote 129, item 2, "Standardization of Hose Couplings and Allied Fittings," I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us just how the work is progressing in connection with standardization of hose couplings? We have been doing a certain amount of work each year, and this year the amount in the estimate is \$198,000. Just when is it expected we will be caught up with the standardization of hose couplings for the different fire departments throughout the province?

HON. MR. WELSH: I gave the figures rather broadly. I must admit, a few moments ago. All Southern Ontario is completed at the present time, except Cornwall and the Ottawa Valley. Many of the surveys have been made in Northern Ontario. As a matter of fact, survey teams are working up there now. While we have a very large area in Northern Ontario, we have comparatively little work to do, because there are only a few major towns there, and it will not take long. I expect that by the end of this year—I will not say definitely we will be through—but we will be very well along, indeed. We are moving to the Ottawa Valley to commence down there next week.

We will be there for some months doing Cornwall, Ottawa city, the towns in the Ottawa Valley, and then the teams move into Northern Ontario.

I can assure the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett)—and I say this in all sincerity—that we are certainly trying to get this job done as quickly as we can, as we realize it is important, and time is of the essence.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, do you get any assistance from the Federal Government for the item?

HON. MR. WELSH: Yes, we signed the first agreement with them, and they pay one-third of the costs. But we get a great deal of other assistance, in addition to that we receive from the Federal Government, because, while we do not ask the municipalities to pay anything, we have had wonderful co-operation right across this province from every city and town into which we have gone. In the cities of Kitchener and Hamilton, for example, they placed all their technical people in the fire departments at our disposal, and we got on with the job quickly. We certainly do appreciate it, and I think it speaks highly for the public-spirited citizens and fire brigades in those places.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat disturbed and I think other hon. members may be, by the general remarks the hon. Minister made in regard to civil defence. He painted a graphic picture, and one that might very well be true. If we were attacked from the air, with all the new methods of attack which can be envisaged, the item in the civil defence Estimate, almost all of which deals with the standardization of hose couplings, would appear inadequate. It would appear to me that if the hon. Minister is alarmed, as I think he genuinely is over this matter, there should be much more of an effort put forward to step up civilian defence in this province. I would say to the hon. Minister that if we were in danger of attack, and if our facilities were inadequate before this Vote was put through the House, they will still be inadequate after the Vote goes through.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, at first glance I can see the reason why the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be concerned at the small sum of money that is voted for civil defence. I certainly did not try to be dramatic about it, when I was presenting the facts as I understand them to be at this moment. Those facts have a secondary implication, to me at least. That is, they have pushed the danger of war back a couple of years. I think that is true, and I think it is believed to be true

by all the General Staffs, not only in Britain and the United States, but also in Canada itself. We know that Russia has the atom bomb, comparable to our own. But we also know that we are "one jump" ahead of them with the hydrogen bomb, and I cannot conceive of Russia—and I say "Russia" frankly because it is the only enemy in the world we have to consider at the moment—attempting an attack on the free nations at the present time.

We have not endeavoured to train civil defence workers, but to train civil defence instructors who can take a group of people and give them elementary training which will enable them to save their own lives, and those of their neighbours, and keep the country's protection at its highest peak. I hope we shall never need civil defence in this country, but it is a form of insurance and I think the amount in the Estimates at the present time is adequate to pay the premium for this year.

MR. OLIVER: They are going a great deal further in the United States than we are here. They seem to realize the need for civilian defence in the United States much more clearly than we do in this province. Does the hon. Minister think they are wrong and we are right?

HON. MR. WELSH: As a matter of fact the effort made in the United States has been extremely well publicized. They have marked air-raid shelters, for instance. This is a subject on which, Mr. Chairman, I may be excused if I speak from personal knowledge. I was stationed at Croydon, England, during the war—a suburb on the outskirts of London—and it got the worst "shellacking" of any London suburb. We spent a good deal of time in digging people out of air-raid shelters, and recovering them from bomb wreckage and I think the same as the British, and the same as a great many Canadians, that before we spend any money building air-raid shelters we should know against what we are trying to protect ourselves. Is it gas? Then the shelters must be air conditioned. Is it frag-

mentation? Then the shelters must have concrete walls. It is carbon-monoxide? In that case a further solution must be found. All these things are important. The Americans went ahead with all this. They set up air raid shelters and now they have found they do not know whether they will prove of value or not.

In Canada we have not made that mistake, but I should not like a single hon. member to think that Ontario is lagging in its programme of civilian defence, because we are not.

MR. SALSBERG: I had no intention of speaking on this item, but I do want to say a word or two. It is because of the "bit of war talk" we heard and which I think was very unfortunate. It is all right, Mr. Chairman, to have our civil defence, in the same way as it is all right to build and maintain a degree of defensive forces. Every country is doing that. But the fact is that there is no defence against atomic attack, and there is no defence against a hydrogen bomb attack.

A newspaper which came out an hour or so ago carries this headline: "One H-bomb could destroy biggest city, Strauss says." Asked whether that applied to New York, his answer was: "Yes, to Greater New York." And I think that while we spend some money—and I have no objection to the Estimate—the greater emphasis should be on the need for peaceful understanding and for arrangements between the powers which will end the threat of an annihilating war rather than that we should engage in labelling one country or the other as the "enemy." This applies especially when the other country mentioned has displayed, on more than one occasion, a desire not only to limit armaments but to reduce armaments.

I suggest to all hon. members we should pay less attention to those who spread hysteria from below the border and take a more rational view and consider the sounder opinions which come from statesmen and great leaders in Europe.

Vote 130 carried.

On Vote 131, Civil Service Commission, Salaries, \$102,400.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on item 13, can the hon. Minister tell us why the Civil Service Commission is not established on the basis of what it was originally meant to be, namely a commission of three. I understand the civil service, through their association, has been pressing the government for the appointment of a commission of three, rather than one commissioner. I say this with all respect to the present commissioner. I have no criticism to offer of his work nor of him personally, but it seems to me that the staff has a reasonable argument when they want to have a commission of three, and one upon which they will have the right to be represented.

HON. MR. WELSH: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Act says a commission *may* be appointed. While the hon. member for St. Andrew makes the statement that the civil servants are exerting pressure in favour of a commission, I want to tell him, Mr. Chairman, that I have never had a request for such a commission. And I think Mr. Foster, the present commissioner, does a good job and that he enjoys the respect of all the civil servants.

MR. SALSBERG: It was not necessary for the hon. Minister to say that, because I said it before him. But the hon. Minister knows that the official journal of the association a few months ago carried an article which argued in favour of a commission of three.

Vote 131 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report progress and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario) moves second reading of Bill No. 52,

"An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Labour Relations Act is a very brief one and it concerns the voluntary revokable check-off of union dues. Under this particular amendment, the employee is protected. As the term applies, the check-off is revokable on the written request of the employee. I believe if the voluntary revokable check-off had been part of our labour legislation, the protracted strike in Northern Ontario would not have taken place.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) that the one mine which had it, the Preston East Dome mine, was the first to come on strike. How does the hon. member figure that out?

MR. THOMAS: I think the strike would have been shortened generally if that had been agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out that the first mine to go on strike was one with the check-off?

MR. THOMAS: Here we have a situation where the employees will give consent to the employer to deduct government bond funds, contributions for hospitalization and so on. In the City of Oshawa, at the present time, we have a campaign for the extension of the General Hospital there at a cost of \$2,250,000, and the employees in our city are giving General Motors and other industries permission to take a certain sum from their wages to contribute toward the hospital campaign. That is entirely voluntary, and this amendment to the Labour Relations Act would enable this to be done more widely. The deduction of union dues can only take place on the written consent of the employee and could be revoked at any time on a written request to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, through an amendment to the Municipal Act, our friends in the rural areas have that privilege now. There again, contributions are entirely voluntary and can be revoked at any

time. All labour is doing is asking for the same privilege.

The various unions, Mr. Speaker, have what they call their "citizens fund," and if they so wished the men could contribute to any political Party they chose.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: But they always choose the same one.

MR. THOMAS: That is entirely up to them. It is quite a democratic procedure.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Speaker, all that the Labour Unions are asking for is the same privilege which is extended to those in agriculture. On behalf of the trade unionists, I appeal to the government to grant this concession. If they are prepared to bring in legislation like that, themselves, we shall be very happy to withdraw this bill. I hope the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will see fit to support it.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, in supporting my colleague on this bill, I wish to point out that I have lived in Northern Ontario where all this trouble took place, for 33 years, this coming summer, and I have had an opportunity of seeing this method of deducting dues in effect. As I have stated to the hon. Minister privately, and have stated in this House on different occasions, I did not at first understand the difference between the unions which did not deduct dues through their employer, and those which did, and I did not understand the difference between the "revocable" and the "irrevocable" check-off.

All that my colleague is asking for in this bill is the voluntary, revocable check-off: that is, union members would have the right to volunteer to have their dues deducted, and they could also withdraw that right or privilege at any time they wanted to, after having given the permission.

However, there is another type of check-off which perhaps is a little more direct in its application on unions. I

have seen it in operation in the paper mills for over 30 years. It is the compulsory, irrevocable check-off. That means, that once a man obtains employment in a factory where that practice is carried out, he must, of necessity, permit his dues to be deducted by the employer, and turned over to the union, and the employee has no say whatsoever. The minute he commences work there, he is subject to that provision.

The paper industry permitted that type of check-off many years ago. In 1917, in my home town, this compulsory, irrevocable check-off was put into effect. The other day the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) told me: "But that was by agreement." I admit that. Certainly, it was by agreement between the paper company and the men. But you are dealing with different types of industry. Scattered throughout Old Ontario we have many types of industry wherein management is quite willing to grant some type of check-off, which is just another name for union security. But in certain industries we have management which will not, under any circumstances, grant this concession. In Northern Ontario, we have the great mining industry, and not one group of management will agree to permit the slightest form of check-off. When industry in Old Ontario, including many big concerns, as well as the paper industry, has agreed to some form of check-off, what is there to "union security" which leads the mining operators to refuse it? As ably stated by my colleague, the strike in Northern Ontario last year was due in part to the demand of the men for union security.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): How does the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) get around the Preston East Dome? They had a check-off.

MR. GRUMMETT: They did, but they struck for wages. Their wages were very low.

HON. MR. DALEY: They were the first struck, and the last settled, and they were the only ones who had the check-off.

MR. SALSBERG: What does that prove?

MR. GRUMMETT: That may be, but their wage schedule was away down as compared with Hollinger. In the Porcupine area, the basic rate ranged from 83 cents to \$1.01. It is understandable that in a mine with an 83 cent basic wage rate, the men would ask for an increase in wages, and, indeed, they did ask for \$1.01, because they knew that only 40 or 45 miles away was a big paper mill at Iroquois Falls, where the basic rate at that time was \$1.41. Both union security and wages entered into the strike in the Porcupine, and I am convinced—and I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) feels the same way—that if we had just had to settle the question of wages during that long and bitter strike, we could have settled the difficulties long before we did. But as it was, the men held out for union security, and the mining operators held their ground, and refused to grant any type of security whatsoever.

That was the cause of prolonged suffering in the mining area. This bill is the very mildest form of union security which can be granted. It is the voluntary, revocable check-off, and once established I am sure that it will go a long way toward doing away with bitter struggles in the mining areas. That, Mr. Chairman, is where you are going to find the difficulty; in connection with union security. Other branches of industry are quite prepared to make small concessions, at first, and gradually extend greater concessions in the way of union security. If the government itself would put into effect a bill of this nature, as stated by my colleague, we are quite prepared to withdraw our bill tonight, if the government will tell us that they are going to bring down a measure similar to this one, which will take one short step—one small step—towards giving unions the security they ask, and which we have incorporated in this bill.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the government has made their position in this matter definitely clear

over the period of negotiations, and in discussions in this House. In regard to Preston East Dome, the union had established confidence in the minds of management, who were prepared to go along and concede the check-off, which they did. At that time there were two other companies which did the same thing, and between the time that this "check-off," as it is called, was granted, two of the companies closed up, leaving only one which had been willing to concede that "favour"—shall I say—to organized labour, that being Preston East Dome. In spite of the fact that they had union security, that is, the check-off, they still were the first mine to be struck, and in spite of the fact that they had granted the check-off, they were the last mine to be settled, which did not sit very well with them.

The hon. member (Mr. Grummett) mentioned that they struck because of a wage rate of 83 cents an hour. I am not too sure of my figures, because I am speaking from memory, but in a group of somewhere in the neighbourhood of 300 workmen, and there was a base rate of 83 cents, with respect only to a few outside workmen, amounting, I believe, to about 10 people.

MR. GRUMMETT: Classed as labourers.

HON. MR. DALEY: About 10 people, and one of the first things we were able to do was to get the Preston people to agree to wipe that rate out, so that all their employees were raised to the rate, which was then \$1.01, or I believe \$1.03, and, with the increased amount, to \$1.08, which would be the basic labour rate. That was accomplished in my office.

As far as any comparison between what the farmers have, which the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) considers to be a check-off, I personally can see no comparison with that, and a check-off in industry. The farmers get together and agree they will permit a deduction of a certain amount of money to go to the farmers' own organization, which controls this money and uses it for purposes the farmers decree, that is, to conduct

the business of the organization, and also for publicity intended to create markets to improve the position of the farmers. It is their own money, and is simply handed to a certain group of their own people to use.

MR. T. D. THOMAS: Is that not true of trade unions?

HON. MR. DALEY: It is not, no.

MR. THOMAS: I think it is.

HON. MR. DALEY: The deductions in industry in connection with hospital funds, and so forth, are voluntary efforts, and I think we should say to management that we appreciate the fact that they will do this, because it is an Act to assist in the raising of funds for very worthwhile purposes. That is not something which continues, it is something that goes on for a period of two or three weeks, or a month, or whatever the length of the term of the campaign is, and then it is done, but a check-off in an industry is a permanent thing. Once it is given, it is there. True, the men can introduce the revocable clause, and if they have the courage to revoke the permission, that could take place, but I am sure once a man signs to have his dues deducted, it is not easy for him to withdraw.

However, Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, we—that is, I, representing the government, and the rest—feel this is a matter for collective bargaining. It is the first step in union security, but it is also an important step in collective bargaining. There is a great deal of value to be derived from keeping it that way.

MR. GRUMMETT: You can only have collective bargaining where there is a will.

HON. MR. DALEY: I have seen many times, in settling disputes between conflicting parties, where the check-off was "sold" for something else. What happens is that the union comes in, submits a list of things they want, and included among them is the check-off; the company says: "All right, we will

give you the check-off, if you take something else off. We cannot give you both, but we will give you one or the other." It is a bargaining position, and you are taking something away from one side and making sure that the other has it.

We do not agree with that. We believe collective bargaining is just that, and the parties should sit down together. If a union, by their actions, gains the confidence of the employer—and a great many of them have—after having gained the confidence of a sufficient number of the people who work in that plant, they have no difficulty getting a check-off. Many industries give the check-off because they have dealt with the union; they know it is solid, and that they are going to work with them. They have a mutual understanding of each other's problems, and both are trying to do the best they can for the other. In that case, the check-off comes along naturally. But for us to say by legislation that a company, whether they have any faith in the union or not, is required by law to make this concession, I think is wrong, and I think my colleagues think it is wrong. I say here and now we will not accept the bill which the hon. member (Mr. Thomas) has, I am sure in all sincerity, advanced, because we do not believe in it. It is a matter for collective bargaining, and we intend to keep it that way.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, in this instance, as there has been a number of others, I fail to understand the resistance of the government to popular pressure and popular request.

The question of the check-off is one which confronts this government now, and has for quite a while, and I think it is true to say that an overwhelming number of organized workers have been asking for some such type of legislation. Not only that, but very important people in the judiciary have recognized the justice of this request, and have made recommendations which establish certain formulae and precedents, which are followed quite widely. Yet, this government continues to shut its eyes to an evident necessity.

You see, Mr. Speaker, many fundamental changes have taken place in our economy, which affect the relationship between workers and employers. It is no longer a case of small groups of artisans who band together to form a union, and who work in small groups in shops. Today we are confronted with the employment of masses in single plants, with thousands and tens of thousands of workers, working in a massive industry under one management. That creates conditions which the trade union movement find it difficult with which to cope in the manner which was done years ago.

When the hon. Minister of Labour worked at his trade of carpentry, the system in his union—indeed, I think it is still true today—was that each worker paid his dues direct to the union, or the business agent came around on the job, and collected them. That was true in my own trade. I was secretary of my local union when I was wearing knee pants—

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I used to enjoy going to the union and paying my dues, and meeting the other members of the union. I think if union men would adopt that policy, and attend their union meetings, pay their dues, and take a more active part in the union activities, we would not get into as much difficulty as we do today. The fact of the matter is, they do not take much interest in their union activities.

MR. SALSBERG: I agree with the hon. Minister that union members should attend their union meetings. When I was secretary of my local union, everybody came to the union meetings, and paid their dues there, but we were a small group in our shop, as the carpenters are, when working on their jobs, and as the printers are when working on theirs.

But the hon. Minister must remember that when the workers organize in plants such as Ford's, or the General Motors, or International Nickel, they are organized in thousands—in 10,000 or 15,000 units—and it becomes physically impossible to collect the dues.

HON. MR. DALEY: Not if the men want to pay them.

MR. SALBERG: First of all, the men must want to pay them, that is true. But it would require somebody at every gate of an enormous plant, like Ford's, to sit there at a table, and when the men come out, stop each one and have him pay his dues. That is impossible.

Furthermore, human nature being what it is, when 10,000 men go out of a plant—or even 5,000—through one gate, they are anxious to get away to see a ball game, or to run home, or go for a glass of beer, or keep a date, and they will not stop to pay their dues, and before you know it there is a terrible backsliding in union responsibility.

It is these new conditions which require a new approach, and I think Mr. Justice Rand took that into account when he was handling the famous Ford case. He recognized the responsibility every worker must have toward his collective - bargaining agency, which brings him the benefits which he enjoys.

Mr. Justice Rand established a formula which bears his name, the effect of which was, if you are not a member of a union, you should be checked off anyway, and the money handed over to the union, because the non-union men benefit from the efforts of the organized men in their struggle for a better living standard.

The Rand formula is widely applied, and what the unions ask this government to do is to enact legislation which will make it obligatory upon the resisting and recalcitrant employers. There is always a small group, a small non-conforming element for whom we had legislation to oblige them to check-off the dues if the workers ask them to do so in writing.

The legislation before us is limited in its objective, in that it also provides for a worker to sign himself out of paying his dues; in other words it is a revocable type of check-off.

There are hon. members in this House who come from areas in which the paper-making industries are established.

and they know this policy has existed for a long time.

I think the hon. Minister of Labour forgets, when he argues against this check-off legislation, that in his industry, when he worked as a carpenter, or when I worked at my trade, we had the closed union shop. In other words, if the present hon. Minister of Labour, when he was working with a hammer and saw, did not pay his dues, he was dropped from the union, and he could not work in a union shop. It was a closed shop. That was true in most crafts. If you did not pay, and were not in good standing, you did not work, and everybody "darned well" paid, because that was an important condition for continued employment. The hon. Minister must know this legislation is of a very minimum type, because there are few closed shops, in large scale industries but in those days the thousands of workers who paid their dues directly, had additional protection of a closed shop. There the employees paid their dues to the business agent or the chairman on the job, and unless they paid, they could not work. That is not the type of relationship which exists today. There is no closed shop in large industry, there is not even a union shop, and if you deny them this degree of protection, you are denying them a great deal.

The fact is, so I am informed, that 7 out of 10 provinces have some type of union security legislation in operation now, and that 6 of the provinces—

HON. MR. FROST: 5, I think it is.

MR. SALSBERG: I am further informed that 6 out of the 7 have a check-off of varying degree in their legislation.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members on the House of Commons Committee at Ottawa have dealt with this question, and voted for the check-off to be a part of the National Labour Relations Statute. That is a fact.

As in some other cases, I am obliged to embarrass the government by saying it should follow the lead of its national spokesmen in Ottawa, who have gone on

record and voted for the check-off type of legislation.

Furthermore, there are branches of industry operated by this government, where the check-off is in force. You know, of course, Mr. Speaker, the railroads now have compulsory check-off, and I understand the Northland Railway is checking off dues. I am very glad this is so—

HON. MR. FROST: We are doing it right here in this building.

MR. SALSBERG: And you are doing it with the farmers, with the nurses, and the teachers, as the result of legislation enacted here. We enacted a bill a year or so ago which obliged registered nurses to pay a certain amount to their association, or they could not be members of it—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is getting away from the argument altogether. It is not necessary to convince us that the check-off be permissible. That, I may say to the hon. member, is the present situation. I do not know whether they have a check-off on the Northland Railway. If such a check-off applies to the railways generally, then it does apply to the Northland Railway, and that is all right.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Justice Kellock gave that in his decision.

HON. MR. FROST: It was negotiated, and we are in agreement. In regard to our employees in the building, we have the check-off granted to them for three associations, the Civil Service Association, the War Veterans Association, and I think there is one other.

I would like to point out to the hon. member, and to the hon. members of the House, that personally I am not opposed to the check-off—by no means. The government is not. The problem involved is as was stated by the hon. Minister of Labour.

The framework of our Act is collective bargaining. Anything can be bargained at a collective-bargaining table—that is, within the law, of course.

I have made no secret of it, and the hon. members of this House know, that 4 years ago I was somewhat disposed to recommend to the House the inclusion of the check-off in the legislation at that time.

But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is this: There are, I think, 8 different kinds of check-off, ranging from the voluntary revocable, through to the Rand formula, the closed shop, union shop, everything.

Mr. Speaker, representatives of labour and industry sitting around a table can have any one of those they want, or any combination thereof—anything upon which they agree.

The hon. Minister of Labour tells me—and I can so assure the House—that there is not in America a collection of experts, men of ability and training, such as we have in the Labour Department, such men as Professor Finkleman, Mr. Metzner, Mr. Fine, and I must include the hon. Minister of Labour himself.

I think the hon. member for St. Andrew will agree with that. He is bound to agree with that. They tell me this, and I think it is a fact, that the framework and basis of our Act is free collective bargaining of anything which is within the law. The minute the government starts to legislate in that field, then you find at once that industry wants something, and then labour wants something, and you narrow it down to where you might arrive at the point where you completely obliterate collective bargaining, and then it becomes a matter of government arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, nothing can be more undesirable than that. It gets down, as the hon. Minister of Labour has said on several occasions, to a question of wage fixing, price fixing, condition fixing, until the whole spirit and scheme of this Act which has worked so well in this province is completely destroyed. That is the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that to put in voluntary revocable check-offs is completely meaningless in this part of Ontario. Here the check-off takes many different forms such as the "Rand

formula," something of that sort. This really would have no meaning in the greater part of industrial Ontario.

In fact, if you were to write a declaration in the Labour Relations Act that a check-off is valid, and they can have any kind of a check-off they want to negotiate, there might be some meaning to it. But that is the law now. Why repeat something that is already the law? To put in voluntary revocable check-off, which, as I say, is meaningless in the greater part of industry today, and has no relationship to the agreements they are negotiating, simply to show that you are in favour of the check-off, is, I think, on the side of being silly.

These various types of check-offs are there. They can have them, and they can negotiate them, but the minute you begin legislating in the collective bargaining field, you do irreparable damage to the set-up which has worked so satisfactorily in the past.

I point out to the House that in the last 10 years, since the first Act was passed, it has gone through a period of experimentation. After all these years, I would like to say something to the credit of the predecessor of the hon. member for Ontario, the hon. Gordon Conant, who had, in his day, to do with the framing and drawing of the first Act, and he did a very conscientious and good job for which he received credit. Certain conceptions such as the Labour Court and several other things were proven by experience, not to be the best method of treatment. Nevertheless, that was the commencement of our Labour legislation back in 1943.

Over these years when you consider the tremendous industrialization of Ontario, where we have changed so radically to an industrial economy with the unionization of workers by the tens of thousands—indeed, by the hundreds of thousands—we have in this province a record that is not paralleled in all America.

It is true there are sections which may require amending of course; there always will be. You will never reach the point where everybody will be completely

satisfied, but the advances which have been made in labour jurisprudence, and in administration, are really phenomenal. I say again, as regards check-offs, I do not think there is anybody on the government side who expressed any opposition to check-offs. The opposition is to such action which would spoil the picture by doing something which upsets the present operation of the Act, and what it means. That is the point.

MR. SALSBERG: I can just say they must understand we disagree on this question.

Motion negatived.

HON. MR. FROST: In connection with the 21st Order, which is the bill proposed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). I may say I would like to further consider it, as I think there might be some merit in that bill.

MR. NIXON: I can assure the hon. Prime Minister there is great merit in it.

HON. MR. FROST moves Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT, 1953

House in Committee on Bill No. 65, "An Act to amend The Corporations Act, 1953."

Sections 1 to 30 inclusive agreed to.

On section 31.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, you will notice that there is an amendment required to section 31. The bill has been reprinted, and the amendment is in the reprinted form.

HON. MR. WELSH moves the section be amended as in the reprinted bill.

Section 31, as amended, agreed to.

Section 32, as amended, agreed to.

Section 33 and 34 agreed to.

On section 35.

HON. MR. WELSH moves section 35 be amended by adding thereto, the following words:

Section 286 of The Corporations Act, 1953, is amended by striking out the word "to" in the seventh line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "may" so that the section shall read as follows:

286. Every corporation, unless otherwise expressly provided in the Act or instrument creating it, has and shall be deemed to have had from its creation, the capacity of a natural person and may exercise its powers beyond the boundaries of Ontario to the extent to which the laws in force, where the powers are sought to be exercised, permit, and may accept extra-provincial powers and rights.

Section 35, as amended, agreed to.

Section 36, formerly 35, agreed to.

Sections 37 to 40 inclusive, agreed to.

Section 41, as amended, agreed to.

On section 42.

HON. MR. WELSH: The amendment is in the reprinted copy.

I move the bill be amended in accordance with the reprinted copy.

Section 42, as amended, agreed to.

Section 43 agreed to.

Bill 65 reported.

THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 77, "The Child Welfare Act, 1954."

HON. MR. FROST: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) want this bill held over?

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I do not like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to do so. This is the second time, but the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) wanted to speak on this bill, and if it could be held over, I would appreciate it.

HON. MR. FROST: It will be held over.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you.

ONTARIO FUEL BOARD

House in Committee on Bill No. 94, "An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, there have been so many amendments to the bill in its revised form, that I think some explanation by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) might help.

HON. MR. PORTER: There will be explanations when we come to them.

MR. SALSBERG: Actually, they are all through it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Each one might require a separate explanation. In order to convince the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) it would require three or four explanations.

MR. SALSBERG: That is quite true. The hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) explanations require elaboration.

HON. MR. PORTER: No, just repetition to din them into the hon. member's head.

Sections 1 to 13 inclusive, agreed to.
On section 14.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, 14 and 15 are the sections which set out what the board may do. I did not have a chance to speak on second reading. I do not remember the circumstances, but I think it was understood that the bill was going to committee anyway, and we would be able to deal with some of these problems, when the bill came back.

I suggest the Act, as it now stands, establishes a committee which will have very little relationship to what was anticipated by the people, as a result of utterances made by spokesmen for the government, namely, that we would have a publicly-owned utility for the distribu-

tion of natural gas within the borders of this province.

As the Act is now before us, these two sections make it clear that all this board will have power to do is to regulate the construction, location, spacing, etc. of the pipeline. I do not think we are doing our duty, and I do not think the government is doing its duty, when it fails to set up a board of this sort as a commission to operate the natural gas distribution in the province, as a public utility.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that this is quite out of order, because the principle involved in this bill was thoroughly discussed on second reading, and the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) raised that point and argued it, and I attempted to answer his arguments, and the bill was passed. I cannot see how this is relevant on this particular section in committee. It is just a repetition, simply a dull, boring repetition of what the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has advanced before.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) dislikes it so much that he stays away from the House days at a stretch.

HON. MR. PORTER: I was just tired of listening to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg).

MR. SALSBERG: We got on so well when the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) was away, because we did not have so many silly interruptions. I do not know who sent for him, because we were doing very well without him. I heard no complaints, and nobody rose to question where the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) was.

AN HON. MEMBER: We all knew he was on public business.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has something constructive to offer, will he please sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: What I propose, Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: The principle of the bill has been approved in committee, and the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is out of order. Please sit down.

Sections 14 and 15 agreed to.

On section 16.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, on 16, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) one question. In this section the board has the power to fix the rates to be charged to ultimate consumers of natural gas. Is that in reality the position of the board, that they want the power to fix the rates to the ultimate consumer?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, I should think in many cases they would deliver the gas to a public utility within a municipality, and then the utility in turn would—

MR. OLIVER: Deliver it to the consumers?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, but the board's main power in fixing rates will be with respect to the rates the utility charges to the customer in the municipality itself. That is where the public needs protection, with respect to the spread between the price paid and the price they are charged for it. That happens now, of course, in South-western Ontario with the Union Gas, and the Dominion Gas, and the various other companies there. Under the present legislation their rates are fixed. Very often the municipality and the company are able to come to some agreement which is endorsed by an order of the official in charge who has power to fix the rates, but nevertheless all those rates have been fixed for many years, and the pattern has been well established. This section merely broadens the power to any new utility which may be set up.

One exception now is the Consumers Gas Company. They have a private charter. They operate under a private Act which was passed many years ago,

and under that Act I think there is some limitation of the dividend they can pay, or something of the kind.

MR. SALSBERG: 10 per cent.

HON. MR. PORTER: Also, the City of Toronto has some measure of control over their activities. However, this section will put them, as well as everybody else, under the board.

Sections 16 to 22 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 23.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, 23 really takes the power from the board and vests it in the government.

HON. MR. PORTER: It does not do anything of the kind.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, it does not say the government, I beg your pardon, it says the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, which, of course, we understand.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is, in a sense, an appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council from orders which might be made by the board.

MR. SALSBERG: That is what I am saying.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is not what the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) said at all. He said, "it takes all power away from the board."

MR. SALSBERG: Well, that is right.

HON. MR. PORTER: It does not take all power away from the board. Anyone can appeal.

MR. SALSBERG: Anyone can appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and the Lieutenant-Governor can set aside the board's action, and can make such other decisions as he sees fit, and impose them on the board. That is what the section says, "impose them on the board and all affected parties."

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, is that not right?

MR. SALSBERG: Then you might as well have no board, and just have the Cabinet handle it.

HON. MR. PORTER: This is simply an appeal.

Sections 23 to 27 inclusive, agreed to.
On section 28.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, these are very wide powers which we are giving in this section, and we are giving them to "any member of the board, or any inspector or other officer or employee of the board." And what they do under this Act is "enter upon, pass over, take up or use any private property or the property of any municipality or local board thereof, or of the Crown or any agency of the Crown." Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) not think we are going a little too far in extending it, certainly to an employee of the board? It should be tied down a little bit there, because these powers are very sweeping.

HON. MR. PORTER: Those powers, of course, are limited to the scope of the Act itself, and would have to be invoked for the purpose of carrying out some order that the board might properly make, under its powers. It is necessary to have such a section as this to enable the board to enforce its orders. But, of course, the orders can only be made within certain limits, within the scope of the Act, and "for the purposes of this Act" are the governing words of that section.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, yes.

HON. MR. PORTER: After all, the board is not empowered to build a pipeline, and expropriate property for the purpose of building a pipeline, or that sort of thing.

MR. OLIVER: It would seem to me that "any member of the board, or inspector or other officer" should be sufficient, without putting in "employee."

HON. MR. PORTER: An "employee" implies an "authorized employee"; someone who has definite instructions to carry out an order of some kind.

MR. OLIVER: All right.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston):
An authorized agent.

Section 28 agreed to.

On section 29.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to hear the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) on section 29. It gives power there to step in and take over abandoned wells, and sell the equipment. What is the purpose of that? It would seem to me, in most cases, the salvage which would be retrieved would not be worth the effort expended. In many cases, at least, the amount recovered would be pretty small in comparison with the effort. I do not understand the purpose of it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, that section is carried over from one of the other Acts which are incorporated into this one. Perhaps I can obtain an example of this principle being applied. It is perhaps not used very often, and only in a very limited way, but it is one of the Statutes which is being incorporated.

MR. C. E. JANES (Lambton East): That is quite understandable. There are cases where a pipe is sticking up, and the company refuses to move it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Hazardous situations may arise and the board should have the power, if it becomes necessary, to carry out anything considered to be in the general interest.

Sometimes, these small companies go out of business, and leave its equipment, the well, and everything that has to do with it, in a state which might be called "hazardous." It is that sort of thing which was in mind when this section was originally drafted. It has been carried forward, and there has been no suggestion it should be limited in any way, in the light of circumstances under which it has been used in the past.

Sections 29 and 30 agreed to.

On section 31.

MR. SALSBERG: I wonder why this section is necessary. It provides that:

No person shall use natural gas for any industrial purpose unless he is the holder of a permit for such purpose.

Does that mean, for instance, that a little jeweller who is continually using natural gas when working at his bench, would have to get a permit to carry on his trade?

HON. MR. PORTER: This applies to industrial trades.

HON. MR. FROST: It was in the old Act. The basis of the Conservation Act was that gas was used for home purposes primarily. I think during the last war, the emphasis was changed to industry, because of a shortage of power, but with the withdrawal of controls, it reverted back to the old system.

MR. OLIVER: Are permits presently required?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, for industry. But this legislation is dealing with a practical situation which exists today. With the importation of western gas, it may be desirable or necessary to remove some of these things, but we must remember that western gas is not here as yet, and we have to conserve our own supply.

MR. JAMES: That has always been one of the headaches we have had, that is, to secure the permits. It is very difficult to get them and there are many of them requested.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, and there is a great backlog of requests from domestic consumers. If too much is allotted to industry, it denies gas to the domestic consumers. It is part of the whole conservation policy which has been carried out for many years with respect to natural gas which is produced in our own province. It is considered necessary to limit the industrial use, where there is not enough gas to go around.

MR. SALSBERG: Is that not sort of a nuisance?

HON. MR. FROST: No, it is very necessary. In the war days, tens of

thousands of heating units were taken out of houses to enable gas to be used for industry.

MR. SALSBERG: As an emergency order.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. I suppose there are still thousands of those units still out, and an effort is being made to replace them.

At the present time, the emphasis is being changed from house heating to industry. I think it is better to leave it the way it is. It may become desirable to take it out, if we get the natural gas—as I hope we will—from the west, in the quantity we require, but it does not interfere with conservation at all.

MR. SALSBERG: By this Act, such a business as a print shop, with a small jet on the press, would require a permit.

Sections 31 and 32 agreed to.

On section 33.

MR. OLIVER: Is that a new section, or an old one being brought forward?

HON. MR. PORTER: It is being carried forward.

MR. OLIVER: Is that true also of section 34?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

Section 33 agreed to.

On section 34.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Chairman, getting away from gas, and down to coal; what protection has the consumer to assure he will get the right kind of coal at the present time—I mean the retailer and the customers both. I refer to the number of B.T.U. units. During the war, they sold everything, and what protection does "John Public" now receive for the coal he is purchasing?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a gas bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know of any steps which have been taken.

HON. MR. FROST: He might change his dealer.

HON. MR. PORTER: This section, which has been carried over from a former Statute, has been exercised to deal with emergencies, and not with the ordinary course of business.

MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but they repealed the Fuel Act—

HON. MR. PORTER: The measurement of coal is under the Municipal Act.

MR. EDWARDS: What about the B.T.U. units?

Section 34 agreed to.

On section 35.

MR. SALSBERG: It may be a bit too late, but I would ask the government to pay some attention to the question raised by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edwards). It was my task at one time to be the chairman of the Fuel Committee of the City Council, and we found we had many problems we could not solve as a municipality, because the higher levels of government did not offer sufficient protection to the consumers.

Sections 35 to 38 inclusive agreed to.

Sections 39 to 41 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 94 reported.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 95, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 95 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL FRANCHISES ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act."

On section 1.

MR. SALSBERG: Does that protect the municipality? I mean the municipality affected; would it have anything to say about it? This gives the company

a right to pass through a municipality which may be necessary, but what do we offer to the municipality in the way of protection?

HON. MR. PORTER: There is authority for the gas line to pass through municipalities.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not opposed to that, but I suggest there should be some protection to the municipality, or that it be given some voice in determining how it passes, where it passes, under what conditions, and so on.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know how you can blow hot and cold on this. If you are going to give the power to have a gas line go through a municipality, which does not intend to distribute gas, and the municipality says, "No," or imposes some conditions, you will not be able to have the line built.

HON. MR. FROST: Damages are available to private owners in the municipality.

MR. SALSBERG: I agree, as everyone does, that the pipeline has to go through a populated area. But I think the municipalities should be given some voice in deciding the route and the conditions under which that will be done. Otherwise, a utility like this would ride roughshod over the municipalities.

We had the same situation in Moore Park, where a number of citizens banded together and were up in arms because Hydro was going to erect poles in that area.

This will apply to the smaller towns, where this utility can ride roughshod through the municipality, just as they see fit.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 96 reported.

THE GAS PIPELINE ACT, 1951

The House in Committee on Bill No. 97, "An Act to amend The Gas Pipeline Act, 1951."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 97 reported.

MR. SALSBERG: May I ask the hon. Attorney-General if the municipalities affected have the right of appeal?

HON. MR. PORTER: That section has been passed.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, come on; do not be behaving that way. Will the municipality have a right of appeal?

HON. MR. PORTER: This is only an amendment to one subsection.

MR. SALSBERG: Then the hon. Attorney-General does not know?

THE LONDON FOUNDATION

The House in Committee on Bill No. 27, "An Act to incorporate the London Foundation."

Sections 1 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 27 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report certain bills with, and certain bills without, amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report one bill with amendment, and five bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: There are one or two bills with which I would like to deal at this time. Order No. 26 might be advanced. It is a private bill.

THE BOARDS OF THE BAPTIST CONVENTION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

MR. OLIVER, in the absence of Mr. Nixon, moves second reading of Bill No. 24.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I make this suggestion to the House, in connection with the Election Act, the Voters List Act, and the Controverted Election Act. They relate to various sections of the Election Act, and might be discussed better in committee than on second reading. I think there will be some additions, including the bringing in of a provision for permitting Indians to vote. If they were advanced tonight, they would be in committee stage, and could be dealt with there. I would like to request, Mr. Speaker, that these three orders be advanced.

THE ELECTION ACT, 1951

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend The Election Act, 1951."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE VOTERS LIST ACT, 1951

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 137, "An Act to amend The Voters List Act, 1951."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT

HON. MR. PORTER moves second reading of Bill No. 138, "An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves that Order No. 43 be discharged and the bill be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to; Bill No. 67 withdrawn; the Order discharged.

MR. SALSBERG: Is it proper to ask why, Mr. Speaker?

HON. MR. FROST: The Act provides for the levelling off of contributions by the Civil Service; it also provides for the government matching these amounts.

Upon looking into it, we found the government, first of all, was subsidizing the payment of interest. We have been paying above the rate of interest which is normal, in the form of subsidies.

In addition to that, we are placing in the superannuation fund, as we have done previously, the sum of \$1 million, and it was decided it would be better to review the whole matter, rather than put it through at this time.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to deal, first of all, with second reading of the Fair Accommodation Practices Act, which is No. 62 on today's Order paper; the Municipal Act, No. 63 on today's paper. This may be followed by further debate on the budget, and

Orders 28 and 29 on today's Order paper, dealing with reports by the committees on Reform Institutions, Indian Affairs.

Tomorrow night, we will proceed with Estimates and bills.

Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof; it stands adjourned until 2 of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provision of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended insofar as they apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: I beg to table answers to questions 40, 43, 45 and 53.

HON. MR. FROST moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.52 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, April 1, 1954

Afternoon Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, April 1, 1954.

Final Report, Standing Committee on Health, Mr. Leavine	1073
Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, 1943, bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading	1073
Consolidated Revenue Fund, bill respecting, Mr. Frost, first reading	1074
Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario, bill to promote, Mr. Frost, second reading	1078
Municipal Amendment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading	1086
Report, Select Committee on Indian Affairs, Mr. Robson, Mr. Pringle	1088
Resumption of Debate on the Budget, Mr. Leavine, Mr. Pryde, Mr. Lyons, Mr. Hunt	1091
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Downer, agreed to	1112
Theatres Act, 1953, bill to amend, Mr. Nixon, second reading	1113
Recess, 6 o'clock	1113

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1954.

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very happy today to welcome several groups of visitors to our galleries: pupils from the Blantyre Public School of Scarborough, students from the North Simcoe Public School of Oshawa, students from Owen Sound Collegiate of Owen Sound, and we are particularly glad to welcome students from the University School of Nursing. To the latter, I would say you have been called to a very high profession and will render a splendid and continuing service to relieve the sick and to help the suffering, and we wish you every possible success.

We have a very interesting group with us also. I do not know whether I should announce this group at all, but they are the ladies of the Women's Conservative Association of Orillia. My position being strictly non-political, I must just make the announcement which has been given to me here.

I might tell the ladies from Orillia that we are in between two fires in this House. The hon. Prime Minister talks about the "good old days," and speaks of the great town of Orillia where, I understand he has his name on a tree which some people would like to cut down. On the other hand, we hear of the glories and the beauty of Lindsay. However, I think we can safely say we are very happy to welcome the ladies from Orillia. You can feel justly proud, all Party feeling aside, that our hon. Prime Minister comes from your very fine and friendly town.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. S. F. LEAVINE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second and final report of the Standing Committee on Health, and move its adoption.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Leavine, from the Standing Committee on Health, presents the committee's second and final report as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 123, An Act to amend the Cemeteries Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 133, An Act to amend the Pharmacy Act, 1953.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO CANCER TREATMENT AND RESEARCH FOUNDATION

HON. MACKINNON PHILLIPS moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, 1943."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Act of 1943 provided for a body corporate to consist of not less than 7 members nor more than 10. This amendment provides

it shall consist of not less than 7 members, who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and omits the maximum number.

We all know how fast this great province of ours is growing. The Ontario Cancer Research and Treatment Foundation have now installed in Ontario two cobalt bombs. The first in the fall of 1951 was installed at London, the second in the fall of 1953, at Toronto, and the third is now being installed in Hamilton. I am very glad to be able to tell the House today that we have every reason to believe we will have the one in Windsor by the end of April in the stage of installation, and the one at the Head of the Lakes before the end of May.

One year from then, we hope to have two more cobalt bombs, one at Kingston and the other at Ottawa.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in relation to this bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) which provides for the enlargement of the board, I have in mind an appointment to the board, provided of course, the House approves of the bill. I always like to take the House fully into my confidence in everything I plan to do.

It is our intention to appoint to the board as soon as possible, Mrs. Egmont Frankel. There will then be 2 women on the board. Mrs. Frankel's work not only in the Cancer Society, but in the general work to unite the forces against this disease, has been outstanding. She is one of the dynamic members of the Ontario Cancer Society. This organization makes it possible for men and women in every walk of life to do their part.

Mr. Bradley Heintzman, a young man of great and outstanding ability, who is the head of this society, recently was appointed to the board, and with Mrs. Frankel, will form a very strong liaison between the Cancer Society and the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation.

Mrs. Frankel's work has not only been dynamic and forceful, but she possesses that sympathy and personal

interest which is exemplified in the work of The Little Red Door, which makes her contribution indispensable.

Mrs. Frankel is really one of the great driving forces of this province, and her organization, particularly of women, is something very outstanding. To put her energy and her great abilities behind the work of the Research Foundation and the work in connection with cancer, is something which will add to our forces very measurably.

THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. NIXON: How much this time?

HON. MR. FROST: \$100 million. I have discussed this matter with the Treasury Board, and others, and I think that the amounts which are unused with relation to previous bills which have been passed, total in the neighbourhood of \$150 million. I would be very glad to give the actual particulars tonight.

However, the amounts which are left over from those authorizations are in odd sums, for instance \$23 million or \$35 million, and in the event of loans of, say, \$50 million, it is more convenient to have the amounts in one bill, and have the authorization there, than to refer to several different Acts.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House, the following:

Annual Report of the Commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police from January 1st, 1953, to December 31st, 1953.

Report of the Secretary and Registrar of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1953, with respect to the administra-

tion of The Companies Act and the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act.

Report of the Secretary and Registrar of the Province of Ontario for the calendar year ending December 31st, 1953, with respect to the administration of The Extra Provincial Corporations Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to a matter at this time, which seems to be about as convenient as any to refer to it. It is with reference to the Vote or amount we have granted to the University of Toronto, for the School of Dentistry in the Supplementary Estimates a couple of weeks ago. At that time, I said a special grant of \$1 million would be paid to the University of Toronto to provide for the extension of the College of Dentistry. Hon. members will realize there is a close relationship between dental and medical health.

In Canada, there are only 5 dental colleges, the largest of which is in Ontario. Ontario's increasing population growth, makes expansion necessary. With the additional demands from the other provinces, the need is immensely magnified. A substantial increase in the dental teaching facilities of Ontario is desirable, therefore, not only from the standpoint of this province, but from that of Canada.

Because of the nation-wide benefits which will result from our extended dental teaching programme, and the recognition that dentistry contributes to good health, it is hoped the Government of Canada will join with the Province of Ontario in making a substantial contribution to the cost of this undertaking. In making this special grant of \$1 million, a few days ago, we are contributing in a very real way towards the betterment of dental health in Canada.

Please note again that there are only 5 dental colleges in Canada, of which ours is the largest. Our college, the Royal Dental College, therefore must make a greater contribution. Being the largest one of 5, it follows that it must make a

greater contribution to dentistry in Canada, than any of the other colleges. This college, as it now stands, has to bear a major share of the load. This is a Canadian project. The need is urgent, and we are anxious to make our contribution here in Ontario as fully and as effectively as possible.

On behalf of the government, and I am sure on behalf of every hon. member in this House, I now state, on this 1st day of April—which by the way, is the birthday of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) will no doubt refer in a moment—that we are prepared not only to make this special grant of \$1 million which I believe has already been paid, but we are prepared to match, in addition any sum the Federal Government will make to this institution.

If they will make a special grant of \$1 million, we will give another \$1 million, or even match \$1½ million, which I would like to see.

MR. OLIVER: We will have a new building before long.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. May I point out that there are moneys set aside for health expenditures in Ontario which cannot be spent economically. This has been explained and is clearly understood. My suggestion is that, without increasing this appropriation at all, the Federal Government might apply some of the money which has been set aside for grant-in-aid funds to the University of Toronto to support the great cause of dentistry and we will immediately match the amount. That, I think is the practical and proper way of meeting this situation, which is really of fundamental concern in this country.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware that I did not give you the customary notice in respect to this question. I did not have the time, as a matter of fact, but I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will not object to taking my views into consideration in regard to this matter. It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with

an answer to a question on the Order paper yesterday. The hon. Prime Minister answered a question of mine, No. 40. The question was this:

What logging taxes have been collected in each fiscal year applicable by (a) Mantane Contracting Co.

and it lists a number of other companies. Then it goes on to say:

What corporations taxes were collected from the incorporated companies for each year 1951-53 inclusive?

The hon. Prime Minister replied to the question on the Order paper, suggesting I see R.S.O. 1950, chapter 216, section 34. After some searching, I did locate what I was supposed to look for, to find the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker. Section 34 of chapter 216 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario reads as follows:

Every person who, while employed in the services of His Majesty, has communicated or allowed to be communicated to a person not legally entitled thereto, any information obtained, under this Act, or has allowed any such person to inspect or to have access to any written statements furnished under this Act, is guilty of an offence, and liable on summary conviction to a penalty of not more than \$200.

I am glad that the penalty is not more severe than \$200, but I would say in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Prime Minister, surely that is not an answer to the question. In the second place, surely hon. members of the Legislature are entitled to what is—and what I always considered to be—public information.

That was all I asked for in this question, and it is hardly an answer, to be referred to a Statute. The Statute has no relation at all to an hon. member of a House asking a question, but has to do with giving out information to some irresponsible person, to some person who is not entitled to that information. However, when a member of the Legislature asks for information on a public matter,

information which should be available in a governmental department, I suggest in the first place, he is entitled to it, and it is not the answer at all to refer him to a Statute. That does not apply in the case of an hon. member of the Legislature.

HON. MR. FROST: This Legislature, in its wisdom, many years ago, imposed what are known as "secrecy bars" to the giving of information relative to taxpayers. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows the penalty is \$200. My legal adviser is not here, but I suppose it provided upon failure to pay, under The Summary Convictions Act, those who do such-and-such can be imprisoned. I do not think the hon. Leader of the Opposition would want me to violate a Statute of this House, which was passed by this House, and put myself in such a position.

Another thing I would like to point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition is that this information, being given by way of question and answer, becomes public, and is available then to the public—quite properly so—and to the press of this country. This same provision is in the Income Tax Act of Canada. How would the hon. Leader of the Opposition like someone to go to Ottawa and ask that his income tax returns be laid on the table? That is the fundamental part of this question, and I would tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition I am quite prepared to do this.

I do not think this will be a violation of the Statute, but I will consult with the law clerk to make sure neither he nor I, nor any member of the treasury staff, will be affected by it. I would be glad to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) in confidence the answers to his question. As a matter of fact, I had, in all innocence, the answers ready for him. I then discussed the matter with the treasury staff who pointed out that it would be a clear violation of the statutory provision imposed by the Legislature itself. I do not want to withhold any information from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am prepared to give him the information confidentially. Then he will know the situation, but I think he will realize it would be totally unfair

to give the amount of taxation, and make that information public, because it would be a violation of the Act in revealing information, which we must get from taxpayers in confidence, in order to make assessments against them.

MR. OLIVER: If the hon. Prime Minister will read the section I referred to he will find that it does not refer, nor can it be made to refer to hon. members of the Legislature.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition will appreciate, surely, that if the information is given in this House it is tantamount to telling everyone.

MR. OLIVER: If an hon. member of the Legislature takes the responsibility of asking the question in order that the public might become acquainted with the information, it is certainly not proper for the government to say the public should not be informed on these matters.

HON. MR. FROST: If that principle were recognized it would mean that any person's income tax returns could be made public if questions were asked about them. Surely that was never intended.

HON. MR. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Perhaps I should make a comment on report of the accident which occurred at the Richard L. Hearn steam generating plant.

About 6 o'clock this morning number 1 generator, for some unexplained reason, exploded. I am pleased to announce to the House that the accident is not as serious as first thought or as it has been reported. No. 2 generator will be in operation within a day or so. No. 3 is being converted to 60 cycles. No. 4 was in operation soon after the interruption. The accident did not affect the capacity of our lines in any way, but it has underlined the advantage we have in the interconnections recently made between Detroit Edison and ourselves at Sarnia and Detroit. I say, with emphasis, that the accident was not as serious as at first reported.

MR. SALSBERG: Was anyone killed, or was there any serious accident among the staff?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: No one was killed. Information was given that the building had been seriously damaged. That is not so.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Before the Orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I should say I know the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) is always loath to have this mentioned in the House. Maybe, because of the passing years, one grows more sensitive as time goes along. During the years I have been in this House, it has been customary to wish him many happy returns on this day—It is the 1st of April.

I am sure the hon. member for Brant has warned the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) to say nothing. He would not wish to split the Liberal Party in any way. That is the reason perhaps why the hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying nothing about this. But I am under no such restriction. I am glad to offer the hon. member for Brant, on behalf of all hon. members, our good wishes on this occasion. I might say that the hon. member for Brant was first elected to this House in 1919, 35 years ago, and he has been a distinguished and fine member of the House ever since. We certainly wish him many years of health and happiness and many happy returns of this day.

MR. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, this comes rather as a surprise. I thought that after an hon. member reached the age of 60 there was an unwritten law that his anniversaries, which come at that stage with such alarming frequency, should not be brought to his attention, or at least to the attention of the public. On this occasion, however, I will forgive the hon. Prime Minister for bringing the matter up. When I first came to this House my youth was a matter which embarrassed me seriously. But I find that with the passing of years, that embarrassment has quite changed, and now proceeds from the opposite cause.

I do wish to thank the hon. Prime Minister and hon. members of the House for their very kind words, good wishes and felicitations to me on this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

FAIR ACCOMMODATION PRACTICES

HON. MR. FROST moves second reading of Bill No. 139, "An Act to promote Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario."

Motion agreed to.

He said: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there is much that I can add to the detailed statements which I made on Monday on the introduction of this bill. As I said then, I believe this will strengthen the legislation already on our Statute Books relative to the matter of discrimination. Yesterday afternoon, when we were speaking of hon. Robert Baldwin, I pointed out, as I have done on previous occasions, that one of the great contributions Canada has made to the world is that we have learned to live with ourselves and among ourselves. The birth of Canada and our rise to the status of a great country was only possible because French and English were able to work in partnership from the beginning. The Baldwin unveiling yesterday was just a recognition of that fact. Since this co-operation began in Canada, we have made progress in avoiding discrimination by means of Statutes which, I repeat, are not oppressive, but designed to lead people to regard them as declarations of public intent, and provide ways and means of avoiding incidents which might create resentment. They provide ways in which conflicting points of view can be reconciled. But, ultimately, they provide that there shall be an application to the courts in the event of what we might assume to be flagrant and intentional violation of the law.

I will not elaborate on this, beyond saying that in connection with this particular enactment I received a good many representations. I have a list here of, I suppose, 50 organizations which are interested in this matter. There are just

2 of them to which I will refer, apart from the great labour organizations. I have a letter from a great Roman Catholic churchman who refers to this measure as "People seeking vindication of human dignity as befits free men." I have another letter here from the Reverend Canon Judd, who was here with the deputation which approached us last week, and I believe this resolution was sponsored by the Most Rev. R. J. Renison, who is one of the great Canadians. Here was a man who had a great parish and a great connection here in the City of Toronto, but who was prepared to give that up to go out to a great missionary field in the north country as the Bishop of Moosonee—I believe that is his title—who also referred to this matter.

I may say that about a week ago a deputation waited on this government and was received in one of the committee rooms. The deputation was sponsored by the Civil Liberties Association or organization, and at that time there were people present from all races, creeds and colours. Many of them were clergymen from our churches, representatives of all faiths, and there were also present many of our coloured citizens of Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed, as I know my colleagues were, by a very short speech made by a coloured gentleman, with that deputation, Mr. Don Moore, who represented the Negro Citizenship Association. He told about his people in Canada, the contribution that he and his people were endeavouring to make to the welfare of our country, of his religious beliefs, and his philosophy of life in general. I said I could not see at that time why anybody should wish to discriminate against a man like that—a great citizen, a man with whom one should be proud to be associated, in this country, a man of great ideas and great ideals. I told him that but for the fact that I had a luncheon engagement which I was obliged to attend I would have been delighted and honoured to have invited him to lunch. If the opportunity arises again, I shall do that. I would welcome him to my home. He would be a distinguished guest on any occasion.

This, Mr. Speaker, is just one of the things which are meant by this enactment. It is not intended to be a harsh measure which compels people to be just and fair. It is intended, if it is possible, to conciliate and bring people together.

I know the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) who is busily making notes up there, is going to ask me which hon. Minister is going to take over the administration of this Act.

MR. SALSBERG: No. I am just noting down the very fine words which the hon. Prime Minister has just been uttering.

HON. MR. FROST: It is my intention to approach the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and persuade him to take this over. He is a man of broad views, who has had great experience in conciliation which involves bringing people together, to secure agreement. I do that, with the consent and approval of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) who, with his able law clerks, drew up this legislation—legislation which, I believe, can be held up as a pattern for other jurisdictions. I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Labour, with his generous point of view, will agree to combine this administration with that of the Fair Employment Practices Act. It will be another opportunity for him to use his great abilities, and those of his department, in bringing people together. It is with a great deal of pleasure I move the second reading of this bill.

MR. OLIVER: With the intent and purpose of this bill, I am sure the hon. members of the Legislature are in full accord, as another step forward in the panorama of progress in this province. It is well, I think, that we should remember in welcoming a bill like this that forward-looking legislation is not the prerogative of any particular government as I think the hon. Prime Minister will agree. Back in the days of the former administration there were many instances of forward-looking legislation and this government has carried on in

the same way. This bill marks another chapter in removing from this province the discrimination we do not want to tolerate, and which we will not tolerate in Ontario. I think that in Ontario we are looking forward to the day when we can say—and mean it—that there is no discrimination, either racial or in any other form. In my opinion that represents a great opportunity for the people of this province in more ways than one. It is a great thing for the people of Ontario to be able to say: "We have removed every vestige of discrimination, and our people are equal from one end of the province to the other." But it should have far more importance and a far more significant application than that. When Ontario, as a great part of Canada, and Canada as a whole, is taking an increasingly large share of world responsibility. As our statesmen go to other countries of the world, seeking to lay the foundation for a better era and a better way of life, there will be no better argument they can use than the right to say that in Canada we have removed racial discrimination, that our people are equal no matter what race they come from or what creed they profess. I doubt if we could forge a better instrument for taking our real place in world leadership than being able to say that. This law is a further step in that direction.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, this Act, as has been said, is one step forward in doing away with racial discrimination in Ontario. The Statute has been long desired by our people, and I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister on introducing the Act. As the hon. Prime Minister himself pointed out, the discrimination sought to be overcome by this Act is discrimination in connection with the entering of public places such as theatres, picture houses, skating rinks and so on. But there are other places in which discrimination is equally rampant. I refer to housing projects and rental projects, where the owners refuse to permit people of different races to enter. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will say we cannot interfere with the private

rights of the owners of rental housing units and such places. But I think we can.

HON. MR. FROST: Might I point out to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) that orders have been given by the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Warrender) to all public housing authorities in Ontario that there shall be no discrimination of any kind.

MR. GRUMMETT: Well, why not incorporate something in this Act to that effect? The orders given by the hon. Minister of Planning and Development would cover big housing developments, but it would not cover the ordinary renting of housing units. A man may, for example, own 2 or 3 houses. He then is in a position to discriminate between tenants, on the basis of race.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member will recognize the difficulty of dealing with that problem.

MR. GRUMMETT: I recognize it quite well, but I think the government should do something to limit it. As long as we have this feeling directed against people of different racial extraction, we are giving these people a feeling of inferiority. I would like to see the government go further than it has done, though I admit that this bill is a step forward. I congratulate the government on bringing it in. At the same time, I recognize what has been left out.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this legislation, but, in welcoming it, I must say I do so with mixed feeling. I would prefer that no such legislation was necessary. I would prefer that the relationship between all citizens of our province was such that no law was required to oblige them or to compel them to do what should be the natural and human thing to do. But, unfortunately, that is not quite the level of our attainment yet. That being the case, such legislation is necessary, and being necessary, its introduction is, of course, to be welcomed. I wish to join with those hon. members who have

spoken until now in extending my appreciation to the government for the bill which is before us.

The hon. Prime Minister will remember, that only a few weeks ago I asked him to release one of his many followers in the House to second a bill of mine against discriminatory practices. The hon. Prime Minister sent me a note saying: "If it is a good bill, I would rather introduce it myself." And I am glad he has now introduced a bill himself.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the recent effort for anti-discrimination legislation, as far as I am aware, goes back to 1943 when I came into this House and when the Conservative Party took over the reins of government. It was my privilege to raise this question with Mr. Drew when he became Prime Minister. I repeat what I have said in the House many times, that he displayed a great deal of interest. As a result of my approach, we discussed the problem and, at his request, I provided him with a memorandum on the type of legislation I thought was necessary. I think it is to the credit of Mr. Drew that he did introduce the first anti-discrimination bill in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am always ready to make this acknowledgement to him despite all the other differences and they are many and deep, which I have with the national leader of the Conservative Party.

On another occasion, I congratulated the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) who had the good fortune to introduce another bill which further narrowed down discriminatory practices. I told him he was fortunate to sponsor such a bill, and I think I am correct in saying it will stand to his credit for many, many years when other deeds of his have, perhaps, been forgotten.

The question always raised when requests for legislation against discrimination were made, was whether it was possible to legislate the behaviour of people. I want to say on this occasion that we should recognize that the vast majority of our people are sound, healthy, good people and their relation-

ship with others is all that could be desired. It is unfortunate, however, that blind and unintelligent prejudice still exists in certain areas, and it is against such prejudices that we must have legislation. Let us take the most shocking experience of all, that of the Town of Dresden. There is no question about it that legislation is necessary for a community such as that, where a few people were able to drag a whole community into doing what is wrong and harmful. It is not the whole community which is at fault. It is a few people who have succeeded in creating an atmosphere intolerable, oppressive and uncondonable. I was in that town and I spoke to a number of people, including ministers of the church and members of the town council, and I know the majority did not want that situation to exist. But it takes courage to stand up and say so. I know of a minister of a church there who had to leave the town shortly after he had spoken up. In addition I know of a member of the council who had to give up his grocery business and move out of town because he spoke up in council against that situation.

It is against such conditions as this that we need this legislation.

There are other remnants of discrimination which we should remove from our midst. I am wondering whether we should enact legislation which would make it a condition for the granting of any licence that the holder of such a licence shall not engage in any type of discrimination against anyone regardless of race, colour or religion. I think such a requirement should be a condition of granting licence for taverns in every municipality and indeed for every type of business which caters to the public. I am hoping that this legislation may correct the situation which prevails at present. If it does not, then, I think, an additional amendment may be required in the near future to make sure that it does; just to make sure that any holder of a licence from any level of government will be obliged to use that licence on the basis of equality for all who may care to enter his establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to find that only until quite recently in a larger

town than Dresden, but close to it, there was an unwritten law that no Negro could live in the town, nor could he own a home. I was impressed by the fact that the local paper of that town wrote about it. It is a credit to that paper and undoubtedly a reflection of the majority opinion of the people of that town, that the paper disapproved of that unwritten law. That paper, in writing about the Dresden affair, said: "the citizens of this town should remember their own shortcomings," and I was happy to learn that a week ago, when the delegation, about which the hon. Prime Minister spoke, was here, and when I discussed the status of the Negro in that community, that the "unwritten law" has not been in force for the last 2 years. It is a good development, but it did exist.

I have in my mind an application for an automobile insurance policy, brought to me only a few days ago by a citizen, who asked, "how come this application asks the religion of the applicant?" I do not know what religious beliefs or affiliations have to do with buying automobile insurance, but that is what they are after.

Another citizen brought me a folder issued by an American operating a tourist business in our province who boldly points out that he has a restricted clientele, and describes the restrictions unashamedly. I want to say that some of the serious offenders and violators of our existing fair employment law are the large insurance companies.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): What are the restrictions?

MR. SALSBERG: "Gentiles only." I have had many young persons—most of them young girls just out of our commercial schools—who after applying for jobs, came to tell me that after filling out their application forms in an outer office, where no questions were asked as to nationality, race, colour or religion, which was in accordance with the law, then a member of the personnel department would come out and ask those questions verbally. In one instance, a young girl, who just graduated from

our High School of Commerce, told me she told the gentleman "that is against the law," and the gentleman simply smiled, and cynically said, "that is why we do not have it on our application form, and why I am asking you verbally."

I mention these instances just to indicate what is still before us.

I want to say that when we enter a period of economic recession, the danger of demagogic racial agitation always arises. That was our experience everywhere, including this province. I recall some very unhappy experiences in the days of the big depression. What happens when there is no employment, and people are disturbed and worried is that always a certain reactionary, pro-fascist type, raise racial issues, and seek to antagonize one group of people against another.

HON. W. K. WARRENDER: They are mostly the Communists.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the hon. Minister does not know what he is talking about.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: I have heard it so many times in council, that I know what the hon. member is driving at.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister does not understand the difference between class difference and racial difference.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: Mr. Speaker, I think I know a great deal more about it than the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister has a great deal to learn, and I hope he learns it in time, for the good of his own people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: The legislation being introduced in this bill, is a revision of the 1944 Act, and becomes broadened out. I think it is more satisfactory than was the 1944 Act. However, it leaves a

few questions in my mind which are unanswered.

First, whether the penalty clauses are sufficient for those who want to persist in discriminatory practices. This is most important.

The second question is whether you should not provide for the establishment of a commission—and on this point, I would like to have the attention, if I may, of the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Attorney-General. I am wondering whether there should not be an addition to the bill to provide for the establishment of a commission against racial discrimination, and that commission should be charged with the task of carrying on public education against all forms and types of discrimination.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is quite true, as some people may say, that laws alone will not do away with the evil about which we are speaking. I, for one, subscribe to that, because I think economic and social conditions breed discrimination. Unless we have a more sound economic system we will never do away with discrimination entirely. The law in itself, will not perform miracles. We do, however, need to go to the people and to point out the evil character and harm of discrimination of any type; in other words, a continuous education, utilizing our schools, our public forums, our press, round-table discussions, trade unions, business organizations, churches, and so on—yes, even political groups of all kinds—so that there may be a complete dissemination of the idea of equality for all people.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States, as the hon. Prime Minister undoubtedly knows, many States have anti-discrimination legislation, and some have such commissions. In the State of New York, for instance, they have a commission of 5 members, who are paid \$10,000 a year each. They are full-time servants of the state, and their task is to carry on public education to eliminate all forms of discrimination.

I am not suggesting we establish that type of commission in Ontario. I am, however, suggesting to the hon. Prime Minister, who introduced this bill, that

he add to the bill, a clause establishing in Ontario, an anti-discrimination commission, which should be appointed by the hon. Minister in charge of the enforcement of the Act. This commission to work gratis, that is, to receive no payment for its work. It should plan and carry on educational activities to eliminate discrimination as is done elsewhere on this continent.

I would go further, and say that this provincial commission should have local commissions under its jurisdiction, situated in the main industrial areas, commissions which the hon. Minister will set up. I think they will perform a very important function, because it is not the law alone; there are many other things, and education is one of them. In completing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do so by requesting the government to add to this section of the bill. If it should not be led to do so, I will remind it again when we reach the bill in committee stage. But whether it will agree to include that now, I hope it will see the wisdom of it at a later day. I appreciate, of course, the step forward this legislation takes, and welcome it, as I am sure it will be welcomed throughout the province, and I will, of course, vote for the bill wholeheartedly.

MR. R. JOHN YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I count it a privilege to be able to stand in this House this afternoon, to unreservedly support the measure before the House. It is my opinion that the representatives of the people who have been in this Chamber on several occasions in the past years, when legislation of this kind was brought before the House, and put into Statute law, were very fortunate, indeed.

It is my belief, in regard to this measure, that we are putting into words, the will of the people. When, in the preamble to the bill, it states, "Whereas it is public policy in Ontario, that places to which the public is customarily admitted, be open to all, without regard to race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin," that is, indeed, expressing the voice of the

people, an expression growing out of the way of life which has been developed in this province, and this nation, that all citizens, men and women, shall have equal rights and equal responsibilities.

It is through the representatives in this Legislature, that the people arise with one accord, and speak in unison on behalf of the bill.

The only regret I have, Mr. Speaker, is that one who rises to support a measure such as this, is compelled, either by force of habit, or deliberate intent, in speaking of this non-discriminatory legislation to resort to smears. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) referred to some group, known perhaps to his mind alone, as "pro-fascist." I can think of no other purpose in using that phrase than to be speaking in a derogatory manner.

Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation on the Statute books of this province is an indication to the people of the belief of all representatives that all men and women have the same rights. I do not think it is conducive to the well-being of legislation of this type to have any labels whatsoever placed on any group in this province.

Mr. Speaker, that phrase alone, to my mind, mars what, to me, would have been otherwise a completely momentous occasion.

I think this bill is proper. I, too, do not subscribe to the sentiment that discrimination is something that can be legislated against, but it is an indication to the people as a whole, that the majority are in favour of anti-discrimination legislation.

I believe that it is through mutual understanding; through a realization of the fact that each one has his own way, and should be accepted, that these words which are now in the Statute, will become integrated into the life of each and every citizen throughout the province. I do not think we should be blind to instances which occur. Mr. Speaker, we should not be blind to any instance, no matter how slight, where any aspect of discrimination occurs. But I do not believe in such a militant

aggressiveness which only adds heat, and, instead of bringing people together, divides them.

Mr. Speaker, as is well known, in this province, there have been the 2 great basic races. In the past 50 years, or more, there have been added, many races, in many thousands. I wonder if the hon. members of this House realize that within this Province of Ontario alone of a population of some 5 million, to the basic British and French stocks have been added others, totalling almost 1 million people. We have joined together to make this province what it is today, a province which it is admitted—perhaps in one case under some pressure—and agreed on by all hon. members of this House, the like of which there is no other in this world.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a province, one of 10. I believe the same feeling exists throughout the whole Dominion.

This matter of discrimination is one which all citizens throughout the province should look at from the personal viewpoint. Each of us, at some time during our life, has known a sense of loneliness, perhaps from passing through some strange town, or strange part of a large community. How lonely we are, if we are not accepted. And how happy we are, and how pleasant it is when we establish a contact, no matter how small it is, and we feel that we are a part of a community.

But, Mr. Speaker, think of the hurt and the loneliness of someone who belongs within a community as of right, but is not accepted in all aspects.

This legislation comes at a time, as has been referred to, when this Province of Ontario is attracting many, many peoples, and has attracted many within the past few years. Individually, as families, or as groups, they find themselves in a strange land, and not only under the difficult circumstances of a strangeness, but handicapped by an entirely different background, handicapped as far as language is concerned, unaccustomed to understand our routine way of life, and strangers in the spot in which they find themselves.

Mr. Speaker, think of the loneliness of such a person, when he is not accepted; think of the hurt when not only is he not accepted, but sometimes refused. But, Mr. Speaker, think of the happiness when that person or that group finds himself or itself accepted in all aspects.

Many whom I know intimately have, within this period, taken out Canadian citizenship. One in particular stands out in my mind; a man who, some 2 months ago, received his certificate of citizenship, which, to him was the most valuable document he could ever hope to attain. I mention him, Mr. Speaker, because it was a race between him and his unborn son as to who should attain Canadian citizenship first. How glad the father was that he on one day received by grant Canadian citizenship, and on the next day, his son, born 24 hours later, obtained citizenship by birth, father and son equal. Mr. Speaker, think of the happiness, the well-being of one who realizes that he has been accepted by the community at large.

This Assembly yesterday heard the eloquent words of our hon. Prime Minister in referring to a great Canadian of this province, a man who lived in this province more than 100 years ago, a man who stood by certain principles. Yet such is the nature of the development of our traditions that those principles for which he stood are handed down not only to that long line of his descendants, and to those of his contemporaries, but to everyone within this province.

In introducing this bill, the hon. Prime Minister gave a review of new principles, which this House has accepted, to determine the relationship of man to man within this province. Mr. Speaker, this is a tribute to all those who initiated and carried out these measures. I recall the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts') debate in reply to the speech from the Throne, brought this matter to the attention of the House very forcefully and very clearly. We owe a great deal to those of the delegation which attended upon

the hon. Prime Minister, to bring to him in a concrete method the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, it is to the greatest satisfaction of all of us here, regardless of Party, that the Leader of this Assembly, our hon. Prime Minister, is a man who, when presented with a fair and proper proposition, will accept that proposition, and act upon it. Mr. Speaker, I think that this day will prove to be a source of great satisfaction to you, in the years to come, that you presided over this House, and to all of us present as hon. members of this Legislature, that we sat here, putting a little more body to a great ideal.

MR. SALSBERG: May I make a correction? I am sorry the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) misunderstood my words. I was not desirous of smearing anyone, nor of creating disagreements on this question before the House, but I did refer to fascist groups, to whom racism and race discrimination is an essential tenet of their whole outlook. No one in this House likes, or approves of that. However, I must tell the hon. member that there are such organized groups in our country whose publications, unfortunately, carry on racist propaganda at this time, and it was to such groups I was referring. I am sure he was aware of it.

MR. YAREMKO: I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will not permit a debate, but in reply to the hon. member for St. Andrew, I expressed my belief to the hon. members of this House that if any one of the other 89 hon. members sitting in this House were to contest a riding against a member of the Labour-Progressive Party, the Party to which the hon. member belonged, in Ontario would be labelled as "fascist."

MR. SALSBERG: That is such utter rot and such utter nonsense.

MR. CHARLES E. JANES (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, I only came into the Chamber, and I had no intention of taking part in the discussion on this bill, until I heard the slur thrown at one

of the nicest towns in my riding by the hon. member for St. Andrew.

I would like to tell the House, I intend to support this bill, and I am quite sure, with the diplomatic hon. Minister of Labour in charge, there will be no difficulty. I am also quite sure the people in the Town of Dresden in my riding will fall behind this bill and support it, but I do want to say this: any trouble which we have had in Dresden, one of the finest towns in Ontario, has been caused and agitated by someone like the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): That is true. I happen to know.

MR. JANES: I have had many letters sent to me on this question, and they were all sent from Detroit. They were the people who were causing the trouble. There are two restaurants in Dresden which refused to serve coloured people, but I know they will fall behind this. There was no barber shop into which they could enter, but that is because these agitators have been coming in and causing trouble. I have had letters from Detroit telling me what they were going to do. They came to me and said they were going to organize gangs to smash windows in restaurants, and I advised them to go back to Detroit.

I know the hon. member for St. Andrew went up there and caused dissension and trouble. It is not being caused by the coloured people in Dresden, because they are the finest people in the world. They are lovely people. I could take the hon. members any time, and show them Boy Scouts and Girl Guides working together. I have seen them many times when they were all serving at tables, and there is no happier group anywhere.

I could take you into the schools and into the streets where they play together, and show you the older people visiting in the streets, as happy as can be.

I have no hesitation in saying that none of this trouble is caused by the coloured people of Dresden. I agree with them there should be no discrimination. We have Uncle Tom's grave there, and

the people of Dresden are proud of it. We have a number of the best farmers up there, who are coloured, and we are very proud of them. I want to make it clear to the House I will stand for no slurs on the people of Dresden.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, this was a reflection on me, and I must have an opportunity of replying to it. The reflection was I went to Dresden—

MR. SPEAKER: I will not give the hon. member the floor, I do not think I should, because he has already spoken, and taken a great deal of the time. I gave him a great deal of leeway, and much of what he said, I am afraid, was irrelevant. I thought for the sake of the House, we would save time in committee if I allowed him to speak at this time.

MR. SALSBERG: On a point of order—

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, I have the floor.

MR. SALSBERG: May I rise on a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: After I am through speaking, a point of order may be raised. I think I have been very generous. The hon. member intimated if this was not carried through on second reading, it would be repeated again in committee, and I will have no control over that, but I think I have been very fair, and the House has been very tolerant, and listened to a very long speech, much of which, I am afraid, was quite irrelevant, as only part of the speech dealt with the bill. I think we have had enough discussion, and I think I have been very generous with the hon. member.

MR. SALSBERG: On a point of order, the hon. member who just spoke (Mr. Janes) stated that I, having gone to Dresden, was responsible in some way for the discrimination trouble in that town.

I want to refute that, sir. It is a reflection on my character in saying that I, in any way, was involved in causing the difficulty.

I went to Dresden in 1949, after every newspaper in the country had written about it for weeks. I addressed no meetings. The Labour Progressive Party has no organization in Dresden, and I knew no one in Dresden, but went to see the mayor, and discussed it with him. I discussed it also with several ministers of the church privately, and with the editor of the paper, and then left the town.

For the hon. member to come here and charge me with responsibility for what happened in Dresden is most unfair and I know the hon. member in question does not want to be unfair.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

HON. MR. DUNBAR moves second reading of Bill 140, "An Act to amend the Municipal Amendment Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

He said: In recent years with the rapid development surrounding urban areas there have been more and more cases of urban municipalities annexing substantial areas of the surrounding rural municipalities which have become largely urbanized.

Where the annexation is to a municipality that forms part of a county for municipal purposes, the annexation does not affect county revenues and the loss of assessment is confined to the township from which the area is detached.

This may, where the annexation carries with it a large amount of industrial assessment, very seriously affect the financial position of the township. This has been made very apparent in the cases of the recent Hamilton and London annexations which have been before the Private Bills Committee at the present session of the Legislature.

In addition, where the annexation is to a city or a separated town, the financial position of the county in which the township from which the area is detached is situated, may be very seriously affected.

The Municipal Board until now, has had no power to make any provision to compensate the local municipality and the county in such cases.

Under the amendment to The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953, which was incorporated in Bill No. 120, one phase of this problem has been dealt with in that the township is given for a period of 5 years after annexations ordered on or after December 31st, 1953, the per capita grant based on the population of the annexed area that it would have received had the annexation not taken place. Where the per capita grant to the annexing municipality exceeds the per capita grant payable to the township, the annexing municipality receives the difference between the 2 per capita grants for the period of 5 years.

This provides a solution to one part of the problem but does not assist the county.

Under the amendments to The Municipal Act proposed in this bill, provision is made for an agreement between the annexed and annexing municipality or between the annexing municipality and the county, under which the annexing municipality will pay compensating grants to the annexed municipality or county where a loss of assessment of 15 per cent. or more is shown. Any such agreement may be approved by the Municipal Board, or if no agreement is reached the Municipal Board will have authority to order such payments.

The provision in relation to the county is made applicable not only to annexations but also to amalgamations, as an amalgamation of a municipality forming part of the county with a city or separated town will result in the loss of assessment to the county.

These provisions are carried out in subsection 1 of section 1 of this bill.

The other phases of this bill relate to the objections to a decision of the Municipal Board granting an annexation or amalgamation. Under subsections 14 to 16 of Bill No. 56 the present procedure under The Municipal Act was continued. Under this procedure, if a notice of objection signed by 10 per

cent. of the resident ratepayers in the annexing municipality or in the annexed area was filed with the Municipal Board within 28 days, the order of the board was suspended and was not to come into force until the objection was withdrawn or until the order was confirmed by a special Act.

This procedure resulted in applications to the Legislature for private Acts confirming the orders of the Municipal Board, with the result the Private Bills Committee of the Legislature was, in effect, sitting in appeal from the decision of the Municipal Board.

The defects of this system have become more apparent in recent years due to the number of annexations involving a substantial area. The time at the disposal of the Private Bills Committee during a session does not permit of a thorough and complete hearing of all the evidence relating to the annexation or amalgamation with the result that the government feels that the present procedure does not produce a result which is essentially fair to all parties concerned. This is not a reflection upon the operations of the Private Bills Committee in any way. The point is that it is utterly impossible for the committee to reach a finding when it does not have the opportunity or the time to hear and consider all the relevant evidence.

Under the provisions of this bill the former provisions are repealed and new provisions substituted. Under the new procedure, where the Municipal Board makes a decision in favour of an application for annexation or amalgamation, the Municipal Board will be required to make its decision in writing, identify the area to be annexed, and affix the date of the proposed annexation or amalgamation. Copies of the decision shall then be sent to the clerks of every municipality concerned, including the county, and to such other persons as the Municipal Board may direct.

An opportunity is then provided under which a notice of objection signed by 10 per cent. of the resident ratepayers of the applicant municipality or of the annexed area may be filed with the Clerk

of the Executive Council. Upon the receipt of the objection the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may follow either one of two courses, namely, either to confirm the order of the Municipal Board or to direct the Municipal Board to hold a re-hearing.

Before arriving at its decision the government will investigate the matter in such way as it deems advisable. This may involve an investigation by the government itself or the appointment of qualified persons to investigate and advise the government. Having determined whether the order of the board should be confirmed or whether there should be a re-hearing the government will then make the necessary order.

If the order is confirmed by the government the decision of the board shall be final and no appeal may be taken against that decision except that any right of appeal conferred in respect to a matter of law may still be exercised.

If the government determines that a complete new hearing should be held by the Municipal Board it will designate the members of the board before whom the new hearing shall be held. It is the intention that not less than 3 members of the board shall sit on the new hearing and for the most part it may be found desirable that the new hearing be held before members of the board other than those who held the first hearing. On the other hand, it may be highly desirable that part of the membership of the board at the new hearing should consist of persons who had heard the original application.

Where a new hearing has been ordered, the decision of the board on that hearing is made final and is subject only to the normal rights of appeal on a question of law.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Resuming adjourned consideration of the Report of the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

MR. R. ROBSON (Hastings East): Mr. Speaker, I want to say how much

I enjoyed serving on this committee under the very able chairmanship of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Hon. Mr. Goodfellow). I think that when we went out to investigate the way the Indians live, we learned much from them. I was much interested the other day, in listening to the speech of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett). I have in my own riding one of the more advanced bands of Indians. They were greatly interested in the committee which investigated their conditions, and I feel that we have done a lot of good. Both the Indians and ourselves have benefitted by this exchange of experience. So the day on which the report was presented to the House, it was my privilege to entertain some friends of our Indian band in the House, and they went back to the reserves feeling happy about what had happened.

With regard to the sale of intoxicants, we found, as has been stated before, that some of the Indians were much against having intoxicants on the reserve. That is to be expected, because in every hon. member's municipality we find the same opinion expressed. So it is natural to find it also on the Indian reservations. I feel that when we give the Indians the right to go into beverage rooms, we are only extending to them a privilege which should belong to them. The majority of the bands are going to appreciate that privilege, and feel, as a consequence, that they are not being discriminated against.

During our trip we had the opportunity of observing the educational system at work among the Indians. I was rather astonished at the schools. Many of them were thoroughly modern, though, it must be admitted, others were not so modern. I think the Federal Government has been responsible for some great advances in the last 4 or 5 years in the field of Indian education, and, I believe, if the Indians are given the same privileges in education that we are given, great things can be expected in the future. It is possible we may bring them along to our own way of thinking and living.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say once more what a privilege and pleasure it was to serve on the committee under so affable a chairman.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I was not a member of the Select Committee, and I do not come from a riding in which there are many Indian citizens, but I think that this is a general problem and I would like to make a few comments.

I want to say the report and the recommendations represent a step forward, and to that extent they are to be welcomed. I would state frankly that, in my opinion, this report and its recommendations constitute some measure of atonement for the sins which were committed a long time ago against the Indian population. I would further state there is much more to be done if we are to atone fully for the offences of the past.

The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who spoke most eloquently on every occasion about Indian affairs, drew the attention of the House to outstanding Indian leaders as illustrations of the contribution which Indians have made to Canada's well-being. He mentioned Pauline Johnson. It so happened that I read about Pauline Johnson only last week in a good article in the *Canadian Tribune*. I would like to say, having had my mind refreshed somewhat about the life of this great woman, that while she was undoubtedly a gifted poet and one of the ablest writers in this country it was primarily as an Indian that she wished herself to be known. She said herself she wished to be regarded as a singer of her own people. And I think that, at this time, in memory of this great Indian woman and poet, it should be stated that her poems dealt with the problems of her people. One of them is known as "The Cattle Thief." It is not unfitting that a few lines from it should be read on this occasion:

You have cursed and called him a
Cattle Thief, though you robbed
him first of bread—

Robbed him and robbed my people—
look there, at that shrunken face.
Starved with a hollow hunger, we
owe to you and your race.

What have you brought but evil, and
curses since you came,
How have you paid us for our game,
how paid us for our land?

In that poem there are more lines which I had better not read because they would certainly not add to anyone's happiness in this House. There is another poem called "A Cry from an Indian Wife" which should be read now when we are dealing with the question of the Indians. I will read only a couple of stanzas:

They but forgot we Indians owned
the land
From ocean unto ocean; that they
stand

Upon a soil that centuries ago
Was our safe kingdom and our right
alone.

They never think how they would
feel today,

If some great nation came from far
away,

Wresting their country from their
hapless braves.

Giving what they gave us—but wars
and graves.

Mr. Speaker, I read those few extracts from Pauline Johnson's poems in order that hon. members might recognize that the Indian population still feel very deeply about the wrongs committed against them. I would say, therefore, that we should try, all of us, to free ourselves of any feeling of superiority towards these people. As Pauline Johnson said, they were the noblest of people to be found on earth. They were a kindly, friendly people and I do not think we should have any air of superiority toward them. I certainly do not think we should approach this problem with anything which resembles condescension.

I therefore suggest to the government that it should not consider this report, and the recommendations which are before them, as the completion of the task, but, in justice to the Indians,

it should convene an assembly of democratically elected representatives of every Indian community in the province, and present the report to them and ask them to express their opinions on it and to make recommendations about all the matters contained in it which affect their well being.

I would hate to think, Mr. Speaker, that any Indian should feel that we were handing down something to him, granting some rights or withholding other rights. I believe that in the spirit of justice and equality we should let them make all final decisions about what they think should be done for their section of the population, and not leave this whole matter with the government and trust that it should act favourably towards them. I think such a move as I have suggested would be welcomed by the Indian population. I assure hon. members that it would be the right way to bring about the equality of which so many of them have spoken. It is impossible to bring about equality if you deny the right to participate in the formulation of policy and laws to those people whose rights are being established.

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (Addington): Mr. Speaker, I did not know this afternoon that we were going to have a debate on Indian affairs. However, I wish to express my appreciation for having had the opportunity to serve on this committee. It was a great honour to have been able to visit these people, who were the first citizens of this land in which we are so proud to live. I should like to thank the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Hon. Mr. Goodfellow) who was the chairman of our committee, who expressed the feelings of every member of that committee in the remarks which he made to this House. After he finished, I thought it quite unnecessary that we should make any comment on the report at all, because he had so thoroughly and faithfully carried out the duties which the hon. Prime Minister had placed upon him.

After a good deal of travelling about this province, we reached that great County of Hastings where the Tyen-

dannaga reserve is situated. Up till then I had felt pretty good because the chairman, and myself, and all the other members of the committee could easily be distinguished from the Indians we were supposed to interview. But, after arriving at Tyendannaga reserve, all that was changed. I did not see an Indian there who could be readily distinguished as such. They were just white people, and it surprised me that those people, whom one could not distinguish from other Canadians, were still living on a reserve and demanding that \$4 or \$5 a year, for the one and only purpose of avoiding land tax. The Indian is entitled to everything we give him, but I do believe that the purpose of this committee and the purpose in the mind of the Federal Government, is to bring these people to realize that they have a responsibility as Canadian citizens. That day will come, though it may be a long way ahead. But I think, by proper education and proper environment, the time will come when they will take their place in society and assume their responsibility as Canadians. I have a feeling that there are a few things we could do to help in this direction.

We are deciding to give them the franchise. It is a word they do not really understand. So we simply have to say that we are going to give them the vote. For the most part, they are happy about that. There are, of course, some bands who feel they would not exercise that right to vote if they had it and I have a feeling that they will not exercise it for some years. But the Indians are not so slow as some people think they are. They are very intelligent people.

It made me feel proud when I saw so many schools, so many well kept churches, that we really were doing something for them. I want to say this in favour of the Federal Government: that it is taking great interest in the welfare of the Indians today. The schools were, in general, well equipped. In fact, in one respect I thought they were over-equipped, inasmuch as there was a predominance of pictures of our good friend down in Ottawa, the hon.

Walter Harris, rather than pictures of the Prime Minister of Canada or of Her Majesty our gracious Queen.

MR. SALSBERG: Was he framed or unframed?

MR. PRINGLE: Very well framed.

I did note, however, that there was a shortage of maps in those schools, a shortage of things which are more essential than some of these pictures. I know hon. members must be rather tired of listening to speeches about the Indians, but this was a great thing for me in my riding. In the two counties of Addington and Frontenac we have communities of "Indians," as hon. members know. We did not need to tell our "Indians" that they have the right to vote. They all vote. Nor do they need to be concerned about the right to go into beverage rooms. They go into beverage rooms already, where beverage rooms exist.

The Indians will take their places if given the opportunity. In Cornwall, on the reserve there, over 40 pupils are going into Cornwall daily to the Collegiate. Over 10 per cent. of the employees in the Indian Affairs Branch at Ottawa are Indians, which I think is a good thing. As fast as the branch can educate them, they are endeavouring to take them into the Indian Affairs Branch. This, to my mind, is a fine thing, indeed.

I want to congratulate Mr. Morris, and others of the original Indian Affairs Committee, who gave us every co-operation possible. In all, I do not know who will learn the most, the Indians or the committee which visited them. It was really enlightening to us to see these fine fairs on the Six-Nation Reserve and going about, and observing the conditions under which the Indians live.

It is unfortunate they do not do much in the way of farming. It is too bad to see some of the finest land in this province, simply growing weeds, unless they rent it to non-Indians, as they frequently do. When that occurs, from this land has come some of the finest

crops in the province. I believe it is simply a matter of education for the Indians. There is no coercion to have them vote; they simply go and vote, and if they want to go to a beverage room, they do that. If they do not want to vote they do not have to.

But they all wanted the committee to recommend to the Federal Government that they be allowed to take "packaged goods" into the reserves. I have nothing to say about that, because it is a federal matter, but I do feel that, the Federal Government in their wisdom, should permit the carriage of packaged liquor goods by the Indians, same as the white people. I see the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) smiling, but may I say that we did not see a drunken Indian on our whole trip.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): How about the Indians? Did they see any of the committee that way?

MR. PRINGLE: No comments, sir. I will not become embroiled in any argument with the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Dent).

I can assure you that every member of the committee tried to do the job for which they were appointed, and, through the untiring efforts of our chairman, we feel that we did a good job and performed our duties to the best of our ability.

MR. SPEAKER: There being no further speeches on the Report of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I declare the discussion ended.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. S. F. LEAVINE (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker: In proceeding in the Budget Debate, and the bills related thereto, so much of the work of this session has been so acceptable to me, a stanza from Edgar A. Guest will summarize my attitude:

So little time on earth to stay.

So little time allowed to play.

It seems too bad fault-finding should
Destroy the splendour of the good.

I would briefly comment on a few items included, and some not included, in which I am particularly interested.

The grants for active hospital beds in use as of December 31st, 1953, the increased statutory payment for indigent patients, and the increase to \$2,000 per bed for charitable institutions, are all commendable. It might be well to review some not-too-well recognized factors, as to why such a move is imperative.

It is granted that a rapid growth in population and marked increase in the scope of medical treatment, as well as an older age group and increased hospitalization plans would make pressure upon existing institutions great, indeed, and call for expansion and rehabilitation. To this must be added a change in our social customs. Much medical work could still be carried on in the home, but the cost of housing, both as to capital cost and maintenance, is so high that actually, in most homes, there is no space for adequate care of the sick. This naturally carries over into the older age group.

In other days the parents would reserve a couple of rooms in their home and turn the remainder of the house over to one of their children. Here, in old and familiar surroundings, they were part of the family, kept themselves occupied with many duties such as gardening, and rounded out a long, happy and useful life. Now, because of shortage of space, they, too, often find their way into an institution. There is a great opportunity for churches, lodges and clubs to get into this field of endeavour.

The statutory payments for indigents may not meet the cost of operating a hospital, but I do not think that it is ever desirable to write a blank cheque. There must be some economic leverage to procure efficiency. In my many years of working in hospitals, I know that it has always been a difficult task to obtain a uniform accounting system. Happily, this is not as true as formerly, and the Department of Health and the hospital associations are to be commended for their work in this regard.

I doubt as to whether we will ever know the whole story of operating a hospital, until some organization, be it government or not, embark deliberately on the construction and operation of a hospital. And a first to be recognized is that such is not just another business. There are services that cannot be bought with money, and it is this spirit that must be captured in the operation of any hospital or charitable institution.

The grants to our universities or schools of higher learning meet with my whole-hearted approval. As one who actively participated in soliciting contributions to my *alma mater*, and now again as a contributor to the centennial of Queen's medical school, I am surprised at the difficulty in collecting funds. In the main, I would attribute the defect to two facts. Firstly, our income taxes limit the amount that is reputedly tax exempt, to 10 per cent. of one's income, and this is not enough. Secondly, the subtraction takes place at the wrong end of the book-keeping. You subtract it from your income and then compute your tax. If you computed your tax without subtractions, and then deducted your charitable exemptions from the tax payable, it would make a great difference, and stimulate charitable giving again. Also, there is a widespread belief in many communities that the proper way to raise money is as a tax levy. Frankly, I am adverse to giving twice and still believe that the idea expressed the other day by the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs that ability to pay is the correct practice.

The programme the hon. Minister of Public Welfare first announced on February 22nd, 1954, on rehabilitation work is impressive and laudable. The fact that the initial study is to include the Counties of Wellington, Peel, Halton and my own County of Waterloo seems reasonable. These counties will provide material in the four departments, namely: Health, Welfare, Education and Labour. From my own experience, I know the complexity of the problem and know a number of cases falling under the jurisdiction of

each department. This is a work about which I can be most enthusiastic. I know full well that with reasonable effort it is bound to succeed, and the dividends in happiness and productivity will exceed the most optimistic expectations of the sponsors. A happy vocation is much more important than a pension, no matter how laudable the last may be. I speak with some personal knowledge on the subject, for my paternal grandfather was blind and deaf at an early age, and was known as "Blind Joe" in the counties of Leeds and Frontenac. He made a meagre living and was happy until a ripe old age. Might I state that chronological age is no valid base for retirement.

I will mention a subject that involves the spending of some money but is of vast importance in my own riding. I refer to the advertising of the movie theatres. The *Kitchener-Waterloo Record* is a family paper and an excellent one. They are perturbed by the tendency of taking their directives from the Toronto office of theatres. While I am not a theatre-goer, I must admit I wholeheartedly subscribe to the move to clean up the pernicious advertising. I hope that the assurance that the following announcement be made in a special column of the *Telegram*, "Ontario movie censor O. J. Silverthorne has ordered stricter application of theatre and exchange advertising regulations will be strictly enforced." I consider the whole practice is likely to be the death blow to a sick business, and one which under ordinary circumstances is capable of immense good.

Asking for some latitude, Mr. Speaker, I propose to deal with a subject of great interest in my riding, namely the check-off. I am told the first check-off in Canada was in Nova Scotia, and it was for church dues, sponsored by the Presbyterian and Catholic Churches of Cape Breton. I think we will admit that was a very commendable procedure. On returning to Toronto, after obtaining that information, I enlisted the help of a particularly efficient civil servant to get me the Statutes of Nova Scotia for the year

1900. It is a most interesting volume but I did not find a clue to the check-off. The same civil servant suggested the national headquarters of one of our better known churches and find out what they knew. This appears to be the fact in Springhill, Nova Scotia, there is a practice that the mines do collect church dues not only for the Presbyterians and Roman Catholics but thankfully also for the Anglicans and Baptists. I suppose it was only an omission that the United Church was not mentioned.

Certainly the motive was of the best. I find the great and indispensable farming industry asking for what amounts to a check-off. It is a worthy cause, and I am prepared to support it, if a majority of those concerned favour it. Labour in my own riding is worthy, and they are not among those who were so obnoxious to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour. I can see nothing particularly wrong with the idea. I admit management believe it is a matter for negotiations; they are entitled to their opinion. In our local Federated Charities drive deductions are made by employers, and it would seem only just that a worker could make an assignment of dues for a specific purpose. While I am not committed on this subject, I have expressed myself as not being adverse, provided it was not to mean a vote to defeat a good government. I would rather think that management would have less objection if the unions were corporate bodies, and frankly, I think as organizations grow in stature both as to numbers and influence, there should be no great objection to incorporation.

I would like to mention something which has been under discussion briefly in regard to the Health Estimates, having to do with the expenditure of some \$285,000 for pre-natal examination.

Obviously I am not speaking on behalf of the government, I am speaking as one who practices medicine, even if though this particular phase of my activities is somewhat on the decline.

I may say it is my impression—and is confirmed by my colleagues—there has

been no definite stage at which patients appear for examination.

I rather suspect that a great campaign has borne fruit, a campaign which has gone on for a period of 10 or 15 years, to get the patients to the physicians earlier. Therefore, in my experience, as I see it, I see no great difference, but my colleagues tell me it is very definitely improved, and they point out that so great is it, that sometimes you even see the patients in the doubtful stages.

There is a general agreement, I think, amongst all the people with whom I have spoken that a great section of this particular service—which is not, over all, perhaps too great in importance, but for whom we are desirous of seeing that they get the best possible service—and that is, the unmarried mothers. They certainly come in for examination and treatment at an earlier age, and I think that arrangement is all too the good.

It is pointed out to me also, that there is still in the practice of medicine some 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. of maternity patients who are not in a position to pay, and the only fee collectable, is the \$5, which is the total sum received for the service. I am not saying whether that should or should not be so. As to whether they receive credit for the \$5 the province has paid, if you mean a receipt showing that the \$5 has been paid by the province, I would say, "No". I would say that practically all of them receive, for this \$5, the physical examination, and the cost of the Rh factor on blood, or directly in estimation of the final fee, and the total bill at the end takes into the consideration the \$5 which has been paid. So, while it makes no difference to me as to what the government does, or does not do, in this regard, I would say that up to date, they perhaps have received fair value for the service, and I would think that the physician himself, and ultimately the Department of Health will be able to utilize the results of these examinations for very worth-while statistical information.

Personally, in that regard, I would say that I am very certain about this, that the toxemia which arises from their

condition, can be recognized at a much earlier stage.

THOMAS PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, before commencing my remarks with respect to the budget, permit me to express my deep regret at the passing of 3 of our colleagues during this session of the Legislature. Surely this is unprecedented and I want, publicly to extend my sincere sympathy to their families in their bereavement.

I regret particularly the death of one who has been my seat mate during the life of this 24th Legislature, Mr. Gordon MacOdrum. We have lost an able member and this House and his own constituency in particular are the poorer because of his untimely death.

I would like to speak for a few moments about Provincial Revenue, as it has been laid before us in the budget recently presented to the House.

We have heard, both within this House and in the public press and otherwise observations such as this—"All the money you get comes out of the pockets of the people." That is a truism. It does, but it does not come in equal amount from everybody.

I want to analyze the source of revenue, not as a financial expert, or in detail, but in a general way. There are 5 major sources of revenue, and a number of minor ones:

Tax Rental Agreement, \$123 million.

Gasoline and Motor Vehicle Licences, \$103 million.

Succession Duties, \$20 million.

Lands and Forests, and Mining, \$20 million.

Liquor Control Board, \$45 million.

I haven't heard anyone say that we should go to Ottawa and make an agreement which would give Ontario a lesser amount.

GASOLINE TAX

There has been no criticism lately—that will be reserved until election time—of the amount of the gasoline tax. All and more of this money is being spent on roads. It is surely fair to ask those who use them to pay for them and in

the main nobody objects so long as the tax is used for road improvement. If you don't drive a car you don't pay this tax.

LANDS AND FORESTS

In its wisdom the government has a policy with respect to Lands and Forests which gives us a revenue of \$16 million, plus \$4 million for licences, leases, etc. Presumably, another government might change this policy, but the general public directly or indirectly pays very little of this tax.

LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD

Considerable revenue is obtained from this source, but what is the alternative? Would it be the right thing to reduce the price of this commodity, so that the government would collect less revenue? I don't think so. Thousands pay nothing directly, because they don't use the goods sold by the Liquor Control Board. We don't have to contribute to provincial revenue in this way if we choose not to.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

About \$20 million is collected from estates of persons who have died.

It might be of interest to know that 85 per cent. of the estates of people who died in Ontario last year paid no tax. Of the \$20 million collected, half of it was paid by 2 per cent. of these estates which were taxable—a very few paid this tax.

What I want to point out is the fact that such a large percentage of the revenue of the province is not paid by the average citizen.

Most people think of their taxes as the municipal tax and income tax which are paid directly. Ontario does not impose an income tax. The municipal taxes one paid last year would have been 45 per cent. higher if there had been no grants from the Ontario Government.

EXPENDITURES

In the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture there appears an item of \$100,000 for Junior Farmer extension. That is money well spent and I want to mention one activity which is assisted in this way—I refer to the 4-H Club work.

This is a Junior Farmer boys' and girls' work. There are 1,700 clubs in the province with an enrolment in excess of 19,000. Its objectives are to make farm life more attractive and influence farm people to adopt improved practices.

The principles of 4-H Club work is "learn by doing." Each member is responsible for a project—such as calf clubs, swine clubs, poultry, grain, tractor maintenance, etc. The girls' special interests are nutrition clubs, clothing, home furnishing, garden club—names indicate their nature.

These clubs are of immense value and are providing the leadership which is so essential in a country growing as we are at the present time, and so many New Canadians coming amongst us.

In Huron County, 4-H Clubs are being organized in every township and I am pleased to do what I can to assist them.

Last December on the annual "Achievement Night" which is a sort of a graduation ceremony, over 1,000 young people, together with their parents, were present on that occasion to receive the trophies and other awards won throughout the year. This was a most inspiring event and brought great credit to all connected with its preparation.

The organization of this work is in the hands of the agricultural representatives, and entails a tremendous amount of work. In Huron, both the representative and his assistant are out almost every night of the week. These men together with other older men act as club leaders.

The county home economist in charge of girls' work is equally faithful in the discharge of her duties. These people are performing a splendid service to the agricultural community and, if like the armed forces, medals were awarded, it could be said of them they perform a service far beyond the call of duty.

You may be interested to know that the emblem of these clubs is a 4-leaf clover with the letter "H" in each leaf and the motto is: "Head, Heart, Hands, and Health."

HIGHWAY SAFETY

A brief reference to this, as so much has been said on this subject, heretofore.

Education and strict enforcement of the law are two factors which will have some effect.

The Minister of Highways said, when presenting his Estimates, that it was hard to understand why a person could be such a gentleman in the living room and such a "cad" when driving a car—that is the point one can't explain and I would apply a much stronger word than "cad" if parliamentary rules would permit, to describe the conduct of some drivers.

Some \$210,000 is included in the Estimates under the heading of "Safety Publicity" and I think a splendid job is being done to educate the driving public. However, all of us have a responsibility and the kit left on our desks a short time ago, with suggestions for use when we are called upon to speak in public, should be widely used.

"The constant drop of water wears the hardest stone" is an old proverb and it is still true.

It is said that a complete examination of all drivers is impossible, but I have a suggestion to make which I think is practical. Why not have examination centres established throughout the province where a medical check can be made, eyes tested, car tested for mechanical defects and competent examiners on hand to test your driving ability? The OPP could make "spot checks" at any time and require the driver to report to one of these centres for examination. It could be done courteously and with every effort being made to accommodate the person who has been stopped.

I fully believe a plan of this kind is practical and would have a salutary effect. The penalty for failure to report for examination as arranged would result in cancellation of driving privileges.

I have motored from coast to coast and I can truthfully say, that in my opinion, nowhere are highways better marked and with repeated warnings of intersections ahead, curves and other

hazards. I think of one main intersection near my home where there are 7 warning signs within 1,000 feet. Yet more than one fatal accident has occurred at that point.

Special mention must be made of the local paper in my home town of Exeter in its conduct of a safety campaign.

It won both the national and provincial trophies for the promotion of highway safety sponsored by an insurance federation.

By editorials, pictures and other articles it carried on an endless campaign for months.

In a check with the local OPP I found there was a 20 per cent reduction in the number of accidents reported in the area, in the course of the year.

In addition to this safety campaign, the local OPP had increased its patrol services.

My conclusion is this, that education plus strict enforcement will have some effect on the number of accidents on the highways.

Coming from a rural community, we are quite concerned with the concentration of industry along the 60 or 70 mile strip centered on Toronto and bordering Lake Ontario. We want to have something done to spread this activity over a greater area which we believe will result in benefit to all.

The various municipalities have organized an Industrial Advisory Board on a county-wide basis and I may say, townships as well as towns and villages are co-operating. Their duties will consist of co-relating all information as to the county labour pool—existing industries, housing situation, natural advantages and all other information required by industrial prospects. It will publicize the whole county, but it will remain for individual councils or boards of trade to sell their own individual community.

I want to pay tribute to the Industrial Promotions Branch of the Department of Planning and Development for the assistance and guidance given in the creation of this county board. The County Plan is a new idea and is a real example of co-operative effort. Obviously

smaller towns cannot do much in this field on their own, but co-operatively, as a county they can do much. "In union there is strength." Light industry would find a plentiful supply of contented labour, ideal living conditions, no traffic problems, a few minutes from home to work and vice-versa, new modern schools second to none, churches of all denominations and all the amenities of city life. Nearly every town has artificial ice rinks for winter sports. Nearby are lakeside resorts for summer living and I might add, we expect pretty soon to have that last natural lakefront summer playground developed for the enjoyment of all the people. I refer to what is known as the Pinery stretching along the shore of Lake Huron south from Grand Bend for about 10 miles.

We anticipate definite action to acquire this in the near future, through the provisions of the Parks Act introduced here this session.

In conclusion may I say that the budget of 1954 is outstanding in this respect:

There are no new taxes—petty nuisance taxes are avoided such as are in existence in many other jurisdictions.

As I pointed out we have 5 major sources of revenue, a great proportion of which does not affect the average citizen.

On the other hand, the use to which it is put is a sincere attempt to lighten the burden of all the people in obtaining those services which must come from the state.

Particularly do I like the term used by the Prime Minister, "Human Betterment."

To this end he has earmarked approximately \$150 million for the advancement of the causes of Education, Health and Public Welfare.

This is surely a foundation on which to build a strong Ontario—the aim and purpose of this government.

MR. C. H. LYONS (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, each day that I sit in this Legislature I am rewarded by being able to study the diligence and

constancy that you apply to the task of performing your duties as Speaker.

And it does require diligence and constancy, to repeat, day after day, what might be considered routine matters, such as the prayers you pronounce each day, and still have them appear as though they are a brand new text, each time that you are ushered into this House—and that you are pronouncing them to a brand new audience each time.

I am certain that all those within sound of my voice, hope that you will be spared for many years in order to continue your important work.

From the Great Lakes to the farthest limits of our northern hinterland, from Quebec to the Manitoba border, this empire known as Ontario is on the march—developing its tremendous resources, harnessing its incalculable power, fashioning a story of progress more exciting than any other spot on the globe today. Across the land we are marching ahead, hand in hand, to the rhythm of the motor, the drill, the hammer and the machine.

Vast iron ore deposits, vital uranium, new prospecting potentials all around us, more precious metals, mountain moving developments, new factories and industries pointing hundreds of new tall chimneys to the skies in the north, the south, the east and the west, the whirling wheels and clattering hammers of industry; all these things sing the song of this great province.

Last year personal income in Ontario reached the colossal figure of \$7.1 billion, an increase of 305 per cent. over the year 1939. Today Ontario's personal income is approximately 40 per cent. of that of the entire Dominion of Canada. It is estimated that every man, woman and child in the province in 1953 received the equivalent of \$1,460.

Combined private and public investment in Ontario last year reached \$2 1/10 billion. This type of investment in Ontario is now 38 per cent. of the Dominion's total. Of this, \$2 1/10 billion, only \$403 million is to be attributed to institutional services and direct government spending, while

primary industry and the construction industry accounted for \$198.3 million, manufacturing accounted for \$457.2 million, utilities \$454.8 million, trade, finance and commercial services \$182.7 million, and residential housing \$358.5 million.

Under the impact of this dynamic expansion, the hon. Provincial Treasurer finds himself obliged to cope with increased expenditures all along the line. The total bill for education will rise to \$79.6 million this year—an increase of \$7 million. Likewise, the expanded programme of health services will increase \$2.4 million over last year to a total of \$48.3 million, and public welfare will command an expenditure of \$26.8 million. In the Highways Department the proposed capital expenditure for 1954-1955 is \$65 million. Maintenance and administration expenses will require an additional \$40,763,000, while the Municipal Roads Branch will require \$18,584,000—making the total Highways expenditure \$124,347,000 before allocating the \$21½ million in the Highway Reserve Account.

To municipalities, under a revised grant system, and to local school boards and associated agencies, there will be paid in the current fiscal year an estimated \$134 million. A large part of this huge assistance is a straight endeavour on the part of this government to hold down the municipal tax bills of our citizens. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs sponsored legislation whereby the amount of this assistance will be plainly shown on municipal tax bills, so that our citizens will be fully aware of the part this government is playing.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer rose in this House to present his first budget 11 years ago, he visualized the titanic increases which are represented by today's totals? Last year, when he presented his budget, he quite openly announced that he was exercising his native caution and was trying to foresee the possibility of a slackening in the pulse of business throughout the province—that caution, sir, was not warranted. He predicted

net ordinary revenue of the government for the year at \$334,548,000, but due to the outstanding leadership of the people of this province by their government, and the great optimism created by such good leadership, expenditures by the people in certain lines of commodities actually expanded beyond his Estimates—and he was able to report a surplus for the year now ending of \$58,454,000. What did the hon. Provincial Treasurer do with that surplus?

First, he placed \$40 million in the Highway Reserve Account, then he applied \$18 million to the Sinking Fund, thereby reducing the amount of capital expenditures debt, or, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer so aptly said in the House himself: "I paid off the mortgage on Old Man Ontario's farm."

What a man! I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if I owned an enterprise doing \$350 million worth of business a year, and I knew of a man who could make \$58 million for me, I state most emphatically that the first thing I would attempt to do would be to hire that man—even if I had to pay him as much as the Province of Ontario pays him.

During his term as Provincial Treasurer over the past 11 years, the hon. Minister has seen the physical assets of this province increase by \$467 million. That amount represents the actual value of new highways, buildings, conservation projects and rural power extensions. But the most amazing feature of this great expansion is the fact that 65 per cent. of its cost has been paid for out of yearly surpluses over ordinary expenditures. Now in the language of a business man, surplus means only one thing—it means the profit that is set ahead after all operating expenses are paid. In a commercial business this surplus is used either as additional working capital or it is ploughed back into the business in the form of capital expenditures to provide new plant and equipment in order to keep up with the expansion of its business. And here we see the hon. Provincial Treasurer adhering to the same businesslike principles—simply tearing his hair to keep up with the great

expansion in this province. Last year it meant construction of the new Workmen's Compensation Board building. An addition to Macdonald Institute at the Ontario Agricultural College, the food terminal building at Etobicoke, the Lands and Forests Research building at Maple, agricultural schools at Ridgetown and Kemptville, new registry office for the Attorney-General's Department at Sudbury, the chief forest ranger's headquarters at Sault Ste. Marie, to name a few. This year it will mean a new demonstration farm at New Liskeard. A new registry office building for the Attorney-General at North Bay, an additional 25 housing units for members of the Ontario Provincial Police, more office space for the Department of Highways at Cochrane and Owen Sound, a new office building for the Mines Department at Swastika, a new reception centre at Niagara Falls for the Department of Travel and Publicity; expenditures at the school for the deaf, the school for the blind, teachers' colleges, hospitals and reform institutions, plus all the expenditures on highways, schools, hospitals, welfare buildings, etc.

What a man! What a government! I only wish that a copy of this budget could be sent to every single Communist in the world today, and then there would not be any Communists. It isn't any wonder that this government has so little opposition in this House. Old Man Ontario does not hire a man to do a job like the hon. Prime Minister is doing, and then hire someone else to hinder him. And believe me, sir, the hon. Prime Minister can be Old Man Ontario's hired man just as long as he wants to be.

Now, sir, it is difficult for me to utter a discordant note in the presence of such delightful symphony. Yet, you yourself know, Mr. Speaker, from a strictly vocational point of view, of course, there are many pitfalls on the path to paradise.

Whilst the economic sea appears calm and unruffled on the surface, a few shoals are commencing to appear ahead. Farm prices have been receding, sales of farm implements, textiles, electrical

appliances and steel have slowed down considerably. A few months ago the business decline appeared to be a phase of inventory adjustment brought about at manufacturers' level. Consumer spending was still high. But sales at consumer level have been slipping more recently. They dropped 2½ per cent. in Ontario in the month of January. Carloadings—a usually reliable barometer of industrial activity—dropped 11.2 per cent.

Bank loans are declining. There was a drop of \$56 million in ordinary loans in the last quarter of 1953, compared with an increase of \$18 million in the fourth quarter of 1952.

Canada's position as an exporter is becoming weakened because our quotations are higher than those of our competitors. With our limited markets at home we can't permit that to continue.

Assertions that everything is all right, or must be all right shortly, will not help the economic position of this country. Everything is quite obviously not all right. Contraction of business is already becoming serious.

The Federal Government at Ottawa, which is basing its opinion that things will be all right, on its estimate of capital expenditures, will find too late that its opinion can be wrong. Capital expenditures is the most elusive bird in the forest. Capital expenditures can be withheld at the eleventh hour. Two things are certain:

1. New capital expenditures are rarely undertaken when demand for products is declining.

2. New capital expenditures are rarely undertaken when lower prices and lower costs are anticipated. The investor invariably waits for the better bargain.

There is no sense in retreating from one fading hope to another. We must subject ourselves to the discipline of facts.

There is only one way to bring prices down and send values up. More productivity per man hour. Any trend

towards less effort and less efficiency is serious.

Both management and labour bear a heavy responsibility to see this is done.

No act of government can increase the national wealth, or raise the living standards of the people, unless that act helps to bring about a higher productivity per man hour. Only by higher production of goods and services per man hour can we provide higher wages, shorter hours, longer vacations, and still retain our export markets.

Every labour leader in the land knows that if a tailor who is earning \$1.00 per hour can make a suit of clothes in 20 hours, that \$20 is added to the cost of the suit. But if the tailor takes 40 hours to make the suit, then \$40 is added to its cost. It is as simple as that: 2 plus 2 makes 4 whether Einstein says it, or Lyons. On the other hand, working men generally can not be blamed for opposing gross inequities or inequalities.

Workers on piece-work often go slow because they fear that if they go fast their rate of pay per piece will be cut down, and they will find themselves just where they were so far as earnings are concerned. Such things have happened all too frequently in the past.

There is a small core of wilful men both in the ranks of labour and of management, who are being dragged into the last half of the 20th century, screaming and kicking. They are still fighting their Boer War. To these I say: Both sides must make certain that all rules which hold a man down to doing half a man's work must be abolished. We can't build a strong Canada with half-men.

We must have job security in Canada. We must strive to give our workers continuous employment. Where that is not possible we must develop a sane, sensible programme for more adequate unemployment insurance.

In a nation where the ballot box is still the deciding factor in the direction of our economy, it would appear that greater good would result through education rather than opposition to suggestions for closer co-operation.

LANDS AND FORESTS

And now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests for presenting to this House his White Paper on forestry which, as he so aptly said, constitutes a blueprint for the future management and welfare of that great natural resource. Administration of this large and complex field is of prime importance to all of us here, as well as to future generations.

It gave me great pleasure to hear the hon. Minister—with a gesture of modesty so characteristic of Ministers of Mr. Frost's Cabinet—credit the foundation of this work to the hon. member for Peterborough under whose regime as Minister of Lands and Forests, it started.

The hon. Minister's appreciation of the part played by members of his departmental staff is also worth noting. I can only say to all of those who have contributed to that monumental work, well done gentlemen, well done.

The first thing we have to learn here in Ontario regarding our forest resources is, that they are not what they used to be. Today we are at the crossroads in regard to those resources. The huge stands of white and red pine upon which the saw-milling industry depended in the past are gone. True it is that there are still certain areas controlled by a few mills that will keep those mills operating for a short period into the future: but, as the hon. Minister stated when presenting his White Paper, these will last no longer than about 17 years. It is my personal opinion that some of them will succumb much sooner than 17 years. In less than a century the once great pineries of this province have gone the way of the buffalo and the carrier pigeon.

The lumber industry in Ontario commenced in a modest way in the first half of the last century, being then confined to the lower Ottawa Valley and a fringe along the front of Lakes Ontario and Erie. It expanded rapidly up the Ottawa, and in the latter half of the century covered Southern Ontario and progressed up through the Parry Sound district, along the north shore of Lake

Huron to Sault Ste. Marie. This rapid development was due in large part to the settlement and building up of the mid-western portion of the United States; around the turn of the century the vast Minnesota lumbering operations projected themselves across the border to the white pine and red pine forests of the Great Lakes, and commenced eating their way eastward.

It is timely to note that the history of forest operations in this province, with few exceptions, has been that of, "cut out, and get out."

The white pine stands of the Ottawa Valley now support only a handful of operators, whereas in the hey-day of that area over 1 billion feet of white pine were produced per year. It will take upward of half a century to restore the pine industry of that area—and then only if vigorous and comprehensive restorative measures are taken.

The white pine and red pine forests of the Georgian Bay district are no more, and it is doubtful if they are likely to be, or indeed ever can be, restored in any measure approaching the density or quality of the original stands. They, along with the equally valuable stands of the north shore of Lake Huron, disappeared in about 3 decades, with a very considerable portion of the raw product exported to the United States in the form of unprocessed logs.

The Trent Valley watershed and adjacent areas, once one of the finest white pine areas in the world, now present hundreds of thousands of acres of wasteland as mute testimony to man's extravagant methods of exploitation.

There were large areas of white and red pine west of the Great Lakes, but these too have disappeared. A few small areas remain, only because of their inaccessibility under the methods practiced when the stands surrounding them were removed.

Now sir, for those who may think that the Canadian timber operator was an especially devastating fiend, let me make a comparison between cutting operations in Ontario and those in northern Michigan where approximately the same stands and conditions of pine existed.

The peak of our production in Ontario came about 1908—at least the highest Ontario cut ever recorded was in the year 1908, when 800 million feet were sawn from Crown lands. Then followed a steady yearly decline until the total cut in 1951 amounted to only 150 million feet.

The peak of production in northern Michigan seems to have occurred a few years sooner than it did in Ontario. Practically all lumber cut west of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, was shipped by water and had to pass through the ship canal at the Soo. Here we find that the year of peak shipments was 1899, when 723 million feet of pine passed through the Soo Canal on its way to market. Then the decline commenced; in 1906 shipments had dropped from 723 million feet to 447 million; in 1915 it dropped below 100 million; and by 1924 it had fallen below 12 million.

This, Sir, tells the story of lumbering in the early part of this century, and it applies with equal force to both Ontario and Michigan, the two great pine-producing areas of the continent. But, Mr. Speaker, cutting operations are only part of the sad story of forest decimation; there have been many ills which have contributed to our present distress.

Settlement of lands which were unfit for cultivation, together with the settlement which invariably followed in the wake of lumber operations, resulted in disastrous fires by those engaged in clearing the land. These vast conflagrations completed the ruin of the residual forests left after the white and red pine had been removed. To replace these forests and to rehabilitate the soil and the streams will be a long and costly process, but nevertheless we must guard against handing down to posterity our remaining forests in a similar condition.

And now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to make another comparison of conditions between Ontario and Michigan. Fires swept through northern Michigan during most of the early years of this century too—between 1913 and 1918 they occurred every year—one of the most memorable blazes occurring in 1918. This disastrous fire, which started south

of Duluth, snuffed out many lives. The years 1920, 1922, 1923 and 1925 saw bad fires throughout most of the northern state; and in 1926 occurred the last great conflagration, which wiped out the entire watersheds of the French River, the Knife, the Beaver, the Baptism, the Manitou and the Cross Rivers. Not until after that demoralizing disaster were better methods, more vigilance and newer fire-fighting equipment employed in that state. Even as late as the middle 1930's, I noticed, while driving through the area along the scenic coast road of the south shore of Lake Superior, that a continuous forest of blackened stumps stretched for mile after bleak mile.

During the years 1921, 1922 and 1923 vast fires also swept through Northern Ontario. I can well recall the devastating fires at points along the CPR in the White River area during the summer of 1923, at about the time that the UFO Government was being defeated by the forces of the late Hon. G. Howard Ferguson. The chaos attending the attempts of the Forestry Department to fight that fire was unbelievable. Whilst the fire-fighting forces stood by helplessly awaiting equipment, a carload of fire hose would arrive without nozzles; next day the shipment of nozzles would turn up 50 miles away—without any hose. Tents for the fire fighters would be delivered to one railroad station, blankets would arrive at another, and cooking and messing utensils would be delivered to yet a third destination. It was only due to the rugged character of the men and their exhausting efforts that headway was made against the blaze at all.

One of the first acts of the Ferguson Government the following year was to organize the provincial air service and to construct the aircraft hangar at Sault Ste. Marie. From this main base, sub-bases were set up at various points throughout Northern Ontario such as Sudbury, Biscotasing, Gogama, Remi Lake, Fort Frances, Kenora and Oba Lake, to name some of them. Aircraft for the detection and suppression of fires were allocated to each base, together with forest rangers, fire pumps and hose,

and other equipment. This, I believe, was the first such system for fighting forest fires ever set up by any government in the world; and I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in saying that it was instigated by my late father who was then Minister of Lands and Forests in the Ferguson Government.

From that early start—a tremendous step in those days—has grown the present huge and efficient fire-fighting organization. Today this organization is one of the largest and most efficient on the continent, if not in the entire world. Its organization includes the services of 40 aircraft: during the process of fire suppression they provide a rapid means of transportation of men and material to the scene of the fire. The service keeps permanent watch during the fire season from some 320 towers strategically placed throughout the 110 million acres of forest land included in the fire area.

The yearly number of fires which the service is called on to fight averages close to 1,200; and for this purpose it has, among other things, 7,083 pumps, 2,319,000 feet of hose, 1,150 canoes, together with hundreds of trucks, boats, motors, as well as sufficient tents, blankets and utensils to take care of the needs of a brigade of men. Interesting, and most important to the men of the Forest Protection Service is the modern and extensive communications system which spans the province, linked by radio, and supplemented by about 3,500 miles of private telephone line.

So efficient has this organization become that I have no doubt that if a fire were reported to the hon. Minister at this hour, he would simply reach under his desk and push a button; then he would no doubt lean back in his complacency, light a \$2 cigar, and commence to look worried that the fire was not reported extinguished.

Up to the present, Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking of the saw-milling industry and its relationship to white and red pine timber. But a large segment of the industry is dependent upon spruce timber as a source of raw material.

Just what the situation is going to be in regard to the spruce-dependent mills,

I cannot clearly foresee. Today, a large percentage of our publicly-owned accessible forested lands are controlled by the pulp and paper companies.

Too many of Ontario's spruce saw logs are located on these pulpwood concessions, both domestic and export. It is difficult to see how the spruce-dependent saw-mills can continue to exist without access to these logs.

It is true that many saw-mill operators did not provide themselves with limits while they were available and are largely to blame for the situation in which they now find themselves. It is the citizens of Ontario, however, who will be the chief sufferers if we permit these lumbermen to be eliminated by timber starvation in the next 20 years or so.

Although it is true that most of the pulpwood concessions originally provided for the production of saw-logs at the request of the Minister of Lands and Forests, most pulp and paper companies, and pulpwood exporters, are reluctant to divert saw-log material from the production of pulp and paper to the production of lumber.

The traditional relationship between the pulp industry on the one hand and the lumber industry on the other is analogous to the relationship which existed between the cattle herders and the sheep rangers in the good old Wild West days—each accuses the other of despoiling the forest, so they go their separate ways, each disliking the other. Still much patience and an abundance of good faith on behalf of both these parties will be necessary if the saw-milling industry is to survive in Ontario; and if this co-operation is not forthcoming soon, the lumber industry will continue to diminish in importance to such an extent that in the next 20 years or so it will be classed as a minor industry—which would be a major tragedy, not only from the point of the saw-mills themselves but because of the high mortality rate amongst secondary industries dependent upon saw-mills.

And now Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the pulp and paper industry. Unlike the saw-milling industry, the utilization of wood for the

manufacture of pulp did not assume any considerable proportions until after the turn of the century. The fundamental difference between the two types of operation are immediately noticeable. In the case of the lumber industry, most operators considered their mills expendable; the cost of a saw-mill was much lower than the cost of a pulp or paper mill. The saw-mill operator cleaned the timber off his limit and moved on to another tract, usually taking his saw-mill along with him. Due to this convenient arrangement, the lumberman rarely attempted to obtain large tracts of timber land in advance of his requirements.

On the other hand, the pulp-mill operators were confronted with a tremendous capital outlay, roughly equivalent to from \$80,000 to \$90,000 for each ton of daily production. On this basis a 500-ton mill would cost about \$40 million to \$50 million—this figure of course is much higher today. Therefore it was a matter of great concern to them to obtain extremely large areas of wooded lands to maintain their mills in perpetual operation. As a result of this policy, together with their keen bargaining ability, a large percentage of all the accessible publicly-owned forested lands are in their hands.

As I just stated, Mr. Speaker, pulpwood operations did not commence in this province until the turn of the century, yet by the year 1951 the annual production of pulpwood was approximately 3 million cords. This, Sir, places the cropping of pulpwood close to the position of the pine industry in the year 1908—it may be perilously close to the peak of what the forests will stand. The damage is not yet irreparable, but the present state of our former pine stands indicates the need for amended treatment of our spruce stands.

The steps to be taken, as outlined in the hon. Minister's White Paper, are of great encouragement to me; yet I can foresee the day when a government might find it feasible to call back to the Crown all outstanding concessions, so that the areas could be re-grouped and re-allotted on a more uniform basis,

commensurate with the actual requirements of the operators, and still permit them to operate forever. It is my personal opinion that where concessions are larger than required, the incentive for fullest utilization of wood, on the area, is absent.

The pulp and paper industry in Ontario has not advanced nearly as far as elsewhere in Canada in the utilization of species other than spruce. This may be due to the relatively low carrying charges on limits, as well as the lack of a down payment at the time they were leased, or to the relatively low stumpage rates on spruce, which is undoubtedly the most desirable species from the standpoint of the pulp and paper maker. The ratio of jack pine to other species used in Quebec is more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ times that in Ontario.

The cutting of quantities far beyond the actual annual growth under current silvicultural practices is common on many limits, particularly amongst the export group. Conversely, other large areas of limits are not developed to an extent approaching their possible sustained yield because the present manufacturing capacity of the limit holders concerned cannot utilize the annual growth of such large areas.

We have learned in practice that annual depletion cannot exceed annual growth if our forests are to be maintained. Therefore cutting operations must be carried out under expert supervision, in some places by selective cutting, in others by clear cutting. No large areas can be left barren. Harvesting must be balanced so that trees are growing in various stages of maturity on every part of the limit except where cutting is actually under-way. Also, cutting should be planned to leave conditions suitable for the regeneration of valuable species.

This regeneration process, or "tree farming" as it is sometimes called, means more than just planting. It means, first, gathering cones, drying them and extracting the seed, cold storing, raising seedlings to plant, and then planting them. It means protecting the young trees from disease; it means fighting

fires. It involves choosing the proper soil, controlling soil dessication, upgrading seed-bed conditions, seed-tree spacing and otherwise intensifying tree culture. But all this is necessary if we are to save our forests.

Sometimes we tend to forget that our biggest industry is still based on the nation's trees. Canada's pulp and paper industry pays more workers more wages, and has more capital invested, than any other business in Canada.

I made reference a few moments ago to the disappearance of the buffalo and the carrier pigeon. One of the last strongholds of the carrier pigeon was in the region of Petoskey, Mich., a district about 125 miles south and west of Sault Ste. Marie. Up to 25 years ago there were still people in that district who could recount tales of this marvellous bird; they could describe the annual slaughter that took place throughout the orchards and wooded lands of the district.

The rookeries were closely watched until a day or two before the young birds were sufficiently developed to be able to fly. Then large gangs would go out in the early dusk, set bonfires ablaze, shout and yell, pound the tree trunks with clubs, create an unbearable noise by beating sticks against tin cans or metal containers. This din so frightened the young pigeons that they scrambled out of the nests, and, being unable to fly, became an easy prey for the harvesters, who quickly despatched them, threw them into large containers and carted them off to market.

Today if the older Indians of the district are questioned about the disappearance of the carrier pigeons they are liable to tell you that one dark cloudy afternoon the birds flew away over the horizon and were never able to find their way back again. Some may tell you that they joined the buffalo far over the horizon and they will never return.

Let us be thankful, Sir, that in the case of our forests, we know that, with the type of handling which this government proposes to lend to them, they can and will be prevented from disappearing over the horizon.

I wish to thank the hon. Minister of Education for the good things he has blessed my riding with. He has been most generous with grants for new school construction, and we are hopeful that we will again be on his list to partake of a portion of the \$61.4 million in grants during the coming year.

The hon. Minister of Health has been a tower of strength to the two hospitals in Sault Ste. Marie as well as the Red Cross outposts at Hornepayne and Haunts Junction. It is to be hoped that hospital construction in the Soo will be able to remain reasonably static for a short period of time at least.

The hon. Minister of Public Welfare spear-headed construction of the first and one of the finest homes for the aged that is to be found in the province, and, arrangements have been made to add to its capacity this coming summer.

The various provincial welfare services administered by the hon. Minister of Public Welfare covering old age assistance, blind persons' allowances, mothers' allowances, and public assistance for unemployed persons, brings the staff of his department into direct touch with many residents of my riding. I wish to take this opportunity of commending him on the outstanding job they are doing. Not only does this apply to members of the staff housed here in Toronto, it applies with equal force to those clothed with the responsibility of carrying out the work of his department in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie.

MINES

And now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Mines, not only on behalf of the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, but on behalf of all of Northern Ontario, for his interest in the development of mining access roads in the north.

The broad over-all plan for mining access roads entails the linking up of existing bush roads, district roads, and highways, so that northern municipalities and whole areas, which are now cut off from normal communication with each other and with the outside world, may be linked with the rest of the prov-

ince. These roads, Sir, do not require to be standard specification highways, they require to be only what I have called them—"access roads." It will be seen by the Preliminary Report of the Department of Mines for the 12-month period ending December 31st, 1953, that these roads can be constructed for a fraction of the cost of standard provincial highways.

When I listen to the consistency with which Northern Ontario members of this Legislature dwell upon the subject of roads and highways, I often feel that hon. members from the southern areas must think that we all have one-track minds. Yet the fact is that many small tightly corseted areas are growing up in the north, and the growth is causing them understandable pain. Now Sir, there is a certain pain-killer that can assuage this pain, if the government will administer it in somewhat larger doses and at slightly closer intervals.

It must be remembered that this government, and this Legislature, are the nerve centre and the pulsing heart of a great province. Blood must be pumped not only into the compact core of the body, but to the very extremities that stretch far beyond the compact core. In the case of Northern Ontario, this life blood consists of connecting roads—you may call them access roads, or colonization roads, or any other name you wish providing they are outlets.

Much of the great and growing northern empire has been opened to human occupation within the working lifetime of men now no more than middle-aged. Towns which possess every amenity of urban living are still without highways or railways connecting them with "the outside," and depend on air service for their contact with the world.

Last year the hon. Provincial Treasurer said in his Budget Speech that he wouldn't countenance any small-scale nibbling of highways construction: and, whilst we in the north are always thankful for any attempt to unlock our great store-house, it does seem to me that the construction of these access roads is following the pattern of the little boy who wanted to cut off his dog's tail—

but he didn't want to hurt the dog—so he cut it off an inch at a time.

Surely Sir, this great province doing \$350 million worth of business a year and making \$58½ million profit can afford to underwrite a powerful growing community like Northern Ontario that is destined to become the prime money-maker of the future.

Now, Sir, on page 52 of the Budget Report, under the heading of "Capital Highways Expenditures," there is an item which reads, "Mining Access Roads—\$1 million." On page 53 is another item headed, "Unallocated amount in Highway Reserve Account—\$21½ million." It occurred to me that, with the assistance of the Provincial Auditor, the item on page 52 might be increased from \$1 million to \$5 million; the item on page 53 would then be automatically reduced from \$21½ million to \$17½ million—and the books would still balance.

Mixed up with all the other millions as it is, this item of \$1 million must feel somewhat like the ham sandwich that found itself at the champagne banquet.

HIGHWAYS

And now Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a man who has an enviable record of achievement, not only in Northern Ontario but throughout the entire province—the Hon. Minister of Highways.

Never in the history of Sault Ste. Marie have we been participants in a highway programme of such magnitude and of such promise. Highway work is actually involved on 40 miles of Trans-Canada Highway within the riding. Appropriations have been made, and work is under way in the Michipicoten area. The highway which the entire world has been holding its breath to hear about, the famous Lake Superior Highway, is under actual construction, and by late summer will have broken through one of the wild rock barriers which has hitherto been such a formidable obstacle to its construction; the burning desire that has smouldered in the hearts of men for a third of a century has finally taken materialistic form.

Sir, I have heard the ugly charges of brain-washing, and McCarthyism, levelled against the hon. Minister, and attributed to the hon. member from Kenora. I submit, Sir, that the only McCarthyism apparent to me is the type practiced by the hon. member for Kenora himself. I am not, Mr. Speaker, comparing the hon. member with United States Senator Joseph McCarthy, but with another well-known member of the McCarthy family—Charlie McCarthy—and I should like to ask the hon. member from Kenora who the Edgar Bergen is who pulls the strings that make his wings flap and his jaws waggle.

Why does not the hon. member cease his subterfuge and come out in the open and tell this House who is the group of puppeteers that is pulling the wires? If these charges are being made on the hon. member's own volition, then I ask to be delivered from the most terrible tragedy in existence—energetic ignorance. There is nothing as dangerous, Sir, as a man with a little knowledge; and I am convinced that, even at this late hour, the hon. member wishes he could shut his mouth and make it retroactive. He is attacking a man who will pluck the spear from his very wounds, and will turn around and slay his adversaries with the same weapon.

And now Sir, because I am unable to add one cubit to the already towering stature of the hon. Minister, I beg your gracious permission to resume my seat.

MR. S. J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget Debate, I would like again to congratulate you on the efficient and impartial way you interpret the rules of order and preside over the deliberations of this Assembly.

I would like, too, to extend a welcome to our comparatively new members and say how much we appreciate the contribution they are making. While we welcome new blood in this Legislature, we do regret that so often it comes as the result of our losing valued and highly esteemed members. I am sure we have all been awed by the passing of 4 of the highly respected members of this

body in only a few short months and we feel keenly the loss of their help and comradeship.

Too, I am sure I speak for all members of this Legislature when I say that we regret that for many months now, our colleague—Hon. F. S. Thomas of Elgin, has been incapacitated through illness. I would like him to know that he is not forgotten by his colleagues here and that we are wishing him a speedy recovery. Only 10 days ago I called on Mr. Thomas and had a very nice visit with him. I found him greatly improved and taking a keen interest in what was going on in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the record of this government has been commendable and assuredly has met with the recent approval of many of the citizens of this province as evidenced in the by-elections at Niagara Falls and Simcoe County.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, as a farmer, representing a riding largely rural I feel I should say something on behalf of the rural people of Ontario, or more precisely the agricultural industry of this province.

We have all, at times, heard it stated that agriculture was the basic industry of this province or this country, and that if our agricultural industry were not prosperous, that it would have a detrimental effect on our whole economic structure. In spite of the growing importance of our mining, and other industries in this province, if we take into account the number of people engaged in the production, the processing and distribution of agricultural products, we will find that agriculture is still the basic and most important industry of this province. I think, Mr. Speaker, we can go one step farther and say that if part of our agricultural industry is suffering that as a result the whole industry is not going to flourish and such is the case I believe at present.

There seems to be an inverse ratio between what the farmer gets for his produce and what he must pay for every commodity he buys, and more particularly, at present farm implements

which comprise a very large item in the farmers' budget, while the price of farm produce has steadily declined over the last 2 years there has been a steady increase in the price of every commodity he has to buy. In short, there is too great a spread between what the producer is getting for his produce and what the consumer in the urban centre is paying for the delivered product.

If we look at the values of farm properties today, we will find that farm real estate is selling at less than it was 30 years ago. I bought a farm in the County of Renfrew 30 years ago this spring for \$20,000. Since then, on the farm, I erected a new steel-clad barn and several other outbuildings. Today, if I were to put that farm up for sale, I would have to take a great deal less than what I paid for it in 1923. The value of every other type of real estate in this province has been greatly enhanced during that length of time, and I submit there is something wrong when the values of farm properties have depreciated to such an extent.

Now a word for our rural municipal governments. I have before me a schedule of the unconditional grants to be paid to municipalities in Renfrew County, amounting to \$59,000 for urban and \$46,680 for rural municipalities, which at first glance appears to be, if figured on a percentage basis, very favourable to our rural districts. No town in our county receives more than \$2 per capita and I take it that these figures would hold good approximately for all counties like mine with a large rural population. We are all aware that municipal governments and more particularly rural municipal governments have only one way of raising revenue, a direct mill rate on the assessable property. Now I would like to assure the Minister of Municipal Affairs that our municipal governments will be very grateful for this assistance, and that it will be faithfully applied. I think this is one way of equalizing the money collected by indirect taxation, and returning a portion of it to where it belongs.

If it were not for the market made available by our agriculture industry, such gigantic industries as Massey-Harris out here on King St. in Toronto, and many others I could mention could not exist and carry on business. The farmer provides the market but derives nothing directly from taxes paid by such large corporations or their employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if a farmer wants to install a water system, or some means of fire protection, he must pay 100 per cent. of the cost himself. And many of our rural municipalities where small unincorporated villages are located have been particularly hard hit. It has not been possible to provide organized fire protection, and as a result much higher fire-insurance premiums must be paid. In most of these cases no grant has been paid for fire protection prior to this year which explains the higher percentage increase. The farmer must pay his school rates both elementary and secondary, pay for his hydro rates, his municipal tax and every other tax the same as the urban dweller. I don't know what yardstick was used in compiling these grants, but I feel there is too great a spread between the \$1.50 paid in rural Ontario and the \$4 paid in large urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to this House that the agricultural industry of this province is not flourishing. The value of farm properties except those immediately adjacent to large urban centres is below what it was 30 years ago, while the values of all other real estate have been greatly enhanced. If the buying power of the rural population is reduced, and it has been, the reaction will shortly be felt in every industrial centre in the province. I am not advocating the paying of subsidies as a solution to our agricultural problems, but I would like to see more assistance provided for the rural sections of this province, and more money provided in our Provincial Budget for our agricultural industry to assist the farmers to solve their own problems and do a better, and more economical job of producing for the whole province made possible by providing more county agri-

cultural representatives, supplying more leadership and guidance to our agricultural people.

All departments of this government are important to the well-being of our province, but some departments affect, more closely than others, ridings such as the one I have the honour to represent, and it is with only a few of those that I propose to deal.

I believe that one of the shortcomings of this government has been its failure to let the people of the province know what has been done and why; and to explain more precisely why it has been impossible or undesirable to do certain things. I know there are several pamphlets and circulars sent out, but often these do not reach the masses of the rank-and-file of our citizens. I feel that a greater use might be made of radio and our local papers as a medium of enlightening the people of this province.

First of all, I would like to mention the Department of Education because I feel it is one of our most important, if not the most important department of government. As I stated last year, I think this province is indeed fortunate to have a man of the calibre, the wide experience and practical experience of Dr. Dunlop heading our Department of Education. Dr. Dunlop from experience knows, I believe, the educational needs of our province right from the elementary schools to the highest level of our colleges and universities, as few men in this province do. He not only understands our educational problems, but he has the courage to advocate and put into effect policies which he believes to be in the best interests of our schools, even when he realizes that such policies are going to be unpopular and receive criticism. I feel he is trying to do the most good possible for the most people in this province with the money we have available for educational needs.

I believe that if the people, the taxpayers of this province, were better informed as to the great increase in our school population, necessitating as it does the provision of hundreds of new classrooms each year to accommodate these additional pupils, that they would

not feel that our Minister of Education was taking an arbitrary stand when he states that we cannot subsidize the building of auditoriums, gymnasiums and other non-essential adjuncts of our schools, desirable as they may be. I believe that our Minister of Education is to be commended for the stand he has taken and for a job well done.

As we all know, there has been a great dearth of teachers in this province. The teaching profession is, I am sure we are all agreed, one of the most important professions, but for several years too few of our young people have been entering the profession to keep up the supply of trained teachers needed. The only way we can correct this situation, I believe, is by making the profession more attractive. This can only be done by making provision for adequate salaries and a greater sense of security on retirement. I was glad to see that additional money was provided in the Estimates to bolster the Teachers' Superannuation Fund and provision made through new legislation to improve the Teachers' Superannuation Scheme. I feel that we can go still farther in this direction by providing greater superannuation benefits for retiring teachers, and I might say for retired teachers and the dependents of retired teachers, and I would suggest to the Minister that this matter be given further consideration.

Again I say that this government is blessed with having a man like Dr. Dunlop who has had so many honours come his way and who ordinarily might be expected to take life easy, give so freely of his time and experience to this very important department.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am no different than the majority of hon. members of this Legislature, when I say that during the past year, I have had occasion to call on our hon. Minister of Health on very many occasions. During the year 1953, we had a new hospital with provision for 150 beds, which was opened in the Town of Pembroke, and also a wing was added to another of our existing hospitals providing 50 beds. These rather costly undertakings were only made possible because of the very

generous assistance provided by the government of this province, through the Department of Health.

The hon. Minister of Health, on more than one occasion, has paid a visit to my riding to give his valuable advice and assistance to our local hospital boards, and I can assure you this advice was greatly appreciated. I, like many of the other hon. members, have had many problems to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Health. Many of them might have been considered minor problems, but no problem was too small or too large for our energetic Minister to attempt to solve, and he has the faculty of generally coming up with an answer which is satisfactory to all concerned.

I have here an editorial from one of our leading Ontario dailies, which suggests the battle against one of the most dreaded diseases, polio, has been practically won. This, I might say, is good news for a great many of us here in this Legislature. This article also suggests we may be reasonably hopeful that the other dreaded scourge, cancer, may be counteracted within the next 2 or 3 years.

Because of the large and generous grants provided for our cancer clinic here in Toronto, where a great deal of research work has been and will be carried on, a great deal of the credit must go to the Provincial Government and the hon. Minister of Health for the personal interest which he has taken in that clinic. I have been amazed, as I am sure many of the other hon. members of this Legislature have been, at the hon. Minister's apparent inexhaustible energy in dealing with health problems and visiting the respective ridings.

I would like to turn now for a moment to one of the other departments, that of Lands and Forests. I am sure all the hon. members of this Legislature listened with a great deal of interest to the White Paper presented by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. It is, in my opinion, the most far-sighted and far-reaching policy ever attempted by any government of this province. The

people of my riding are particularly interested in what the Department of Lands and Forests is trying to accomplish. The lumbering industry has always been, and is still, one of the leading industries in Renfrew, and we have at the present time, 3 large saw-mills as well as the Eddy Match Company, and the Canada Veneer Co. plant, all dependent upon our forest industry in Pembroke.

Another governmental policy which will make provision for the perpetuation of these industries is of vital concern to the people of my riding. The policy outlined in the hon. Minister's address will have the effect of making available, to these industries, the resources so vitally needed over a long period.

It has only recently been announced that the Eddy Match Company is establishing its head offices for this company in the Town of Pembroke, and an office building costing \$250,000 is being erected. This is as a result of such governmental policy which will ensure that there will be a perpetuity of resources needed in support of these industries and is to be commended by all the citizens of this province.

I was gratified to hear, when the budget was presented, that money had been specifically earmarked for conservation projects, because I feel reforestation is something which has definitely been long overdue in this province. Reforestation should be undertaken in the Ottawa area, and it was enlightening to learn that of 34 million seedling trees, 15 million were supplied for reforestation projects on privately owned lands, from what I can learn. I understand we have reached almost the maximum output in our existing nurseries, and I would like to submit to the government that funds be made available out of the monies voted for this purpose.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that our Estimates have nearly all been passed, but considerable has been provided for Lands and Forests and for the Department of Highways which has not been specifically set aside for one particular project. I would like to submit through the government to the hon. Minister of

Lands and Forests that funds be made available for the extension to existing nurseries, or the building of new ones, to supply the trees needed to reforest both the privately owned and Crown lands in this province, or more particularly, in the older parts of Ontario. I think in Northern Ontario, a policy of regeneration may solve the problem. That land is lying idle at the present time, and is suitable only for the growing of trees.

Some years ago, a provincial Statute was passed vesting authority in our county councils to pass by-laws regulating the growing of trees on privately-owned land. A great many of our county councils today have failed to take advantage of this privilege, and in many other cases, by-laws have not been enforced.

Since such a large percentage of the trees made available are being planted on private lands, I feel the time will come when more drastic measures will of necessity be taken to prohibit the cutting of immature stands of timber on these lands, along the same lines as have been followed in some European countries.

I might draw to the attention of the House that portions of Addington, Frontenac, Hastings and Renfrew Counties are being denuded of the last stands of pine. At the present time, we have large tracts of sub-marginal land in Renfrew County, and I would like to see the government provide funds for a new nursery in our own County of Renfrew.

Renfrew County has always been considered one of the foremost pine—both white and red pine—counties, and I think it is the natural thing to expect that the government would establish a nursery there to provide white and red pine seedlings to be supplied, not only in that area, but over the whole of the province.

In our Department of Highways, we have as hon. Minister, a man with long and varied experience. Long before taking his seat in this Legislature, he took a keen interest in road and highway matters, more especially municipal roads.

He understands our road problems as few men do in this province, and during his term in office as hon. Minister of Highways, he has done much to assist township and county councils in solving those problems.

Perhaps this is the wrong time to make mention of bridge problems, but for many years, we have been endeavouring in Renfrew County to have a bridge across the Ottawa River. It is a project which we have been considering, which would make for better relations between our English and French speaking elements in this country.

During the last year, we have made considerable headway towards the consummation of this project, and have been assured that this government and the Government of Canada at Ottawa that funds will be available for their share of the project as soon as consent is given by the Province of Quebec.

I might say that, when the budget was presented last year, the hon. Prime Minister of this province earmarked a certain amount of money for the construction of that bridge.

Just the evening of the day the budget was presented, the *Ottawa Journal* in bold headlines across the front page, stated: "\$300,000 For The Allumette Island Bridge." I took it upon myself to ascertain where they had authorization for printing that headline, and, I have it on pretty good authority that any time the Province of Quebec is prepared to sign on the dotted line, the Ontario Minister of Highways is prepared to pay Ontario's share, and we appreciate that very much.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: That is quite correct.

MR. HUNT: The only thing holding it up is the reluctance on the part of the Government of the Province of Quebec to make any definite commitment as to what they are prepared to pay, or intend to do.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Highways that we proceed with the

building of the Ontario part of this structure and I am sure that the Government at Ottawa will assist with that undertaking.

Now I come to another part of this little speech. I hesitated to refer to it, but I am almost forced to do so.

I have an editorial from one of our Ontario dailies, which is not always unfriendly to this government, and I would like to quote briefly from the editorial, appearing in the *Ottawa Journal* of March 12th, where it says:

Word from Toronto is that out of \$124 million for highways in Mr. Frost's budget, \$17 million will be for roads in Eastern Ontario. Perhaps it should be added here that when it comes to highways, Eastern Ontario is a sort of Ontario poor farm—not in a class with Western and Central Ontario with their magnificent roads. It is true that some good work has been done recently on some of our Eastern Ontario highways. Nevertheless, it is a fact that Eastern Ontario highways by and large are bad and that the Frost Government has not been notably vigorous in trying to make them better.

I have no hesitation, however, when I say that I am not in agreement with this editorial, but I think it should not be passed by unnoticed.

In the county I represent, there is a small community, and I refer to the Village of Killaloe. Many times since I have been a member of this Legislature, I have been asked: "Just where is Killaloe?"

We have another village which is still more important, about which a very few members of the Legislature have ever heard, and that is the Village of Golden Lake. It is important, because it is the terminal of 3 of our provincial highways. I have with me an Ontario road map and upon it the hon. members will see that Highway No. 41 is shown as running from Picton to Golden Lake. If any hon. member in this House knows where Golden Lake is, I would like him to raise his hand.

Then Highway No. 60 is shown running from Huntsville to Golden Lake and Highway No. 62 from Madoc to Pembroke, but actually it ends up at Golden Lake, as well. Between North Bay and Arnprior, a distance of 200 miles, we have not a single highway linking Highways No. 2 and 7 with Highway 17, which serves the Ottawa Valley. We have lakes and streams which might attract many tourists to that area, and we have many delightful summer resorts.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, to this Legislature, that it is not altogether fair to motorists in Southern Ontario to provide highways, and then terminate them at Golden Lake, a distance of some 20 miles from the nearest provincial highway. The motorist suddenly finds himself at the end of the paved surface, and back in the woods, and he either has to find his own way, or ask someone to direct him.

I have another editorial from the Eganville paper, which is not always too friendly toward this government.

This is from a letter submitted by Mr. J. J. Foran, who was at one time quite prominent in Renfrew South, in fact, he was one of our candidates some years ago in the riding of Renfrew South.

In his letter to the *Eganville Leader* last week, Mr. J. J. Foran, for many years reeve of the village, contends that when the road was built from Eganville to Pembroke it should have been continued as the northern end of Highway No. 41 as first planned, and for which the highway was originally intended by the late hon. E. A. Dunlop. To turn this road back to the county to control and maintain was most unfair, and Mr. Stanley Hunt, Renfrew North's representative should lose no time in telling the department so, and demand that it be returned as an integral part of the Highway Department and as such receive proper summer and winter maintenance. Eganville and the townships through which this road runs, as well as the Town of

Pembroke to which it is an important business artery, should get busy and bring pressure to bear to insist that it be taken over as a part of Highway 41. Surely the Highways Department owes this section of the country as much attention as it is giving to other sections of the country.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass this on to the hon. Minister of Highways. I am not responsible for the editorial, but I think it should be brought to the attention of this House, because it came from a very reputable citizen of Renfrew South, who a great many hon. members of this Legislature know.

I do feel, personally, that some attention should be given to it, and I would like to draw this fact to the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways, and ask him to extend at least 1 of these highways, to provide an outlet for at least 1 of the 3 King's Highways mentioned, so the motoring public can go from Highway No. 2 or No. 7, through to Highway 17, without having to travel over a portion of township or county roads. I think it is only fair to the motoring public, and since my attention has been drawn to this, I have no alternative but to bring it to the attention of this government and to the hon. Minister of Highways.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the hon. Prime Minister a word of advice. I think possibly it will be necessary to call by-elections in some of the ridings in the near future and I would suggest that a by-election be called in Essex North. It is unfair to the people in that riding not to be represented for so long a period of time in this House.

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before you call it 6 o'clock, I would like to call one or two bills. Today is the birthday of the hon. member for Brant

(Mr. Nixon) and I feel disposed at the moment to accept the principle of his bill, subject to an amendment which we are discussing, which gives the municipality some power in connection with the drive-in theatres, instead of leaving it wholly to the discretion of the licencing board. It will provide for the consent of the municipality, as a part of the arrangement.

THE THEATRES ACT, 1953

MR. H. C. NIXON proposes a second reading of Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend the Theatres Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; the second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Now, Mr. Speaker, would you revert to "motions."

HON. MR. WELSH moves that, owing to unavoidable absence of Mr. Manley, Mr. Oliver be substituted for him on the Select Committee appointed to consider the questions of expense

accounts payable to members of Select Committees sitting in the interval between the sessions.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I refer for a moment to the matter of prorogation? I have discussed this with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and also with the Government Whip.

First of all, it was felt the House could prorogue on Friday but only by pressing the business through, and sitting until very late hours, so it was thought desirable that prorogation might take place some time on Tuesday, or at the very latest, on Wednesday. It probably will be on Tuesday.

I wanted to explain that to the hon. members of the House, because the question of their own personal arrangements enter into the picture.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the Chair.

It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Thursday, April 1, 1954

Evening Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Thursday, April 1, 1954.

Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1117
Estimates, Department of Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Frost	1117
Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Goodfellow	1127
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1145
City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Pryde, second reading	1145
Town of Oakville, bill respecting, Mr. Pryde, second reading	1145
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, second reading	1145
Legislative Assembly Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading	1145
Public Service Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, second reading	1145
London Foundation, bill to incorporate, third reading	1145
Corporation Act, 1953, bill to amend, third reading	1145
Ontario Fuel Board, bill to establish, third reading	1145
Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, third reading	1145
Municipal Franchises Act, bill to amend, third reading	1145
Gas Pipeline Act, 1951, bill to amend, third reading	1145
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, third reading	1145
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Doucett, agreed to	1145
Milk Industry, bill respecting, as amended, reported	1145
Children's Protection Act, Children of Unmarried Parents Act, Adoption Act, bill to consolidate, held	1146
Registry Act, bill to amend, held	1150
Land Titles Act, bill to amend, reported	1150
Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, bill to amend, reported	1150
Homes for the Aged Act, bill to amend, reported	1151
Grand River Conservation Act, 1938, bill to amend, reported	1151
Disabled Persons Allowance Act, 1952, bill to amend, reported	1151
Community Centres Act, bill to amend, reported	1151
Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, reported	1152
Fire Marshal's Act, bill to amend, reported	1152
Certain Lands in the City of Port Arthur, bill respecting, reported	1152
Liquor Licence Act, bill to amend, reported	1152
Travelling Shows Act, bill to amend, reported	1152
Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto, bill respecting, reported	1152
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1152

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1954.

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Thomas R. Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL TREASURER

Vote 133, Main Office, \$387,500.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to say anything about this department. No doubt, there are questions hon. members may desire to ask, and I shall be glad to answer them.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I wish to ask a question on Vote 133. I note that the figure for "Public Indebtedness" amounts to \$39,875,000. I wonder whether the hon. Treasurer could tell us approximately what percentage of that goes to pay for loans from the United States?

HON. MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) on that point, that I gave the figures in the budget. My recollection is that about 17 per cent. of our borrowing has been done in the United States, and the balance in Canada. Of the figures here respecting foreign borrowing, most of that is for hydro and is reimbursed to us. That is the gross figure. I suppose

the question the hon. member has in mind is why we should go to other markets for money rather than to our own. Taking the figures from the budget, my recollection is that in the last 10 years we have borrowed, for new works and provincial refundings, in the neighbourhood of \$1,600 million. Of that great total, only about \$250 million has been borrowed abroad. The hon. member will see the necessity of this when I explain the position further. By borrowing in Canada, we are constantly filling portfolios of loaning institutions and individuals with our securities—provincial guarantees, hydro guarantees and other guarantees such as, for instance, the Ontario Northland Railway. We reach the point at some time when people think there should be some diversification.

In the spring of 1951, I think it was, we went back into the New York market, after staying out of it for many years. The purpose was this. It is quite apparent, as we view it now, we are going to require, in the next 7 or 8 years, when we proceed with the St. Lawrence scheme—and we expect that will be the case—another \$600 million or \$700 million. Hon. members should realize that if you borrow in one market, you have a tendency to drive up the cost of money. In other words, there is a certain resistance arising from the fact that individuals and corporation investors have too many of our loans in their portfolios. That results in the interest rate on our loans increasing.

For that reason, in the spring of 1951—the matter was discussed here in the

House at the time—we turned once more to the New York market, after remaining out of it—for perhaps 15 years—anyway, since the days of the Hepburn Administration. It was done so that in view of the great demand for investment in this country, we would have another string to our bow; in other words, that we might diversify our affairs somewhat.

At the same time, we have been interested in establishing a market in Europe, if we could. That has been difficult, because of the problem of convertibility of Sterling, which we would like to see accomplished, but it is a technical matter which is beyond us. We are interested, and have discussed matters with certain Swiss bankers. As you know, in Europe there has been a tendency for capital to flow into Switzerland. I was talking to a Swiss banker on Monday of this week, and I learned they have passed through a situation, where, from having comparatively little money a few years ago, and high exchange rates and other difficulties, they have reached the position where, in Europe, they have a large amount of money. It is not revealing a secret to say that the Swiss people have been investing in Canadian basic securities, and other such securities that are based upon the broad requirements of the country, but they have not gone into government loaning, because their interest rate is on the high side.

I believe I am correct in saying, in respect to our last loan in New York, that due to the high credit of this country as a whole, determined by its people, its assets, and its ability to pay its way, and that governments generally in Canada, provincially, federally and municipally, are balancing their budgets—were able to effect a loan there, the interest rate of which I shall not give you, although it can be obtained. The rate was so favourable that our statisticians have calculated that, if the Canadian exchange immediately fell by 10 per cent.—and remember we are at a premium now of around $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.—and that situation last during the currency of the loan, which would be around 18 years, we would still be ahead

over Canadian rates. That has been, generally, the basis of our financing in the American market. We are in a favourable credit position, due to the fact that we have not only been balancing our budget, but have been paying surpluses—or what some hon. members might call “surpluses”—into sinking funds, and establishing our credit, which has enabled us to maintain our credit at a very high level.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, in pursuing this question, I want to thank the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) for his painstaking reply. However, it is quite well known that we have before the House an amendment to the main motion on the budget which deals precisely with this question.

HON. MR. FROST: That is the motion of the —?

MR. SALSBERG: That is right, of the Opposition. It is a reflection, in my opinion, of the general feeling across the province that we are going too heavily into the American market for money when there seems to be no shortage of funds in Canada.

The Ottawa Government seems to have no difficulty whatsoever in getting money and selling bonds on a popular basis, so much so, that it is now recalling two Victory Loan Bond issues much earlier than they would normally mature, in order to save money. The question thus arises, why this Government of Ontario could not do the same thing. It may be that Ottawa is getting some loans in the United States. If so, we would like to hear it.

HON. MR. FROST: Our position, and that of the Federal Government at the present time, are quite different. The Federal Government has been able, I believe, generally speaking, since the termination of the war to finance its undertakings from ordinary account. It has been able to finance without borrowing; other than the Canada Savings Loans or Bonds. I do not believe there has been anything in the form of federal loans for some years. It has been strengthening its capital position. Among

other things, for instance, it has assumed, federally, from surplus, the indebtedness of the Canadian National Railways. The government has transferred into superannuation funds very large sums of money, because it had these surpluses to strengthen the capital position.

Our position in Ontario is different. While we were conserving our resources in war days, our position now is one of expansion and development. As I have explained to the House, it is unreasonable to ask our people to pay all of that money from current account. It is fair and reasonable it should be amortized over a period of years, and, therefore, our situation is not comparable with that of the Federal Government. It might be said that our positions, as between war time days, when they were borrowing on a large scale and paying off capital indebtedness, and the situation as it now exists, have been reversed.

To be frank, Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in establishing a third or even a fourth borrowing market in the United Kingdom or in Switzerland. Competition is the life of trade, and it is due to the fact that we are not confining ourselves to one market, that we are able to get money cheaply.

As regards the amendment before the House, I can assure the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that I am hopeful the explanation I have given the House will save the government from defeat when we vote on it next week. I think the explanation I have given is endorsed by every financial adviser in this country as being a sound method, and a sound approach, to this problem.

MR. SALSBERG: I wish to make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I am quite confident that I have not in any way exhausted the arguments which I am sure the official Opposition will present against the government's borrowing policy.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Has presented.

MR. SALSBERG: Has presented—well, I am sure they will continue to do so before the debate is finalized, and that that will result undoubtedly in the upsetting of the government. That is not a prediction, Mr. Chairman, it is an expression of opinion.

HON. MR. WELSH: A pious hope.

MR. SALSBERG: But to continue our discussion.

HON. MR. PORTER: Of what?

MR. SALSBERG: It is evident, also, that the policies pursued until now have not necessarily resulted in borrowing money at the lowest rates. I still maintain that Ottawa is getting money now at a lower rate than we are.

HON. MR. FROST: It always does.

MR. SALSBERG: It is getting it mainly from the Canadian public for re-financing, and saving a lot of money in the process. I think there are a lot of things we could do to the benefit of our own Treasury and the people of Ontario. Some years ago I suggested, and I now repeat, there should be a provincial bond sold directly to the people of the province, and to certain organizations, perhaps through the savings offices of the government. When the Northland has to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as I found the case to be on examining its last report—that is money borrowed for it by the government and guaranteed by the government—that is a rather high interest for a government-guaranteed bond. I think $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would be considered an excellent return by the hundreds of organizations—farm organizations, workers' organizations, credit unions, and others of a similar nature—who would gladly invest their surplus funds in government-saving bonds or certificates, whichever you wish to call them, and receive $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in return. I do not think they are getting that much out of their ordinary investment. Instead of paying it to the American bankers, let us pay it to our own credit unions, co-operatives, trade unions, and other

people's organizations. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I was shocked when I found that the Ontario Northland was called upon to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on a government-guaranteed bond.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out we bought those bonds from the Ontario Northland Railway?

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) did that, then he is certainly overcharging the Northland.

HON. MR. FROST: I would not say that. It owes us \$30 million.

MR. SALSBERG: But you collected \$17 million and never gave it any credit. You put it in the Treasury. I happen to know that; you had better straighten out the books with the Northland. What I was told was that the government sold bonds for which it is called upon to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and I say you should give the people's organizations of this province a chance to buy those bonds. I am sure bonds amounting to many millions of dollars would be taken up.

HON. MR. FROST: We have never borrowed money at that rate of interest.

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) a question? Is it not a fact that when we go into the American market, or even go abroad, as you suggest, we are then leaving more money available in Canada for industrial expansion and first mortgage bonds?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. We are not drying up the market.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I think we all appreciate the benefits that flow from broadening the basis of our borrowings to a certain extent, and particularly when we need to borrow money in quite large sums, as we have in this province the last few years. But the point which concerns me—and I am sure the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) can make this very clear—he said, I think, that we went into the

United States market again in 1951. The story which one hears, and I want to know just what the factual basis for it is, is that since 1951 not only have we gone into the United States market for our borrowings, but we have gone into it quite extensively.

HON. MR. FROST: Some \$250 million.

MR. OLIVER: I should like to hear from the hon. Minister the percentage figures on the amount we have borrowed in the last 2 years in Canada and in the United States, because I can appreciate the advantages of going into the United States market, but I do not want to come to the place in this province when we go whole-heartedly into the United States market, and leave our own particular field in Canada.

HON. MR. FROST: Probably I can give the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) the actual figures. We have still borrowed more in Canada in that period of time, than we have in the United States. The purpose of going there was to avoid affecting or "drying up" our own market, to keep the public demand in our own bonds, and also because of very favourable interest and repayment conditions we were able to effect.

I may say it is heartening to realize the financial position in which this province is at the present time.

The hon. Attorney-General has just returned from New York, being a member of our organization which was there effecting the last loan. It is very heartening to realize the high credit rating of this province. All Provincial Governments, the Federal Government, and a fairly good number of Municipal Governments have borrowed in the United States for various purposes, in some cases for refunding, and in other cases to obtain new money.

Over the last 10 years about 17 per cent. of our money has come from the United States, and the balance from Canadian investors. In the last 4 years, we have borrowed in Canada \$700

million, and in the United States \$250 million.

Vote No. 133 agreed to.

Vote No. 134, Bureau of Statistics and Research, \$63,500, agreed to.

Vote No. 135, Comptroller of Revenue, \$1,023,000, agreed to.

Vote No. 136, Ontario Racing Commission, \$188,000.

On Vote No. 136.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 136, I was going to say that heretofore we have been handicapped in our consideration of this Estimate, because of the abstract way in which it was presented. Fortunately, we have an hon. member of the House who is also a member of the Racing Commission, and I think it would be extremely helpful to hear his views pertaining to matters in connection with racing.

MR. SALSBERG: We want some good "tips."

MR. JOHN W. HANNA (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this time that a great trust was imposed in me, and it is very pleasing to be a member of the Racing Commission. I am only a junior member of the commission, but we have a great chairman, and a great organization of 4 members. No doubt now, racing will attain a high standard in this province, and as time goes on will prove to be "big business" for Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: Does the hon. member mean to say it has not been of a high standard formerly?

MR. HANNA: It has always been on a high plane. I would like to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as he comes from a racing country in Western Ontario, he knows there are a great many good tracks, and that good horses are bred, and a great deal of pleasure is afforded to the rural people as well as those living in urban municipalities.

At this time, may I say I am very happy to have this appointment. I did not know whether all the hon. members of the House knew about it, so I thought

I would say a few words regarding racing.

One great feature up to the present time, since I have been a member of this commission, is the fact that there will be effected this year a saving to the bettors of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$495,000. As the hon. members know, betting is a very high-class financial transaction.

It will be the duty of the committee to see that the public gets fair play, and is provided with good, common, clean, sport, and we are proud that the government is now taking some part in racing.

MR. SALSBERG: I thought they were taking a big part of it.

MR. HANNA: I would like to say to the hon. member for St. Andrew, that I hope to see him and to have him bring some of his money to the tracks. I am doubtful if he has ever been at a race track. I do hope to see him with some of his friends from Spadina, who own a great many race horses.

It does make me happy to be on this board, with men like the chairman, Magistrate Bigelow, Mr. McGee, and Mr. MacIntosh. Our headquarters are in the Royal Bank Building, and have been provided with very lovely offices, and you can secure all the information you desire there.

MR. OLIVER: Is that right?

MR. HANNA: If you do not know your way around, come down and see us sometime.

While on this commission I am going to endeavour to be what might be called "an ambassador of goodwill" to attract more people to the tracks, and to endeavour to make many good friends. I have a great many friends now, and I trust I always will have.

I might say that we have not a large budget, but I do expect that racing in the future will be, as I said, "big business" in the province.

Now, if there is anything further any hon. member would like to know, just mention it.

I can assure you that we will stand for no nonsense.

I think you will find in the future the public will be provided with honest, common, clean sport. I am very happy that the hon. Prime Minister has seen fit to appoint me. I feel that it is a job which will require considerable energy on my part, and I do hope I will be of some value to this government.

MR. SALSBERG: May I ask the member of the commission whether it is true that the organization of which he is an august member is planning for night racing in this province?

HON. MR. FROST: No.

MR. SALSBERG: I have heard rumours to that effect.

HON. MR. PORTER: We only have that in the Legislature.

MR. SALSBERG: As far as I am concerned this is a salt mine. I just slave around here. Has the member of the commission any statement to make, which might be quoted?

MR. HANNA: I would like to answer the question by the hon. member for St. Andrew, by saying that if the government ever changes its policy, I will be glad to inform the hon. member of that fact.

Vote 136 agreed to.

Vote 137, Post Office, \$369,000, agreed to.

Vote No. 138, Provincial Economist, \$80,400, agreed to.

Vote No. 139, Tabulating, \$82,000, agreed to.

Vote No. 140, Theatres, \$114,400.

On Vote No. 140.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote No. 140—"Theatre Branch," I do not want to press the hon. Treasurer for any lengthy speech, although we all enjoy listening to him, but if he cares to make some remarks about one aspect of this problem, I think it would be appreciated.

I think the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. Manley), spoke earlier in

the session on the showing of certain pictures which he thought were of a doubtful character—I am very mild.

This affects our Censor Board.

I want to confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am always torn betwixt and between when it comes to discussing the Censor Board. On general principles, I am not very happy about the ideal of having all the performances, theatre productions, and movies we seen censored, or that it should be the prerogative of a small handful of people to determine what the public at large should, or should not see.

On the other hand, I am bound to acknowledge the fact that for many years there has been a Censor Board in existence, and certain responsibilities have been placed upon it. I appreciate fully the difficulties of the Censor Board. On the one hand, it cannot satisfy all segments of society and groups, and, on the other hand, it cannot escape the wrath of certain segments of society and groups.

I think they recognize, as do the hon. members of the Legislature, there is no ideal situation at the present time. There is, however, considerable dissatisfaction, and there has also been considerable complaint about the extremes to which certain theatre owners are going with their displays, and in the way they advertise the movies they are showing. I think most of the American pictures—I think that is true; "most of them"—are not of a very ennobling character, and many of them perhaps should never have been shown at all to the public, certainly not to the younger members of our community.

For myself, I want to further state that I go to see more British and other European pictures than American—

MR. JANES: How about the show in this Chamber?

MR. SALSBERG:—I do not know the feelings of others about it, but I think a great number prefer the British pictures, which are more natural, more human, and even when they are not of a very high cultural character, nevertheless they seem to be more acceptable, and more natural and more human than

these pieces of artificiality and vulgarity which comes from the south. In most European pictures you see human beings, and reality; you do not see the "kewpie dolls," the cardboard lovers, and the misleading description of life, which is often very harmful. I understand that they are now making Spillane's trash into movies, and all you will see will be something like "I kill," "he kills," "she kills," and finally "we kill."

I appreciate their difficulties, and it is a hard job they have. In fact, I have said on previous occasions, I would like to see the government increase—and increase considerably—the salaries of the members of the Censor Board. I repeat it now, I would like every member of this board to receive sufficient income to enable him to live in comfort, and to be beyond approaches which may be attempted on the part of anybody in the business. I think the hon. members of this House would unhesitatingly approve a policy of that sort.

But on this subject, I think a few additional words should be said. There are people who think our younger children should be kept away from all the American pictures. I do not know whether that is the correct viewpoint or not. I think, though, we should establish more consultative bodies of such organizations as the Parents-Teachers Associations, Home and School Clubs, and others, who will advise, assist and pass judgment to the board. I think there should be more care taken in the selection of pictures shown on Saturday afternoons to our children.

The new grading of pictures is something about which there are conflicting opinions. Some people think they should be graded with the possibility of showing what are termed "adult pictures," but which are not meant for mass circulation. I have heard others say that it is merely an advertising promotional proposition. I am not in a position to take a stand either way.

I saw the picture about which the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) spoke, and I would like to correct the statement, for the record, and state to the hon. members of the house that it

was not a French picture. It was a German-made film, and what is worse, it was made by one of Hitler's chief movie-producers, and it carries with it the degeneracy which prevailed in the days of Hitler. It was not necessarily a lurid picture, but rather a picture in which life was described as being without a spark of hope or promising outlook. It was typical of the mentality of the men around Hitler. Whether that picture should have been shown or not, I am not here to judge and determine. I think though one should make these few remarks in order to perhaps hear something from the hon. Provincial Treasurer and Prime Minister of the province, who is "saddled" with this branch. I do not know whether it is the happiest part of his duties, but I have addressed myself to the hon. Prime Minister and now, may I say to him, "it is all yours."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think admittedly that censorship is a very difficult problem. The censor—and sometimes, in appeal, the Treasurer, I must admit, is not too good a Court of Appeal, but nevertheless is a Court of Appeal—receives complaints from various people. There are a great variety of opinions. There are parents who vary in their attitudes to pictures, some who resent censorship; some who want censorship. There is a variance in the attitude of adults.

It is interesting sometimes in Boards of Appeal, which were set up to hear complaints against these pictures, drawn from representative organizations in the province relative to pictures, to hear the points of view they express.

I remember a year or two ago we had a French picture *Le Ronde*. There was a tremendous controversy about it.

MR. SALSBERG: What was the name of it?

HON. MR. FROST: *Le Ronde*. I saw the picture and I thought it was silly myself, but that is only my opinion. We set up a very large Board of Appeal, at that time. The Deputy-Treasurer was on it, and we had representatives from across the city.

My recollection is that, by a majority vote, they passed the picture, but some of the reactionaries, like myself, cancelled it. That is one of the difficulties which have to be faced in that type of thing.

The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) has made one declaration from his standpoint, the hon. member for St. Andrew has made his declaration from a completely different standpoint. He does not like the picture *The Sinner*—which, by the way, I have not seen—but, seeing there is so much controversy about it, I must see it.

However, I want to give you a third opinion—an opinion with which most hon. members here will know and respect—by Mr. Alex Barris. Everybody knows Mr. Barris is not one who is influenced by opinions. He is a man with an individuality, and I think it is worthwhile reading his opinion. I notice the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg), with his voluminous clipping system, obviously has the item.

MR. SALSBERG: I have.

HON. MR. FROST: I will read it to the hon. members of the House. Mr. Barris says—

MR. SALSBERG: The first time the press is really quoted in this House.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. This is written by a man of great experience and unquestionable ability, and with a point of view which I think is worthy of recognition and consideration. He wrote:

The question of motion picture censorship was raised in the provincial Legislature the other day in a speech by Peter Manley (L., Stormont) in which he charged that the Ontario Censorship Board had adopted "a lower moral standard" for Toronto theatres than for the rest of the province.

The film that stirred Mr. Manley so was *The Sinner*, which played for several weeks recently at the Odeon-Hyland Theatre under a "restricted" category, which means that nobody

under 18 years of age was admitted, with or without parents. The Liberal member commented that after seeing it he didn't think anyone under 80 should have been admitted.

Mr. Manley is entitled to his opinions, of course, and if he feels, as he said, that the film was "obscene and obviously catering to low moral standards" he is perfectly justified in saying so in the House.

But we don't happen to agree—either with Mr. Manley's opinion of the picture or, what is more important, with his views on movie censorship. It is generally conceded that Ontario has the most enlightened film censorship on this continent, and the showing of *The Sinner* supports this stand.

Consider for a moment the effect of the establishment of this new restricted category for films. Hitherto, the only existing categories for films (other than outright rejection of them by the board) have been either blanket approval for all audiences or the "adult entertainment" tag put on films considered wrong for children. This "adult entertainment" label served only as a guide for parents—there was and is nothing to stop parents from taking their children to such pictures if they so desire. It need hardly be added that a good many of them do so.

Because some parents ignore the guidance of the censor board, the board had only two alternatives: either to allow children accompanied by parents, to see adult pictures; or to reject entirely films that would be acceptable to adults and, indeed, in some cases beneficial.

The setting up of the restricted category has changed that. It has by no means been shown that the restricted category has worked as a green signal for all kinds of sensational and immoral films. There have been only a handful of them, anyhow, and at least some of them have been intelligent, honest films dealing seriously with serious themes. Among these, we would include *Intimate*

Relations, based on a Cocteau play, and the aforementioned German-made movie, *The Sinner*, which showed with frankness the degeneration of a young woman whose standards were lowered by the environment in which she grew up, but which certainly did not indicate approval of those standards.

Another of the restricted pictures was *The Moon Is Blue*, a light comedy which could hardly have corrupted the morals of an adult and which, incidentally, has been shown elsewhere—both in Canada and the United States—where no such restricted category exists, which means that quite probably a good many children saw it. Even Dr. Hugh Flick, who administers film censorship in New York State under the state's Department of Education, has said that he considered Ontario's film censorship superior to that in his own state. However, he has no authority to change regulations.

The restricted category, therefore, serves two purposes. First, it tends to cut down the number of minors attending films that might prove harmful to them in some way or other; second, it makes possible for adults the viewing of pictures that might not otherwise be shown at all.

As to the complaint that the Censor Board has set different standards for Toronto from those for smaller communities, that hardly stands up. The board's decision on any film applies to the whole province—any theatre owner, in Toronto or Espanola, is then free to show or not show any available picture. Every theatre operator must consider the preferences and prejudices of his particular audience.

Some censorship is a necessary thing. But too much censorship, of the kind which, as Mr. Manley suggests, would make films forbidden "for any one under 80," can do a lot of harm, too. It can stifle artists and industries, and result in a public's being robbed not only of entertainment but of intellectual stimulation.

I read that because it gives another point of view. We have 3 of them, one by the hon. member for Stormont, a different one by the hon. member for St. Andrew, and one from a critic on one of the great newspapers, who is very well known. I suppose the hon. members here could present many more opinions which would vary in some degree.

It is that particular field in which the Motion Censorship Branch must operate. It must operate to do those things, which in the opinion of the branch, are best calculated to meet the needs and requirements of our 5 million population, and at the same time recognize the standards which are set by great organizations, like the Legion, for decency, and others, as well as our own wishes and desire to keep the motion picture industry clean, not harmful, but indeed, beneficial for our people. I think that is the answer.

Vote 140 agreed to.

On Vote 141.

MR. OLIVER: We have not passed 140 yet. It has not been called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we have.

MR. OLIVER: In connection with the Junior Farmers.

HON. MR. FROST: That is statutory. I suppose the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to speak about the Ontario Junior Farmers Establishment Loan Corporation?

MR. OLIVER: I did, yes.

HON. MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the other night in my room I read in a newspaper the irate comments of some of my own supporters, who are men of individuality. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows I try to stimulate, within bounds, the differences of opinion and the views of various people. The hon. member for Middlesex North (Mr. Patrick), for example, was one, and there were others who had something to say about this organization. I read with great interest what they said.

I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I felt what was said

there—although I was not at the committee meeting conducted under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay)—deserves the most serious consideration, and I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition, it will be carefully considered.

I think the gist of the objection was that the board is a bit too "tough" I put it that way, "the board was tough." That, perhaps, is not a bad fault to start with. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was in this House in the days when the Agricultural Loan Board functioned, and nobody was more critical of the—I was going to say "liberality," but perhaps I should not put it that way, because I would not want to draw politics into it—so I will say "generosity" of the old Agricultural Board—

MR. OLIVER: I am afraid all the "liberality" was in the early 30's.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, but you have to start safely and soundly. As a matter of fact, we still have about \$5 million of the old agricultural loans which was passed 25 years ago, outstanding. I think it is now amply secured, and the province will ultimately receive this money, in the course of liquidation.

But I think it advisable to suggest that a new organization of this sort be careful. I would frankly admit to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that perhaps the officers of this corporation have been a bit too careful. We will look at it. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition will admit it is a good fault at the start of things to be very careful. I repeat, we will look this over and if we can safely do so, will make it more generous, and I think it will serve a very great purpose in this province.

MR. OLIVER: It is a little unusual, though perhaps just as effective, to have the answer before the criticism is made. But I say this in all seriousness regarding this particular agency of government that I doubt whether there is any agency which is further away from meeting the needs of the people it is intended to

serve than this Juvenile Farming Loans establishment. When the hon. Prime Minister says that the board "started off tough," and he tells hon. members that that was the right way to begin, I must remind him that the board did not "start off tough." It started off in a generous way, and then got progressively tougher until, at the present time, a man needs to have his farm paid off and money in the bank before he can apply for a loan from this organization.

I wish to say to the hon. Prime Minister, and I think he is genuinely interested in this, that in my opinion one of the faults lies in the board itself. The chairman has a full-time job apart from running this institution, and another member of the board is our good friend Doctor Walters. One place for which Doctor Walters is not suited is a position where money is being spent, because he does not want to spend money; he would really prefer to hang onto it like a leech, and a spending organization is just the wrong place for Doctor Walters, for whom I have a very high respect.

I think the board itself should be reorganized and it should have a full-time chairman. I do not know whether the hon. Prime Minister is himself conversant with the activities of this board. I do not know if he knows what has been going on in the last few months in the province. But a lot of young men, who have asked a reasonable amount from the board, have been told they could be granted half that sum. Half of that amount was no good to them. It discouraged the young men and we are not getting anywhere with a programme of that kind. This programme could have met a very serious need among young farmers of Ontario.

HON. MR. FROST: You mean: "Will meet."

MR. OLIVER: It will, perhaps, if we change our ways. But it is no use as it is now. We allowed \$10 million in the budget for this, and we only spent a small proportion of that sum. I do not think \$10 million was too much to put

out in a single year to assist young farmers and I suggest the hon. Prime Minister might well examine the situation relative to the activities of this lending organization. I have enough confidence in his impartiality to think that there will be in future a great change in connection with this organization, if he does so. At the present time it is not serving any useful purpose.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has drawn a very gloomy picture, but, after all, it is just 2 years ago that the corporation was formed. Out of the \$10 million at its disposal were to be made loans for the following purposes: To assist Junior Farmers, as described in the Act in the acquisition of land for farming; the paying off of existing charges against land; the consolidating of outstanding liabilities; providing drainage; for livestock, and other purposes relating to the establishment of young farmers. Remember, Mr. Chairman, this is something which had never before been attempted in Canada. It was a new project. On the Board of Directors were Mr. J. C. Steckley, Doctor C. S. Walters, and Mr. E. J. McLoughrey, a member of the staff of the Department of Agriculture. As of January 29th last, loans to the value of \$3,797,000—nearly \$4 million—had been authorized. As of March 11th, about \$3,300,000 had been advanced. The largest loan is \$15,000. The lowest is \$2,000. I think it can be said that this corporation, and this new type of loan, will serve a very useful purpose in Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: They are turning down 50 per cent. of the applications.

HON. MR. FROST: I would not say that. I will look at this when I have an opportunity shortly, and see what the situation is. But I am quite satisfied that, as I say, this organization will serve a very useful purpose in Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: Well, I am quite frank in saying that if the hon. Prime Minister will look at it, the situation will be better.

MR. SALSBERG: On the subject of housing mortgages. I wonder if the hon. Treasurer can announce at this time a change of policy in this regard? I think this item refers to the second mortgage field in which the government was engaged. I think the re-entry of the government into that field, particularly if they were to do that on a low interest rate, would perhaps make quite a contribution to the partial solution of the housing problem for many working people who cannot buy a house because of the high cost of finance and, in particular, the difficulty of getting a second mortgage.

HON. MR. FROST: This section is the old second mortgage loan. The National Housing Loans are up to 90 per cent. That does not leave us much room to step in.

MR. OLIVER: How much is outstanding of these old second mortgages?

HON. MR. FROST: The original loans were \$16,610,000 and the principal outstanding is about \$10,574,000.

Vote 140 agreed to.

On Vote 141.

Vote 141 agreed to.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, the Estimates of the Department of Public Welfare for the coming year make provision for a great many needy persons in this province. Through legislation and administrative experience, we have been able to develop a system of public welfare services which deals with almost every contingency of dependence and need—social assistance for children, families, the disabled, the aged and infirm. While we are progressive in our public welfare legislation, our prime concern is to maintain a high standard of living for all citizens; and this can only be assured through the continued development of our private enterprise system—a reliance upon production and

economic expansion throughout this province.

The past year has been a good year. We have enjoyed an exceptionally high measure of prosperity, and the potentials for further growth and development in this province are unquestioned. We have a reliable and energetic people who have a very great measure of initiative. I believe we have only begun to tap and utilize our great natural resources which are there for the benefit of all citizens. There is a notable contrast between this favoured land and province of ours, and some European and Asian countries. The extremes of wealth and poverty which exist in some of those areas are almost beyond belief. I believe we are all conscious of the fact that elsewhere in the world, untold millions live in absolute want and dire need; without proper food, clothing and the necessities of everyday life; where life is nothing more than a struggle for survival against overwhelming odds. We are fortunate, indeed, to live in a province and a country where it has been possible for us to take positive steps, and to develop ways and means of assisting persons in need. For, despite the continued economic expansion and development in this province, some of our citizens are unable to reap the benefits of our private enterprise system for various reasons beyond their control—conditions of dependency, disability, infirmity and age. Meeting needs which result from these conditions is, of course, the job of the Department of Public Welfare. In this way, our citizens, as a whole, have accepted their responsibility to those less fortunate than themselves.

In looking over our welfare legislation in this province, one cannot help but be impressed with the progress which has been achieved. New welfare measures have been developed—especially in recent years—and many amendments have been made to continuing Acts. All have contributed towards improving and strengthening our welfare services. This, of course, is a continuing process—a job which is never ending.

I would like to pause for a moment to mention a matter which is of concern

to me—particularly as a farmer—(and, incidentally, I must confess that my first love is and always will be the farm). I believe that most of us are aware of the surpluses which have been created in certain dairy products. The importance of the dairy industry in providing economic security for a very large number of producers, related industries, and people, cannot be stressed too much. The butter surplus, for example, is increasing; and I would seriously propose to the Government of Canada that steps should be taken to issue this surplus butter to persons and families who are at present in receipt of the various forms of public welfare assistance, as well as to the various public and private charitable institutions. It is most unfortunate that huge stocks of surplus butter should remain in storage when it could be readily made available, with great benefit, to needy persons and institutions. We would assure the Federal Government of the co-operation of this province in the distribution of this important commodity by means of any plan which they might care to adopt.

There is some concern with reference to the increased measure of unemployment which has been experienced during the past few months. Now I cannot see the development of anything like the depression of the thirties ahead of us; nor do I propose to join the unhappy ranks of those who seem to be trying to talk us into a depression. This is a time when our thinking should be straight, clear and objective. It is my view and the view of this government that the Government of Canada should assume full responsibility for rendering assistance to persons who require help because they are out of work.

(1) The Government of Canada is the only government in a position, financially, to develop an adequate programme to assist the unemployed;

(2) The Federal Unemployment Insurance offices possess the administrative machinery, with full knowledge of unemployed persons in their respective jurisdictions, including their qualifications;

(3) this plan will avoid duplication of effort and services;

(4) uniform standards of assistance across the country would be ensured;

(5) provincial and municipal revenues are inadequate for such a major undertaking;

(6) welfare programmes lending themselves to provincial administration are already in effect; and

(7) finally, the adoption of the Federal Unemployment Insurance scheme recognizes the principle of federal responsibility. If the existing scheme is not adequate in its scope, then it is well within the powers of Parliament to extend it to meet today's conditions.

Much of today's unemployment is of a seasonal nature. The province, year in and year out, carries on an increasing programme of public works largely related to hydro expansion, highways and public buildings. In the light of our resources, this programme will be continued, perhaps enlarged. Possibly, the Federal Authority could assist by enlarging its programme along similar lines. We have co-operated willingly and cheerfully with Ottawa in all matters relating to the welfare of our people. This, we shall continue to do; but it is obvious to all of us that, if there should be any large measure of continued job shortage, then the immense revenues and resources of the Federal Government must be brought to bear upon the problem. There is no doubt, of course, that the movement of natural gas to Ontario will have a stimulating effect on industry, and the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power project will be one of the major employment programmes in the history of the province.

In referring to the additional funds which the province is contributing in the form of unconditional grants to municipalities, I would like to quote a statement of our Prime Minister, which he made in his Budget Address. He said:

The new (unconditional) grants can be used by the municipalities for any purpose; but they are related as

closely as possible to the responsibility assumed by—(municipalities) for health, welfare—and other similar services. They represent a unique attempt to provide for the equitable distribution of the burdens placed upon the municipalities through the assumption of these responsibilities.

I would like to add that these unconditional grants will undoubtedly be of great assistance to municipalities, particularly in meeting their share of the costs for the welfare services which remain on the local level.

Traditionally, private social agencies, including those founded by churches, fraternities, and other specialized local community groups, accepted responsibility for services to needy persons. Many of these services are now rendered by governments through public welfare departments, and I think the reasons for this gradual transference from private to public sources are quite obvious. Yet, this movement of responsibility upwards to the larger units of government does not mean that private organizations have no further responsibility in the field of welfare. Indeed, it is most desirable that every encouragement should be given to the many private agencies which still remain dedicated to the cause of welfare. They are in a particularly strategic position to provide the individual attention and intensive service which some cases require, and which a public programme by its very nature, cannot provide.

There is one particular organization which I would like to single out for special mention, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. This private agency has accepted responsibility for a group of persons who require specialized attention and service. At the present time, this nation-wide organization is raising funds to establish new headquarters, more adequate for their purposes, in a property located in Toronto, formerly called "Divadale," near Sunnybrook Hospital. I anticipate that this campaign will be successful, and I commend it to your attention. The Province of Ontario has contributed \$250,000 for this purpose; but most of the funds will

come from private sources. Needless to say, any highly successful organization, such as the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, must have a capable director with zeal, foresight and ability to guide the agency in the development of its programme of service. Such a man is Colonel Eddy Baker, who, without doubt, has done more than any other person in service to the blind in Canada, and, indeed, his influence has been felt in other parts of the world on behalf of the blind. I wonder, at this time, whether the Board of Governors of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind should perhaps consider giving recognition to the accomplishments of this extraordinary man by renaming "Divadale" the "Edward Baker Hall."

I firmly believe that private welfare organizations are an indispensable part of our democratic way of life. The Atkinson Foundation is continuing its notable contribution in the fields of health and welfare. Many private organizations would have found it exceedingly difficult to carry on their work if funds had not been made available from this foundation. I have been most impressed by the work accomplished, and by the many areas into which the funds of the Atkinson Foundation have been diverted with great benefit to the persons served.

Another important piece of work is being done by the Mason Foundation. The citizens of the Sudbury area have benefited greatly through the foresight of the founder, William E. Mason.

On this occasion, I would also like to pay tribute to the Law Society of Upper Canada in providing free legal services for needy Ontario citizens. Throughout the province, I have received many favourable comments with regard to the organization established by the legal profession to protect the rights of those who have insufficient funds to meet the costs of legal services, and, surely, this is an important part of private social services. All these examples which I have given (and there are many others engaged in the various facets of welfare) indicate the scope of private organizations and how much can be achieved for the betterment of all through private effort.

In the Department of Public Welfare, we are not unmindful of the professional training for social work which is given at two universities in Ontario. The University of Toronto School of Social Work is recognized by the department through the provision of substantial grants which have been made in the way of bursaries to students to enable them to continue their training, particularly in the second year of post-graduate work. I am especially pleased to learn of the growth of the University of Ottawa School of Social Welfare (Saint Patrick's College). This newest school is also being encouraged by the department in the provision of a grant of \$4,000 for the current year. The Ottawa School is under the direction of the Rev. Swithun Bowers, and is specializing in the training of graduates for child welfare and institutional placements. Saint Patrick's College does not have the financial support which other universities have. I can assure the Legislature that we require more graduates from schools of social work than are available at the present time, particularly for the child welfare field. I would therefore commend to the attention and consideration of private donors the excellent work being done by Saint Patrick's College in the training of persons for the field of social welfare. The support of private donors is needed in order that their work may be continued. This school is a credit to Ottawa and Eastern Ontario, and many of its graduates are serving in agencies throughout this province.

CHILD WELFARE

In this session of the Ontario Legislature, we have witnessed an historical event in the passing of the new Child Welfare Act. The importance of services rendered to children through our network of Children's Aid Societies in this province cannot be over-emphasized. The children receiving these services include:

- (1) Children with difficult behaviour problems—unable to adjust at home, in school, or in the community;
- (2) runaway children;

- (3) children in detention homes or training schools;
- (4) juvenile delinquents;
- (5) children from broken homes;
- (6) mentally retarded, physically handicapped, and emotionally disturbed children;
- (7) over-protected and pampered children—rejected and unwanted children;
- (8) unmarried mothers, and children born out of wedlock;
- (9) children needing protection of person or property;
- (10) neglected, abused and abandoned children; and
- (11) children needing guidance or placement in foster or adoption homes.

Insofar as possible, services are provided to any child who needs such services, and there is no discrimination with reference to race, colour or creed.

It is my earnest wish to see the Children's Aid Societies strengthened, and I feel that a forward step has been taken in the passing of the new Child Welfare Act. This new Act will undoubtedly prepare the groundwork for the development of further financial assistance for child welfare work. The funds already appropriated for these services have, of course, greatly increased in recent years. Yet, I do not feel that we can make a more worthwhile investment of money, time and effort than in our children. I am convinced that children today are the finest generation in our country's history, and the investment in their future is a must. We are therefore determined to render every possible help to Children's Aid Societies in the great work they are accomplishing in this field.

DAY NURSERIES

This province is making a sizeable contribution towards the maintenance and operation of public day nurseries in several Ontario centres. No other province shares in the expenditures for this type of service, and only two states in the United States—namely California and Massachusetts—are financially engaged in such a programme. There are

also many private day nurseries in Ontario carrying out excellent programmes for children. All day nurseries are subject to inspection and licencing under the provisions of The Day Nurseries Act of this province.

MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES

Ontario's programme, whereby allowances are granted to mothers with dependent children, is still the most advanced legislation of its kind in Canada, with regard to qualifications and rates of allowances provided. Amendments in recent years have made it possible to extend assistance to a very large number of families not previously covered. Provision is made under The Mothers' Allowances Act for special or supplementary assistance for those families who require more than the basic rate of allowance to meet their needs. Additional amounts are also provided for fuel allowances during the fall and winter months. I note that during the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1949, our expenditure for special assistance amounted to \$107,000, and for fuel allowances, \$157,000. During the fiscal year just ending, our expenditures for special assistance will have amounted to \$547,000, and for fuel, \$505,000. I would again emphasize that these amounts have been made available in addition to the basic rate of allowance provided under the Act.

The granting of Mothers' Allowances assistance is one of the most important social services coming under governmental auspices. Through this programme, it has been possible for many families to maintain themselves as units, and for the children to grow and develop within the normal family setting.

DISABLED PERSONS' ALLOWANCES

I would like at this time to refer briefly to our newest social welfare measure—the Disabled Persons' Allowances programme. It has been of considerable personal satisfaction to me to learn of the intention of the Government of Canada to design a similar programme for disabled persons across Canada based upon the pioneer work we have done in this province. I have stated many times

that we could not have developed a more worthwhile welfare programme, and this becomes so evident when one receives a letter like the following—a portion of which I would like to quote:

I wish to thank you for the cheques that you have sent me. After 32 years with my Dad supporting me and all the money they have spent in keeping me from getting any worse than I am, I am very grateful for what you have done by making me feel that life after all with me will be worth living. . . .

In another letter, a recipient stated:

Please convey to those concerned my sincere thanks and appreciation for this allowance. It has made such a difference in my feeling of security. I shall always be grateful for this allowance.

I am sure that these brief statements from letters sent by recipients give some indication of the needs being met by our Disabled Persons' Allowances programme. One cannot help but feel repaid many times over for the efforts being made on behalf of our disabled citizens.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

In reviewing the statistics related to the ever-increasing number and proportion of older persons in our population, some rather notable features are revealed which explain the reason for the increase. In the first place, the death rate has decreased markedly even during the last 25 years. For example, the death rate for Canada in the years 1921-1925 was 11.3 per 1,000 of the population. In 1952 this had decreased to 8.6 per 1,000 of the population. It is also of interest to note that a person born in 1901 had an even chance of reaching 46 years of age; while in 1950, the normal expectation of life had risen to 65 years of age, an increase of 19 years. The trend towards longer life has become most apparent in the increased proportion of the population 65 years of age and over. According to the census figures for 1951, the percentage of persons 65 years of age and over was 9.0, which is to be compared with 6.8 in 1931, 5.6 in 1911,

and only 4.6 in 1891. These rather startling figures serve to point up the major problem which we face today, and which we will continue to face, even more acutely as time goes on—that of providing assistance, and developing various types of care for the elderly persons who are requiring such services in increasing numbers.

During the past fiscal year, the number of persons who qualified for old-age assistance showed a slight increase. The question has often been raised concerning supplementary allowances. I believe our Prime Minister placed this question in a proper perspective when he stated that if the Government of Canada would see fit to raise the maximum basic rate of old-age assistance, the Province of Ontario would be most willing to share such an increase on an equal basis with the federal authority.

At the present time, arrangements may be made for supplementary assistance through municipal sources for needy cases requiring additional funds over and above the monthly rate of assistance. The Province of Ontario and the municipality concerned share equally in the cost of such supplementary assistance up to a maximum of \$10 per month.

The Federal Government by legislation establishes the standard of living for old-age assistance cases in providing that the maximum rate of assistance shall be \$40 per month. In accordance with the terms of the agreement, Ontario shares 50 per cent. of the cost of this assistance. It would appear that the Government of Canada is not in favour of making provisions for increased benefits of any kind in connection with any of the welfare programmes for which they have assumed either whole or partial responsibility. In opposing any measures which would lead to increased welfare benefits, the Minister of National Health and Welfare was quoted on one occasion as stating:

I do not want steps taken now which might result later in a serious reduction of . . . any . . . social welfare

measure. That has happened in Great Britain; it is happening today in France. That has happened in Belgium and in at least 4 other European countries. It has happened in at least 3 Latin-American countries that I know of.

I feel that this is a rather pessimistic view to take. I would again state that we are prepared to go along with the Government of Canada in increasing the maximum payment for old-age assistance cases.

HOMES FOR THE AGED

I have already expressed the fact that we face an acute problem with reference to the increasing numbers of persons in the older age group who require specialized forms of care. We must continue to direct our efforts towards the development of various types of programmes to give assistance to this group of persons. Several measures, of course, have already been undertaken in this connection, and I would like to review them briefly:

(1) You will recall the recent development of the Elderly Persons Housing Aid programme which is financed mainly by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation with the Municipal and Provincial Governments sharing a small portion of the costs. I feel I must express some disappointment over the fact that only a few municipalities have taken advantage of this legislation to provide low rental housing units for elderly persons. An outstanding example of the type of accommodation constructed under the provisions of this programme is the Beech Apartments in York Township. This form of housing meets a definite need for those elderly persons who are quite capable of managing their own affairs, but who cannot provide suitable accommodation for themselves. I am hopeful that other municipalities will see the merits of this plan and will soon establish many more low-cost housing units for our elderly citizens.

(2) Our many private charitable institutions—particularly those sponsored by church organizations and other private groups—are making an important con-

tribution in the care of aged persons. An amendment to The Charitable Institutions Act will raise the capital grant for new construction, or for additions to existing buildings from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per bed. There is a great need for increased activity in this area by private institutions, and we are prepared to lend every assistance to them in the expansion of their programmes to care for more elderly persons. Undoubtedly, the increase in the capital grant, which I have just mentioned, will have a stimulating effect upon this work.

(3) The Homes for the Aged programme has continued to expand and enlarge with many fine new homes constructed in recent years with others in the process of construction or in the planning stage, as well as additions to existing homes. I would assure the members of this Legislature that these homes are vitally necessary for the care of many of our aged citizens. Indeed, if we did not have these homes, a very large number of elderly persons would, of necessity, be continuing hospital cases and would seriously hamper the active treatment process. Needless to say, the problem of overcrowding and the shortage of hospital beds would be even more acute without our homes for the aged. Adequate supervision and necessary attention are provided for the persons residing in these homes, and much has been accomplished in the development of uniform standards of care throughout the province.

(4) Regardless, however, of the great strides which have been made in the development of our Homes for the Aged programme, I feel that we must take other steps to meet the growing problem of providing care for elderly persons. I believe the time has come when we should augment these efforts by the introduction of a new measure which will really be a counterpart of the care provided in the Home for the Aged setting.

It is evident that many individuals who would qualify for admission to Homes for the Aged might receive adequate care and attention in a private dwelling if financial assistance could be

made available for that purpose. I, therefore, propose to develop a programme of special home care for elderly persons, and I am having regulations drawn up to put this scheme into effect.

This special home care for the aged should be most acceptable in the larger centres. By way of explanation, I should point out that the persons who would qualify for this special type of care would be the same persons who would qualify for care in a home for the aged. In the City of Toronto, for example, I would visualize aged persons making application for special home care at a central intake which would actually be an adjunct of the home or homes for the aged in the Toronto area. Providing the applicant was acceptable for admission to a home for the aged, consideration might then be given to the possibility of placing that applicant in a special home-care placement. Coupled with the intake section, there would necessarily have to be a home-finding service for applicants who might be cared for in this way.

I am also proposing that the province would share the costs of maintenance in these special home placements on a 50-50 basis with the responsible municipality up to a total maximum of \$60 per month. This special home care for elderly persons would, of course, be optional and at the discretion of the home for the aged and the municipality concerned.

Almost all homes for the aged have waiting lists of persons who desire admission, and I feel certain that many of these persons might be quite adequately cared for in a private dwelling, under the scheme I have proposed. Undoubtedly, there are many people who would be willing to accept elderly persons for care on a room and board basis. I might add that the home for the aged, and the municipality entering into this plan, would necessarily have to be satisfied that the private home placements were suitable, and in the best interests of the persons accepted for such care. The key point in this whole scheme will be a carefully developed home-finding service. The elderly persons placed in these private quarters will have medical ser-

vices made available to them in the same manner as if they were actually residents of the home for the aged.

I am convinced that this scheme is practical and workable. I was quite interested to see a report from one of the district welfare supervisors of my department which touches on this point. He stated as follows, and I quote:

Mrs. S. has now decided to take into her home an old couple if available. I called the superintendent of the home for the aged, and he promised to keep her in mind. If the situation should arise where he has applicants with no home of their own, unable to gain admission because of lack of space for the time being, he said he would direct them to the home of Mrs. S.

To sum up, then, I believe that the adoption of this plan for special home care for elderly persons would mean:

- (a) a saving in capital costs of construction, as well as depreciation costs;
- (b) a flexible two-way programme of admission and re-admission insuring continuity of care—that is, if it was considered advisable, a person might be transferred from a home for the aged to a special home-care placement or vice versa;
- (c) a way of providing adequate care for the aged in homes in the community, and out of institutions; and
- (d) possibly, a more economical way of providing for the increased proportion of the aged in our population—particularly those who would qualify for admission to a home for the aged, but who are able “to get around” without aid.

As I have mentioned previously, the problems of providing for the ever-increasing number of aged persons must be tackled in many different ways, and I have not exhausted the possibilities. Certainly, one of the things I would urge strongly is that industry should provide employment for as long a period as possible for the older worker. Indeed, I believe that this will be seen as “a must” as time goes on. Furthermore, I would

make an appeal for more families to accept responsibility for their older members. Most of us look forward to as long a life as possible. Consequently, we all have a stake in old age, and a share in finding satisfactory solutions to the problems which present themselves as the life span continues to increase.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I believe it is fair for me to say that in my department, we have a well-knit staff under a capable group of directors. There is a fine relationship and spirit of co-operation between the personnel of the various branches.

In dealing with the cases which come to our attention, we endeavour to look beyond all the necessary forms and documents required by legislation to the person applying for assistance, and to regard him as an individual entitled to every possible consideration and attention. Naturally, it is our concern to grant assistance to all persons who come within the provisions of the various welfare Acts and regulations. In some instances, we find that certain cases, for various reasons, do not qualify for aid at the time of submitting the applications. The members of the Legislature know that the circumstances of individuals and families frequently change—sometimes within short spans of time. We, therefore, welcome the opportunity of reviewing cases at any time to determine whether the altered circumstances will permit us to render the assistance which we were originally unable to render.

Furthermore, any applicant for welfare assistance to my department should feel free to request reconsideration of, or to appeal his case at any time, particularly if he has reason to feel that some error has been made in the reaching of the decision with respect to his application.

I might add that the field staff of the department is carrying a very large responsibility in connection with "out" cases. They make, on the average, some 12,000 visits monthly relating to applicants or to recipients of the various forms of assistance.

I think I can sum up, best, the approach we have tried to take in the department towards persons who require social welfare services by quoting an old proverb:

Sometimes, that which is given with a kindly hand is more acceptable than that which is given with a full hand.

HON. MR. FROST: Before calling the first Estimate, I would like to inform the House of a change in the order of calling future Estimates. Instead of dealing with the Department of Public Works tomorrow, we will deal with the Department of Reform Institutions, and the Department of Public Works, and the Department of Travel and Publicity will be dealt with on Monday.

Vote No. 142, Main Office, \$394,100.
On Vote No. 142.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I would like to speak about item 24, "Marian Hill Charitable Institution, Pembroke, \$9,500." It is a new item. I do not recall ever having seen it in the past. Would the hon. Minister explain what that is for?

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Item 24, and also 23. There is no provision in the Charitable Institutions Act whereby we can make provision for grants to a charitable organization in connection with renovating an old building. For very obvious reasons, it was not thought advisable that we should make that provision, because there were a great many old buildings in this province which might be taken over by charitable organizations, which, when renovated and rebuilt, would still not be worth the money spent on them. We felt that we had to control this, in view of the fact there are some buildings which do lend themselves to renovation and re-building, and we thought we should give consideration to making a grant to an organization building accommodations which actually are new, for the elderly people.

In the case of the Salvation Army, item No. 23; that is a grant to the Salvation Army as part of the purchase price of the old Galt Hospital, which is not

being used for hospital purposes, since the new hospital was built. It is a good building, and we felt we were justified in assisting the Salvation Army by making this grant.

The other is a good building in Pembroke, which the diocese of Pembroke was renovating, and which will accommodate a large number of the aged people in that area. We do not propose to make these grants statutory, but to consider each case on its merits, and this will enable us to make the grants where we think they are justified.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Before asking my question, I would like to express my thanks to the hon. Minister and his staff for the very excellent co-operation we have received throughout the year. I am quite sure I voice the opinion of all hon. members of the Legislature when I say we do appreciate the co-operation received from the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and his staff.

The other day the hon. Prime Minister said that his Minister of Labour, and the Department of Labour was the best in the world. That is covering a great deal of territory, but I will say that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and his staff have been very courteous and helpful during the past year.

The item upon which I would like to speak deals with the burial of immigrant indigents, in accordance with a provincial agreement.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: In reply to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) we have an agreement with the Federal Government on a 50-50 basis, whereby we assume the responsibility for the burial of any New Canadian who has not had 1 year's residence, and is, therefore, not qualified under the residence rule, as far as a municipality is concerned. That also applies to hospitalization which might be required by a New Canadian.

MR. THOMAS: Is the fee for the burial still \$75?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: There is no stipulated fee at the present time.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 142, item 6: This is a long item containing many different portions, and I want to refer chiefly to "Transportation of Deserting Husbands."

The total amount in this item is \$3,000. In that I presume is included the return of deserting husbands back to their homes for prosecution for deserting their families. Is that considered an appropriate amount to look after this item?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: We feel it is. There are not too many of them. We have brought back a few, but most of them can pay their own way back.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, my question would also come under item 6. Could the hon. Minister tell us how many municipalities are paying the supplementary pensions to those on pension?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I understand there are about 1,000. The municipalities are granting supplementary assistance to about 1,000.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): One thousand people or municipalities?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: One thousand people. There are not that many municipalities.

MR. OLIVER: That is not very many people either.

MR. THOMAS: About how many municipalities, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: There are about 100 municipalities, assisting about 1,000 people. We do not advertise this too much, so there are not too many.

MR. OLIVER: I do not think it would stand much advertising, anyway.
Vote 142 agreed to.
Vote 143, Child Welfare, \$2,455,300.

MR. GRUMMETT: Item 4. Mr. Chairman, away down the page is "Maintenance for children from unorganized territory, committed to the care and custody of the Children's Aid Society, under the Children's Protection Act, and the Juvenile Delinquents' Act, \$273,000."

These children are mainly brought in from unorganized territory. Owing to the fact that the husband and father has deserted his family, I believe it is becoming rather a burdensome expense on the province, arising from fathers having deserted their families and leaving them in necessitous circumstances.

As the hon. Minister knows for some years I have been advocating more strict measures for those who desert their families, and I would like to see pressure put on them, to compel them to return and look after their families, or punish them for having deserted.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: We have adopted sort of a "get tough" policy. I may say I understand the incidence is much heavier in Cochrane than any place else.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Minister tell us why?

MR. GOODFELLOW: There is a great deal of low-cost housing there, and these people move in from other places. I am told it is not the local people who are deserting.

We have succeeded in bringing a great many deserting husbands and fathers back. In some cases, the wives object; they would much rather we did not try to find their husbands, for very obvious reasons, because if we are paying Mothers' Allowances, and we find the husbands and bring them back, we have to discontinue the Mothers' Allowances. We have no other course to follow, because the husband is back, even if he is no good, and will not work.

We have to use a great deal of discretion in getting husbands to support their families.

MR. GRUMMETT: Do you not think some municipalities would rather

see you not do anything to bring the husbands back? After 1 year the family is taken off municipal relief, and the province takes over, and the municipality is relieved from all further responsibility. The wife and mother may be on Mothers' Allowance for 10 years, and the municipality has no further concern over the family.

Vote 143 agreed to.

Vote 144. Day Nurseries, \$324,500, agreed to.

Vote 145. Mothers' Allowances, \$7,003,400, agreed to.

MR. THOMAS: I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the case of a lady who applied for Mothers' Allowance in my riding about 2 weeks ago. This lady's husband was drowned last year, and had left his widow and 2 children, one aged 4, and the other aged 8. The husband had some insurance which provided, on his death, the payment of \$50 per month.

After 12 years there was a cash payment provided of \$5,000. Now she has limited assets of less than \$1,000 and has applied for Mothers' Allowance.

The department's decision was this: that she had to commute that \$5,000 over the next 12 years. It would have increased her monthly pension to about \$60. Now the husband, when he was alive, took out that insurance policy in order to provide the children with an education when they became 18 years of age. The decision of the department means, of course, that she must now commute that insurance, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there is some way in which a position like this may be dealt with? If the pension is commuted now, it will mean that the children will be without the benefit of this money, at the very time when they need it the most.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It has always been the policy that any estate over \$1,000 has to be put into a controlled account to be liquidated. It used to be when a child reached the age of 16. Now the age limit is up to 18. A line must be drawn somewhere. How

much insurance would the hon. member say a husband should leave to provide for his wife and family, on an annuity basis, before we should have to consider paying Mothers' Allowance? I feel we definitely have to draw a line. I would be glad to look into this particular case, but there are thousands of mothers in this province who have no assets of any kind. It is just a question of how far we should go in respect of assets which are left by way of insurance.

MR. SALSBERG: On this question of Mothers' Allowance, I would like to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the policy being followed in that department which theoretically sounds very convincing—I find it difficult to argue against it—but in practice there have been instances where it has caused hardship. I refer to the policy of not paying mothers who work more than 50 per cent. of the time. The theory behind this decision is to provide proper maternal care for the child, and that is sound, because we are not supporting or aiding mothers, widows or deserted wives because they are mothers or wives, but because they have to take care of their children. That being the case, a policy which seeks to provide the maximum of maternal care and personal attention is laudable, and, so far, I go along with the department. But I want to suggest that while it is true, as the hon. Minister has said that the staff is very helpful and considerate, the regulations ought in some way to be softened up and made a little more flexible, because I suspect that as it is being applied at present we are weeding out and eliminating from the roll families who otherwise would be entitled to our assistance. I think the number of cases carried by the department is smaller than it was a year ago, though I do not see any figure here in the Estimates. On the other hand, the cost is higher. That would speak well for the department, since in other words there are fewer cases and more money being spent on them. But I suggest there are cases where the application of this rule is causing hardship. I have in mind a case where a mother is told not to work more than 3 days a week. She may find

it difficult to get employment for 3 days, but she may get a job for 4. Of course we all understand that even with the aid of our assistance, plus her 4 days' earnings, she is still not in a very enviable position. She barely gets by. But if we insist on no more than 3 days, and if she cannot get a job for 3 days, then the problem is clear. Either she must give up the work and live on Mothers' Allowance only or she must give up Mothers' Allowance and live on 4 days' earnings only.

As I say, I agree with the policy. It sounds reasonable. But I do suggest that we need flexibility in its application, and there are instances where the demand for a rigid adherence to the new regulation creates an impossible condition. I have in mind one family where the mother, working in a seasonal trade, may find herself obliged to work more than 3 or 4 days for a very short period, after which she may be unemployed for some weeks. I say that in such cases we should certainly apply our policy very flexibly and with the utmost consideration for the families involved.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: The hon. member for St. Andrew almost succeeded in convincing me at one point in his argument. I am not so convinced now. I think our policy is reasonably good.

We did adopt a policy of getting a bit "tough" with those mothers who were working full time. We found there were hundreds of mothers across this province who were drawing Mothers' Allowance benefits in such circumstances, and in many cases they were receiving much less in salaries and wages than they should have been receiving. Employers were taking advantage of them to some extent. I may say we only obtained a reaction from about only 50 full-time working mothers after they had been informed that they would have to cut their working time so as to qualify for the allowance in the proper way.

I do think, however, Mr. Chairman, that a point has now been reached, as we have eliminated a lot of these cases, where we can become a little more

flexible and use a little more discretion in dealing with cases on their individual merits.

Vote 145 agreed to.

On Vote 146.

Old Age Assistance Branch—salaries, \$280,300.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): In connection with Vote 146, I see, Mr. Chairman, that the total vote is headed "Old age pension grants," but that included in the Vote we have assistance to blind persons and the Blind Persons Allowance Act. In some places expenditure in respect of blind persons' allowances is set out in addition to expenditure for old-age assistance and I was wondering if it would not be possible to divide completely these items in future. It is headed "Old Age Assistance" and why should not this be restricted to a separate item?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: There will be no difficulty in doing that. We will do that in future.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 146 I should like to say that this is an item upon which I feel very strongly and I commence the few remarks which I intend to make, with the full knowledge that I will bring the wrath of the government and its supporters down on my head. But I can assure the government and its supporters that I am fully conditioned to that, and quite immune. Their disapproval will not hurt me, and they can go ahead. As far as I am concerned, I will not even begin to apologize for what I am going to say.

My remarks on this matter will not be directed to the head of the department, nor to its officials, nor to the hon. Minister. In fact I should be happy if the hon. Minister would sit there and not attempt to answer me, but let the hon. Prime Minister answer instead, because I think this is a matter for which the whole government must take the responsibility.

I refer to the question of old-age assistance. I am glad to see the hon. Prime Minister taking his place in the

Chamber. I would also be glad to see old-age assistance given on a scale which would not result in starvation in a great many cases. When that is the situation, one cannot dispose of it by any formal presentation of the case, nor by any humble petition to the government to take it into consideration or to give it attention.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that I have raised this on previous occasions, and I expect some hon. members on the other side will say: "Why do you not say something new?" But I will continue to say what I am saying, in the House or outside the House, as long as this government persists in a policy which results unquestionably in starvation in many cases.

The present old-age pension is \$40 a month. In view of the changes which have taken place in the province during the past few years, the government is actually spending less on assistance to our aged citizens than it has spent in previous financial years. For this year the Estimate is for \$5,406,000. That is for old-age assistance, and allowances for blind persons. Last year the Estimate was for \$5,526,000; the year before that it was \$6,240,000, and for the fiscal year 1951-52 it was \$11,300,000. Of course, the \$11,300,000 was the year before the introduction of the universal pension for 70 and over, and then there was the big drop. But the drop continues, and the government, on the one hand, is spending less on this most important of services; and on the other hand records increasing surpluses during the same years.

I couple those two things because we have no earthly excuse for refusing to supplement our old-age pensioners by at least as much as other provinces are doing, no financial excuse and no moral excuse. I know the government will say they are ready, and indeed are already sharing with some municipalities a supplementary allowance up to \$10 a month on a 50-50 basis. I say that is wrong, first because the municipalities are in no way able to assume additional burdens, whereas the province can discharge this responsibility without the

assumption of any burden; and, second, that because of the financial position of the municipalities it is reasonable to assume that they will hesitate to assume this additional cost.

The result is that in a city like Toronto there are 572 old-age assistance recipients who are getting a supplementary allowance up to \$10 a month in the form of rental assistance. In other words, where an aged person, who has no other income, comes to the City Welfare Department and shows them that the rent is so high that it leaves very little for food, the city then allows them up to \$10 a month to help in paying the rent, and charges the province half of that amount. I think it is wrong.

I cannot speak for the whole province, but I can speak with some degree of knowledge of the situation in this Metropolitan area, and in this area, Mr. Chairman, the facts of life are that it requires a minimum of some \$62 a month—a minimum, mind you—to live. And that is on a minimum budgetary basis, as worked out by the Welfare Council. These are inescapable facts, and when we expect them to exist on \$40—shared by the city—increased by \$10, we are still insisting that some of them starve.

I know “starvation” is a bad word, but there is no other word for it. Mr. Chairman, it is only 3 or 4 days ago—to be exact the 26th of last month—that the *Toronto Telegram*, a supporter of this government, carried a story on the front page with the following heading:

“Old Folk Hungry On \$40 Pension”

and the story starts out as follows:

Is it possible that people are going hungry, even to the point of starvation in Toronto? Welfare authority said today it was not only possible, it was inevitable. They quoted statistics to show there must be hundreds, perhaps thousands, of old-age pensioners in the city, and more in some of the suburbs, who cannot possibly be getting enough to eat. Welfare figures show that an old-age person, living entirely on the \$40 a month pension,

must pay at a minimum for subsistence \$7 a week, or \$30.33 for a room; \$25.84 for men, and \$22.50 for women on food; \$7 a month for personal care such as laundry soap, toothpaste and such incidentals. Mrs. Jean Good, Secretary of the Division on Old Age of the Toronto Welfare Council, said today: “If they have to pay \$30 of their \$40 a month for rent—and sometimes they pay more than that, very seldom less—then that leaves them with \$10 for food.”

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted from the report of this evening paper to illustrate to hon. members that I am not trying to make a case against the government, as sometimes certain hon. members feel that all I do is criticize. As I have told them in the past, I am quite sure that all the praiseworthy deeds of the government are getting sufficient praise, and I am not called upon to add to the laurels that are handed out to the government by its supporters. I am not making a case, I am merely bringing to the House what other very responsible, very capable and authoritative people in this field know to be the truth.

And Mr. Chairman, may I say to those hon. members who come from the rural areas and who may feel that the situation in their area is different and therefore perhaps have a little less patience with me than maybe some city members; to them may I say that the situation in their areas unquestionably is different. The cost of living is lower, rent is lower: In a small town or village or in a farm area there are certain items that an old-age pensioner, or a couple, will be able to obtain for a fraction of what it costs in a city like Toronto, Hamilton or Ottawa. I therefore ask them to please understand that in a big metropolitan area like this, if one has no relatives to fall back on, but has to rent rooms, then the present pension spells starvation.

I read into the record a year ago statement emanating from the Toronto General Hospital, of cases of elderly people who collapsed in the streets of Toronto, and were diagnosed, after their recovery under hospital care, as having suffered from malnutrition. The records

of those cases showed that they had no other source of income, and therefore could not put aside enough money for adequate food to keep themselves in health.

Now these are not stories; these are not things picked from thin air, they are established facts brought to light by those bodies and groups that are created and financed for this purpose.

It means very little, Mr. Chairman, to be told that it is entirely the responsibility of the Federal Government. I am prepared to support the government with everything I am capable of in their efforts to get Ottawa to give more to old-age assistance recipients. But what I insist on, and will continue to insist even though it causes unhappiness maybe among some in the Treasury benches, is that so long as Ottawa does not do it, we, with more money than we know what to do with, must come to the assistance of these people. That is all there is to it.

And I suggest there is no escaping the proposition that I am making.

There is another point that should be hammered away at, and that is that what I am proposing is already in effect in other provinces. In British Columbia, until now there was \$10 monthly supplement, plus hospitalization care. Now that province is increasing the supplement to \$15, bringing the total up to \$55 where proven necessity is established, of course, plus hospitalization. The Province of Alberta gave a \$10 supplement, and they are now increasing it to \$15, making \$55. The Province of Saskatchewan, by no means as wealthy as the others, also gives a supplement which was, to my last knowledge, \$2.50 a month, plus hospitalization. But we, in this province, can sit back and say, "Well, Ottawa should do more"—which I agree with, they certainly should—"But we cannot undertake that if Ottawa refuses, because it will create a situation where later on we may have to discontinue certain social welfare services."

I think very highly of the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow), but

I must tell him that I could not follow him when he, in his introductory remarks today, advanced this line of argumentation, and quoted, I believe, from the Right Hon. Mr. Martin, about the difficulty of introducing higher pensions because later on we might have to reduce it. I cannot follow that at all.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I was simply saying what the man said.

MR. SALSBERG: I know that, and, of course, it is not a wrong method of presenting one's position, if one can buttress it by what the right hon. gentleman says. But I do not agree with Martin, and I cannot agree with the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) here, and I cannot keep quiet when we are told of such cases of suffering. I cannot keep quiet.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last Saturday I had a very unhappy experience. Two elderly ladies, whose knowledge of the English language is rather poor, came to my office very happy with a clipping of the *Toronto Star* clutched in their hands, and saying: "Mr. Salsberg, we hear we are going to get more money, and we need it badly. When do we start?"—or words to that effect. I said: "But who told you that?" "Well, a gentleman living in the house gave us this clipping from the paper and said: 'You are getting more money'." When I unfolded the piece of paper, of course all it said was that I had had an argument, I think with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), on the matter of increasing old-age assistance, and that was all. So this gentleman had told them I was trying to get it, and as far as they were concerned, they came down to collect it.

Now, those two elderly ladies need the supplement very badly, and such people exist in every riding in every large centre.

One could say: "Well, I have done my duty, I brought it to the attention of the government; what more can I do", and then go home and have a clear conscience or at least rationalize oneself into a condition where one's conscience

is almost clear, and say: "That is all I can do, I tried and the government refused."

Mr. Chairman, I confess that I cannot rationalize it that way for myself. I cannot condition myself to a state of mind that would let me be at peace when people in my and your ridings are evidently not eating enough food, and knowing that there is all the money necessary to provide them with that food. I cannot rationalize it, and I cannot sit down and say: "Well, I have spoken."

I hate to press the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I have done it before, and I have done it to those who preceded him. But I should like to hope that there will be a change of policy. I want to say to him that every time I hear him say, when asked about the \$58 million surplus: "Well, we are paying off the mortgage," I want to tell him, every time he says that, that he may be paying off part of the mortgage but he is starving his grandparents in the kitchen. I do not think "Old Man Ontario" wants him to pay off a mortgage like that. Besides, we are paying off the mortgage very well without starving anybody. But as it is, I suggest we are starving old people. In addition to providing the extra millions that we have set aside for disposing of the mortgage, you are able to throw in another \$20 million there and another \$10 million here. But what have you got for those old people? You are saving money on old-age assistance, that is where you are economizing.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), who is not in his place, thinks this is a very hilarious matter, and he laughs.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: We were not laughing at the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg).

MR. SALSBERG: I want to tell the hon. Attorney-General that he should be ashamed of himself for laughing when these arguments are advanced.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): I did not hear that.

MR. SALSBERG: He ought to be ashamed of himself, coming back from Wall Street, as he has, too.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Why does not the hon. member go over, and get arrested?

MR. SALSBERG: I leave it to him to get arrested. The hon. Attorney-General is excellent at arresting, and what he arrests mostly in this province is progress. I want to tell him that—

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member stick to the Estimates, please?

MR. SALSBERG: I am sticking to old-age assistance, and that is the item, and what an item, an inescapable item which is called "146".

I would like to have a very fine public discussion with the hon. Attorney-General in his riding. I would love to go down there and rent a hall—

HON. G. H. DUNBAR: The hon. member would get an audience for the first time.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not worry about my audience, let the hon. Attorney-General and I discuss this question before the people of his riding. Let no one be complacent about it.

MR. J. W. HANNA (Huron-Bruce): Give us a bedtime story.

MR. SALSBERG: This is the type of bedside story which should keep the hon. member awake all night if he has a conscience.

MR. NICKLE: He does stay awake all night.

MR. SALSBERG: If he does stay awake all night, it is not because of what he hears from me, but for other reasons, and they are not such good reasons either. He just cannot sleep.

I conclude for the moment with an appeal to the government to alter its course, and to at least follow the example of other provinces such as British Columbia and Alberta, and provide a supplementary allowance of at least \$15

a month; and to also improve the hospitalization services for the aged, and in that manner do the minimum which we are capable of doing for the most deserving section of the population.

In conclusion, I want to say when I suggest a \$15 a month supplementary allowance, I am not suggesting a maximum figure.

In discussing this matter with the Commissioner of Public Welfare for the City of Toronto, he told me that in his opinion what is necessary is \$20 a month supplementary allowance if the aged people are to get along. I said, "Well, thank you for being so frank in expressing your opinion to me." He said, "My dear sir, that is not meant for you alone. I have said this publicly and if you want, you can quote me."

I agree with him. I am arguing at the moment we at least should do what British Columbia and Alberta have done.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): On that item, I had a case brought to my attention which I am mentioning because I think it has a wide application. It is the case of a woman who is living in a village about 30 miles from Ottawa. As she was widowed, she decided to live with her daughter in Ottawa. She had a house in her village, and through the good offices of a conveyancer, she managed to sell that house, but on a monthly basis.

I am speaking from memory, but I think the purchase price was \$3,500, payable \$25 a month, plus interest. She is 60 years of age, and she made application for relief.

I understand the policy of the department as agreed upon between the Dominion and Provincial Governments is that a pensioner may retain \$1,000 at the age of 70, and draw the pension of a Federal Government thereafter. The balance is to be apportioned in equal shares between her present age and until she reaches 70 years of age: In this instance, the balance between \$1,000 and \$3,500, or \$2,500, is the amount, and as this lady is about 60 years of age, it means that the sum of \$2,500 is to be divided in 4 portions, making about \$600 a year.

On that basis, since your regulation is to the effect that they may receive \$40 provided their income does not exceed \$20 a month, it means that the contribution of your department is about \$5 a month.

Mr. Chairman, this lady has a security, which brings her about \$30 a month. She cannot live on that security, and whereas she should be entitled to \$60 a month, actually what she receives is \$30 a month. Surely there should be ways and means devised so this lady should be entitled to receive the \$60 a month to which she is entitled. I do not know if it would be by transferring to your department that security, or whatever means you may devise, but I think there is real merit to that case. I would like to hear the hon. Minister tell me if there is any method of solving such a problem, because I think this problem is not an isolated one and has probably happened in other cases.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I might say I do not like any part of our old-age assistance programme for people between 65 and 70 years of age, for the very obvious reason that it is unsatisfactory to a great many people. The reason for that is, you cannot explain to them why they have a very restricted means test between 65 and 70, and then the Federal Government becomes Santa Claus at 70 and they get \$40 a month regardless of any income or assets they might have.

We have a great many such instances because under the present formula we have to compute any assets over \$1,000 by the number of months until they are 70 years of age, and consider that as income under the means test.

We did bring forward at the recent conference we had with the Federal Government, several other suggested formulas, one of which we would hope the Federal Government might consider and adopt, which would take away that very restrictive and unfair computation.

A great many people, without knowing they are in receipt of old-age assistance, perhaps get to a point where they cannot look after themselves, and

they sell their home. As long as they have their little home, only 5 per cent. of the assessed value is computed as income. The minute they sell that home, in a great many cases, we must cancel the allowance because they have a sale, yet it might only be a mortgage receivable. In some instances, they might possibly have an arrangement whereby they could get so much a year, but they do not realize, when they do that, they are jeopardizing their assistance.

However, that is the way the computation is at the present time, and I would hope from the discussions which we had at the conference with the federal authorities, that some other system of computing cash and real values might be considered.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): On that point, I have a question I would like to ask the hon. Minister.

I hope the hon. Minister will agree with respect to the means test and its severity, that this government has been master in its own house up until now. If it is severe, then it provided the provisions which made it severe, and this government can relax.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: We never established the means test.

MR. OLIVER: I beg your pardon?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: We never established the means test.

MR. OLIVER: There is no means test between 65 and 70?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: That is set by the Federal Government.

MR. OLIVER: That is right.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Right across Canada.

Votes 146, 147 and 148 agreed to.

On Vote 149, Disabled Persons' Allowances, \$2,840,500.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): On Vote 149, would the hon. Minister

please tell us how many there are under disablement pensions at the present time?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: As of the present time, there are approximately 5,500. There have been 6,000 who have qualified and about 500 have been transferred or are deceased, or what have you.

MR. THOMAS: That is quite a jump from last year. I think the hon. Minister stated that last year there were 3,300. With the entry of the Federal Government into the scheme, does the hon. Minister think there will be any relaxation of the regulations, does he think there will be an opportunity for more people to qualify and that the total of permanently disabled included will be increased?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I would say that in my opinion the Federal Government is going to follow our present set-up in connection with the administration of disabled allowances almost to the letter. Many of the provinces at the conference were not very favourable to broadening the programme. They wanted it to be more restricted than our own, and until experience has been gained, both by the Federal Government and by the various provinces I think the administration is going to be rather restricted.

Vote 149 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report that it has agreed to certain resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker. There are 3 private bills for second reading. One of them is the Hamilton bill. I think they might be advanced in committee where they might be dealt with better than on the second reading.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON

MR. COWLING in the absence of Mr. Elliott moves second reading of Bill No. 5, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. OLIVER: With regard to that bill, Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. Prime Minister will agree that the amendments shall be printed in with the bill so that they may be considered by hon. members. There may be important amendments.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh yes.

THE CITY OF LONDON

MR. T. PRYDE in the absence of Mr. Robarts, moves second reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TOWN OF OAKVILLE

MR. T. PRYDE in the absence of Mr. Hall, moves second reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the Town of Oakville."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: There are 3 other second readings in government Orders. If there is going to be any extended debate on the Farm Products Marketing Act, I will hold it over.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary) in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow moves second reading of Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

HON. MR. PORTER (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is possible an amendment may be introduced in committee, depending on the report of the select committee which was set up to consider certain phases of this bill.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

HON. MR. WELSH moves second reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Service Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bills were read a third time, and passed, and intituled as in the motions:

Bill No. 27, An Act to incorporate the London Foundation.

Bill No. 65, An Act to amend the Corporation Act, 1953.

Bill No. 94, An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board.

Bill No. 95, An Act to amend the Public Utilities Act.

Bill No. 96, An Act to amend the Municipal Franchises Act.

Bill No. 97, An Act to amend the Gas Pipeline Act, 1951.

Bill No. 110, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

THE MILK INDUSTRY

House in Committee on Bill No. 68, "An Act respecting the Milk Industry."

On section 1:

MR. OLIVER: May I ask a question of the hon. Minister responsible for this bill? The government promised they would leave this matter before the committee for some time. They have done that. They have kept their promise in that respect. I want to ask the hon. Minister if there has been, of late, any real objection on the part of organized agriculture to the bill as it is presently written, or as to these amendments? If the hon. Minister can tell the House there has not been much objection to it, then there will not be much objection to it tonight, as far as I am concerned.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): I can say that this bill has the whole-hearted support of the 4 producer groups.

Section 1 agreed to.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: There are still 2 amendments to be made.

I move:

1. That section 28 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

28. The local boards constituted under the Farm Products Marketing Act and known as the Ontario Cheese Producers' Marketing Board, the Ontario Cream Producers' Marketing Board, and the Ontario Concentrated Milk Producers' Marketing Board are continued as local boards under this part.

2. That section 51 of the bill be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

51. O. Reg. 100/51, as amended by O. Reg. 17/54, O. Reg. 101/51, as amended by O. Reg. 308/52, O. Reg. 146/54 and O. Reg. 18/54, O. Reg. 102/51 as amended by O. Reg. 309/52, O. Reg. 19/54 and O. Reg. 31/54, Regulations 98 and 99 of Consolidated Regulations of Ontario, 1950, and O. Reg. 40/54, O. Reg. 411/54, and O. Reg. 42/54 shall, except in so far as they are inconsistent with this Act, be deemed to have been made under part III of this Act.

Motion agreed to; bill amended accordingly.

Bill as amended reported.

THE CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT, ETC.

House in Committee on Bill No. 77, "An Act to Consolidate and Revise the Children's Protection Act, the Children of Unmarried Parents Act, and the Adoption Act."

Sections 1 to 15 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 16.

MR. OLIVER: On section 16, Mr. Chairman, there has been some objection to certain parts of this provision. Apparently, under this section, the wardship is now removed at the age of 18 except in special cases. Representations have been made to me that it would be better to continue wardship until the wards are 21, but to allow a judge to terminate that responsibility at any time, before a ward reaches that age, if he has reason to do so. What does the hon. Minister say to this?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: The people I have consulted on the drafting of this Act—the people who should be conversant with child welfare organization in the province—can see no reason, except in certain circumstances, why wardship should not terminate at the age of 18. After all, it is at the discretion of the judge in any particular case as to when wardship should end. In certain circumstances, unless you have a provision such as is now suggested, a ridiculous situation can arise. You may have a girl who is a ward of a Children's Aid Society and she marries at the age of 16 or 17. She may have a home, and 2 or 3 children, but nevertheless she remains the ward of the Children's Aid Society until she is 21. We feel wardship should be terminated at the age of 18, unless there are special circumstances, and the judge will decide that.

Sections 16 to 18 agreed to.

On section 19.

MR. GRUMMETT: This section provides that a child who is the ward of one Children's Aid Society may be transferred to another Children's Aid Society in the municipality to which the child actually belongs. What is the object of making such transfer?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, may I give you a concrete example? A child, for whom there is a charge-back for maintenance to the town of Sioux Lookout, is a ward of the Toronto Children's Aid Society. In the Kenora district, the per diem rate is, I think, about \$1.20 a day, whereas the per diem rate in the City of Toronto is over \$2 a day. It seems most unfair, in this particular case—and I am only citing one case, we have several of them—unfair that Sioux Lookout should have to pay the Toronto per diem rate, when a suitable home could be found in the Kenora district, where the child had residence, and where the charge-back is on the municipality of Sioux Lookout at the present time.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is, it may be possible to secure a foster home for such child in his own local municipality?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: That is right, a suitable home.

MR. GRUMMETT: What confused me was the wording of the first line, which reads:

Where it is in the interests of the welfare of the ward.

That was why I asked the question.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It is a little misleading, but that is the purpose of it.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, it is a little misleading.

Sections 19 to 26 inclusive, agreed to.
On section 27.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would explain the purpose of section 27?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I think I had better consult my notes, I never like to get into legal phraseology if I can avoid it. There is no change in that section, Mr. Chairman. It is the same as it was in the former Act, and has always been in effect. That is the reason I have no notes on it, because the only notes I have is where there has been some changes effected from the old Act to the new.

MR. GRUMMETT: I should like to get some explanation of subsections 4 and 5, which have to do with the religious faith of the child, after it is committed.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Of course, they have always observed that very closely, as far as religious faith is concerned. The child takes the faith of the father.

MR. GRUMMETT: It cannot be committed to a family of a different religious faith?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: No, it cannot be. That is followed very closely.

MR. GRUMMETT: The next section, Mr. Chairman, is along the same lines, but I was wondering if that is a very good policy to follow. It provides that the judge, in making the order, may consult the child. A child, 8, 9, or 10 years of age would be under the influence of a foster parent. It may have been boarded out in a home, and could be under the influence of a foster parent of a different religious faith, and when the judge is making the order, such child could be influenced into asking that it be allowed to be brought up in a certain religious faith, which may be different from that of its father.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: That would only come into play under very peculiar circumstances. The judge would always first ascertain what the religious faith of the child was. Personally, I do not think that subsection means too much, because I quite agree

with the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) that the wishes of the child should not be taken into account in that respect.

MR. GRUMMETT: I would suggest the wishes of the child be disregarded until that child is released from the Children's Aid Society—at least 16 or 18 years of age.

Sections 27 to 30 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 31.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, there was a suggestion from one of the Children's Aid Societies that reducing the age to 10 years was putting it down too low, and that the courts and Children's Aid Societies had formally considered that 14 or 15 years was the earliest age at which a child might be considered competent to decide for itself. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) should say what is the reason for making that 10 years of age.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: This is in connection with a situation where children have been neglected. It simply makes it an offence to leave any child under 10 years of age unattended for an unreasonable length of time. It is aimed at irresponsible parents, who leave small children unattended, which sometimes results in tragedy of some kind.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) for this section. I think it is a very good section indeed, and I am glad to see it in the Act.

Sections 31 to 34 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 35.

MR. GRUMMETT: In some of the smaller municipalities, it would be quite difficult for the judge to have separate quarters, other than the magistrate's court, for the hearing of this application. This section might put a very undue burden on the municipality, might it not?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It would not be the intention to enforce

it to that extent. They would have to use their judgment in that connection.

Sections 35 to 37 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 38.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on section 38 and a few sections following, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to an item I raised during second reading, which, if approved, would, in my opinion, make a good bill much better.

The hon. Minister will recall that I raised the problem of financing the unmarried mother before confinement, during confinement, and immediately afterwards.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) if, instead of proceeding with his question at this time, he would move the adjournment of consideration of this bill? There are a number of small items on the Order paper which I should like to dispose of, and let this bill stand over.

MR. SALSBERG: I would be glad to accommodate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), but this will only take me a minute, and then I shall be through.

HON. MR. FROST: There are 80-odd sections.

MR. SALSBERG: There is only this section in which I am interested. It is entirely up to the hon. Prime Minister, I will gladly leave it over.

HON. MR. FROST: All right.

MR. SALSBERG: What I suggested at the time was that if the government would provide the financial requirements to take care of those special cases, we would, in my opinion, close the door to black-marketeering in babies. I do not want to repeat the argument I made on that subject, as it is on the record. The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) then replied that I was misinformed, and that there is ample provision through private agencies to take care of such cases. I

have since then written, and have received from the Canadian Welfare Council in Ottawa a copy of the policy statement on the residence requirements as they affect unmarried mothers, and it seems that my information was generally correct, that they have made a special study of this, and have come to conclusions that are very, very definite. They recommend:

That provincial governments be requested to assume entire financial responsibility for the maintenance of unmarried mothers and their children where economic assistance from the public funds is necessary.

and so on. I repeat, therefore, the appeal, and if the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) has not that booklet—

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I have had dozens of them.

MR. SALSBERG: I would appeal to him to consider it, because as I said then—and I do not want to prolong the discussion now—most instances of so-called black-marketeering in babies come when the prospective unmarried mother, hesitant to go to some private charitable or religious institution, will go to private people who will finance her, and then take the child from her after she has recovered. If we were to assume financial responsibility in such instances, I think the need for going to private people—whether they be doctors or ordinary citizens—would be done away with. And if the government is not ready to act on it now, I do hope we shall act on it pretty soon.

MR. GRUMMETT: I know the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has asked to have this bill laid over. Perhaps I could move that it be laid over, because I have one or two more questions.

HON. MR. FROST: That is quite satisfactory.

MR. GRUMMETT. However, at the same time I should like to reserve the right to go back to section 37. My main question is on that section.

HON. MR. FROST: That is all right. It is an important bill.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT moved adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I think we might dispose of a number of non-contentious bills in a few minutes, which would give us additional time for debate and consideration of other important bills later on.

Before proceeding, I would like to refer hon. members to Bill No. 78, the re-distribution bill. I shall mention this again tomorrow when the House convenes. Every hon. member should look at the description of his own riding. As I understand it, the law clerks have modernized the descriptions of the various ridings, by putting in the names of villages and other areas which were not mentioned in the descriptions of 1933, 21 years ago. I suggest each hon. member carefully check over the description of his own riding, to see that it is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to inform the House that the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Resolution by Hon. Mr. Goodfellow, that,

the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council may direct payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to assist in defraying the cost of establishing and erecting new homes for the aged in territorial districts and of additions to or extensions of existing homes for the aged in territorial districts,

as provided by Bill No. 121. "An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act."

Resolution concurred in.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Resolution by hon. Mr. Welsh, that,

Where fees of the office of a registrar of deeds are insufficient to pay

into the Public Service Superannuation Fund the amount required in respect of past services, the balance shall be paid into the Public Service Superannuation Fund out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,

as provided by Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

Resolution concurred in.

THE REGISTRY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend The Registry Act."

Section 1 agreed to.

HON. MR. PORTER moves that section 2 be struck out, and that sections 3 to 17 inclusive, be renumbered accordingly.

HON. MR. PORTER: We have had certain representations about that section, and I think it is perhaps premature.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 2, formerly 3, agreed to.

Sections 4 to 6 inclusive, agreed to.

New section 7 agreed to.

On section 9 (formerly section 8).

HON. MR. PORTER moves that subsection 4 of section 52(a) of the Registry Act, as indicated by section 9 of the bill be repealed, and the following substituted therefor:

(4) This section does not apply to an assurance made to or for the benefit of

(a) A corporation that is licenced or registered under the Insurance Act, the Investment Contract Act, or the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, or

(b) A bank to which The Bank Act (Canada) or

(c) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Section 9, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 10 to 16 agreed to.

HON. MR. PORTER: May this bill be held over? There is another proposal

which has just come to me, at this moment, and I must have some time to consider it.

HON. MR. FROST: Do not report the bill. Hold it over for further consideration.

MR. OLIVER: Is the hon. Attorney-General in the mood to consider other amendments?

HON. MR. PORTER: We are open until the last minute, and then we have to close.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend The Land Titles Act."

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 115 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL SUBSIDIES ADJUSTMENT ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 120 reported.

THE HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

MR. GRUMMETT: I did not have an opportunity of looking over this bill, but I notice section 1 will permit one municipality, which may be separated by some considerable distance, to go in with another municipality and support a home. That is liable to cause certain confusion, because a municipality which might be of great assistance to one area, might want to transfer its allegiance to another municipality because it might feel the rate would be lower in the other area.

I am thinking of Timmins, for instance, where they are building a home

for the aged. Some town which would be in another part of the district might feel it would be to its advantage to transfer its allegiance to Timmins and support the Timmins home, rather than stay in the remainder of the district and be assessed under the general scheme, as applicable to the remainder of the district.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It was designed to take care of the peculiar situation which exists in the City of Port Arthur, which proposes to build a new home for the aged. The Town of Nipigon is also interested in that home, which is to be built in Port Arthur, but the contiguous municipalities between Port Arthur and Nipigon may not be interested.

By this provision, Nipigon can go in with Port Arthur in connection with the home for the aged.

MR. GRUMMETT: Would there be any control over the transfer of allegiance by one municipality to another? What I am getting at is this: Would you be able to say to a municipality, "You have to remain in your part of the district, you cannot transfer to another area merely to escape what might be a heavier assessment"?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: They could not transfer to another district.

MR. GRUMMETT: To a section of the district?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: We might suggest, in our opinion, we would not think it would be advisable, but there is nothing in the act to say they cannot.

MR. GRUMMETT: It might completely upset the remainder of the district. I know the hon. Minister is familiar with Timmins. It is going ahead and building a home of its own, and the remainder of the district is considering a proposition of building a home as well. Suppose one town in the remainder of the district decided it would go in with Timmins. That might completely prevent the remainder of the district building a home. It could take

a large assessment into the Timmins area.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I know the particular situation to which you are referring, and I think in those municipalities adjacent to Timmins, it is only logical and right they should go in with the Town of Timmins. It is much better for the old people to be near a centre like Timmins.

MR. GRUMMETT: I agree it would be for those municipalities contiguous to Timmins, but I am thinking of one or two other municipalities which might have a high assessment, and might feel it would be to their advantage.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It would require the approval of the Minister.

MR. GRUMMETT: As long as the municipality would be required to have the approval of the Minister, I am satisfied.

Sections 5 and 6 agreed to.

Bill No. 121 reported.

THE GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION ACT, 1938

House in Committee on Bill No. 122, "an Act to amend the Grand River Conservation Act, 1938."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 122 reported.

THE DISABLED PERSONS ALLOWANCE ACT, 1952

House in Committee on Bill No. 125, "an Act to amend the Disabled Persons Allowance Act, 1952."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 125 reported.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 126, "an Act to amend the Community Centres Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 126 reported.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 127,
"an Act to amend the Loan and Trust
Corporations Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 127 reported.

THE FIRE MARSHAL'S ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 128,
"an Act to amend the Fire Marshal's
Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.
Bill No. 128 reported.

CERTAIN LANDS IN THE CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

House in Committee on Bill No. 130,
"an Act respecting certain lands in the
City of Port Arthur, occupied by the
Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur."

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive, agreed to.
Schedules A and B agreed to.
Bill No. 130 reported.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 132,
"an Act to amend the Liquor Licence
Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 132 reported.

THE TRAVELLING SHOWS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 134,
"an Act to amend the Travelling Shows
Act."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 134 reported.

THE ROYAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC, TORONTO

House in Committee on Bill No. 135,
"an Act respecting the Royal Conserva-
tory of Music of Toronto."

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 135 reported.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the
committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in
the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT: Mr. Speaker, the
Committee of the Whole House begs to
report it has come to 2 resolutions, and
reports certain bills without amendment,
1 bill with amendment, and progress
on 2 bills.

Report agreed to.

HON. R. FROST: Mr. Speaker, as
I reminded the House, this evening,
tomorrow we will consider the Estimates
of the Department of Reform Institu-
tions. During the afternoon we might
be able to dispose of item No. 9 on
today's Order paper, the further con-
sideration of the Report of the Select
Committee appointed to inquire into
conditions concerning the Reform
Institutions.

If there is any time left, we might go
into committee on some bills, but I
rather doubt that.

HON. MR. FROST moves adjourn-
ment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.20 of the
clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Friday, April 2, 1954

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Friday, April 2, 1954.

Milk Industry , bill respecting, third reading	1155
Land Titles Act , bill to amend, third reading	1155
Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953 , bill to amend, third reading	1155
Homes for the Aged Act , bill to amend, third reading	1155
Grand River Conservation Act, 1938 , bill to amend, third reading	1155
Disabled Persons' Allowance Act , bill to amend, third reading	1155
Community Centres Act , bill to amend, third reading	1155
Loan and Trust Corporations Act , bill to amend, third reading	1156
Fire Marshal's Act , bill to amend, third reading	1156
Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur , bill respecting, third reading	1156
Liquor Licence Act , bill to amend, third reading	1156
Travelling Shows Act , bill to amend, third reading	1156
Royal Conservatory of Music, Toronto , bill respecting, third reading	1156
Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Act, 1943 , bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, second reading	1156
Raising of Money on Credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund , bill to authorize, Mr. Frost, second reading	1156
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole , Mr. Frost, agreed to	1156
Boards of Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec , bill respecting, reported ..	1156
Town of Oakville , bill respecting, reported	1156
City of London , bill respecting, reported	1156
Town of St. Marys , bill respecting, reported	1156
Child Welfare Act , bill to consolidate and revise previous Acts, reported	1156
Registry Act , bill to amend, reported	1158
Highway Traffic Act , bill to amend, reported	1158
Municipal Act , bill to amend, reported	1159
Assessment Act , bill to amend, reported	1162
Cemeteries Act , bill to amend, reported	1162
Pharmacy Act , bill to amend, reported	1163
Farm Products Marketing Act , bill to amend, reported	1163
Public Service Act , bill to amend, reported	1163
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply , Mr. Frost, agreed to	1164
Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions , Mr. Foote	1164
On Report of Committee re Reform Institutions , Mr. Salsberg	1179
Motion to Adjourn , Mr. Doucett, agreed to	1182

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1954.

2.00 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister) moves that the Provincial Auditor be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and all other necessary payments pending the voting of Supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1st, 1954, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that when this House adjourns the present sittings thereof, it does stand adjourned until 2 of the clock Monday afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House, the following:

The Report of the Minister of Lands and Forests of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1953.

HON. MR. FROST: Before the Orders of the day, I again remind the hon. members of the House to look at the provisions of Bill 78, respecting the representation of the people in the Legislative Assembly.

In the report of the committee, the great majority of ridings are unaltered in their boundaries. Regarding this bill, the law clerks and others have endeavoured to bring up-to-date the descriptions of municipalities within the various ridings. It may be that the status of a village has been changed, in the meantime, to that of a town, or there may be an improvement district, or something of that nature.

Every hon. member should read over the description of his own riding, over this weekend, carefully to see there are no errors or omissions, which might easily happen, because there are 98 ridings outlined in the bill.

The following bills were moved a third time, passed, and intitled as in the motion:

Bill No. 68, An Act respecting the Milk Industry.

Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953.

Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act.

Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Grand River Conservation Act, 1938.

Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Disabled Persons' Allowance Act.

Bill No. 126, An Act to amend The Community Centres Act.

Bill No. 127, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Fire Marshal's Act.

Bill No. 130, An Act respecting Certain Lands in the City of Port Arthur occupied by the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur.

Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Travelling Shows Act.

Bill No. 135, An Act respecting the Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto.

THE ONTARIO CANCER TREATMENT AND RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT, 1943

HON. MR. M. PHILLIPS moves second reading of Bill 141, "An Act to amend The Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Act, 1943."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

HON. L. M. FROST moves second reading of Bill 142, "An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Is this the same amount as last year?

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know whether it is the same amount as last year, but it is the "small sum" of \$100 million.

MR. OLIVER: I see that.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to vary the Order, I announced yesterday, and instead of proceeding at once into Estimates, to call Order No. 21. There are a few matters which are non-contentious, and may be dealt with in committee stage.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. T. R. Dent in the Chair.

BAPTIST CONVENTION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

House in Committee on Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 24 reported.

THE TOWN OF OAKVILLE

House in Committee on Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the Town of Oakville."

Sections 1 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A, 2, 3, and 4 agreed to.

Schedules B and C agreed to.

Bill No. 31 reported.

THE CITY OF LONDON

House in Committee on Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 10 reported.

THE TOWN OF ST. MARYS

House in Committee on Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill No. 14 reported.

THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 77, "An Act to Consolidate and Revise the Children's Protection Act, The Children of Unmarried Parents Act, and the Adoption Act."

On section 37:

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I would like to have the hon. Minister explain why this section is necessary in the bill. What is the object of bringing children from other provinces into the Province of Ontario, to be cared for by the Province of Ontario? Why is that section necessary in our Act?

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): I am sorry I did not hear the first part of the question.

MR. GRUMMETT: As I understand this section, it provides for permission to be granted organizations to bring children into the Province of Ontario from other provinces, to care for them within the Province of Ontario. What is the reason for this procedure?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: What section is that?

MR. GRUMMETT: Section 37.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: That is not a new subsection. That practice has been carried on for some time. Children are brought in who have no relatives to look after them, and the societies assume the responsibility for those children until they are 18.

MR. GRUMMETT: This does not relate to bringing them in and to handing them over to relatives. As I read it, it is handing them over to organizations.

Section 37 to 85 inclusive, agreed to.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): On section 85, may I ask the Minister to explain this point. There is a new power here given to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations and prescribe provisions to be included in the by-laws of Children's Aid Societies. That is a new venture on the part of the government, is it not? I always understood that Children's Aid Societies were self-governing. This seems to be an invasion of a field which heretofore has been left to the societies.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: The purpose of this, Mr. Chairman, is to enable uniform by-laws to be drawn up for the societies across the province. It is being done at the request of a great many societies.

MR. OLIVER: This says the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may prescribe provisions to be included in the by-laws. That gives the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the power to vary the by-laws and put something in them from a government point of view. That is different from what the hon. Minister has said. He said the purpose was to supply the societies with by-laws of a uniform standard. If that is the purpose, why not say that? It looks here as if the government could prescribe certain by-laws for some of the Children's Aid Societies and different by-laws for other societies. This does not lend itself to uniformity.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It will be our purpose to make the by-laws uniform, but there may be certain provisions we may wish to put into the by-laws.

Sections 86 to 89 inclusive, agreed to.
Bill number 77 reported.

THE REGISTRY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 114,
"An Act to amend the Registry Act."

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, when this bill was last in consideration we got to section 9, and I have a further amendment which I wish to submit. I move:

That subsection 2 of section 52 of the Registry Act as enacted by section 9 of the bill be amended by inserting after the word "corporation" in the fifth line the words "by the Attorney-General for the purpose of executing such assurance on behalf of the corporation in accordance with the provisions of this Act."

This amendment is entirely for the purpose of convenience in registering documents. Sometimes it was inconveni-

ent to obtain the signature of an officer of a company, and if there is a general power of attorney registered enabling a certain person to execute documents or make affidavits on behalf of a corporation, that should be sufficient. This question has arisen particularly in connection with the considerable amount of business being done with oil and gas leases and affairs of that kind. I see no objection to allowing this simpler way of doing business.

Section 9 as amended agreed to.

Bill No. 114 reported.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment that section 3 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

Subsection 4 of section 19 of The Highway Traffic Act is amended by inserting after the word "vehicle" in the second line the words "or farm tractor" and by adding at the end thereof the words "or to a trailer or other object or device when drawn directly across a highway by a farm tractor."

Section 3 as amended agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: On section 5, Mr. Chairman, I wish to move the following amendment:

That subsection 1a of section 28 of The Highway Traffic Act as enacted by subsection 2 of section 5 of this bill, is amended by striking out the words "highways applicable to all highways" in the fourth line and inserting the words "any highway or portion of a highway."

Also I would wish to move:

That subsection 2a of section 28 of The Highway Traffic Act, as enacted

by subsection 2 of section 5 of this bill, is amended by striking out the words "the council of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto" in the first and second lines.

Section 5 as amended agreed to.

Sections 6 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to section 10, as follows:

Every penalty collected for an offence committed on the King's Highway outside a city, town or village and on any portion of the King's Highway that is designated as a controlled-access highway shall be paid to the department and every penalty collected for an offence committed on any other highway, including any portion of the King's Highway that is not designated as a controlled-access highway within a city, town or village, shall be paid to the local municipality in which the offence was committed.

MR. A. K. ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Chairman, with reference to the amendment in section 5, the amendment striking out the words "the council of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto." Does that mean the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto will not be able to pass by-laws allowing a speed greater than 30 miles an hour?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: No. This amendment will make it clear that the municipality has the power to do both. I think the amendment which deleted the reference to Metropolitan Toronto was section 86 of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, which gives the Metropolitan Corporation all the powers conferred upon a city under The Highway Traffic Act so that it would have the same powers as a city as to decreasing and increasing speeds with respect to Metropolitan roads.

Section 10 as amended agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move that section 11 of the bill be struck out and that section 12

of the bill be renumbered as section 11 and that a new section 12 be added as follows:

12. Section 106 of The Highway Traffic Act is repealed.

Section 11 as amended agreed to.

Section 12 as amended agreed to.

Sections 13 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 83 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 112,
"An Act to amend the Municipal Act."

On section 1.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) a general question upon which there has been some discussion in the press and elsewhere, whether he will say anything as to the eligibility of certain deputy-reeves who sit in County Councils? Has the hon. Minister given that problem any study, and is there any clarification of the position in any amendments to the Municipal Act this year?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No. There was no discussion in any County Council regarding that at all. In the Improvement District of Ajax, the Chairman of the Board felt he had business affairs to attend to at a certain time of the year when the County Council was meeting. There is no trouble in making the other man chairman, the man he wanted to vote in his place, and the other vice-chairman. So there is no need to change the Act for the whole Province of Ontario.

Sections 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on section 11, I wish to move an amendment, and I ask your permission, Mr. Chairman, to explain the purpose of the amendment. It is intended to make it abundantly clear that a citizen should have the right to ask a police commission for an explanation of why the commission revokes, or refuses the granting of licences.

As matters now stand, the police commissions are not obliged to inform an applicant of the reasons why he has his application refused, and this refusal may be based upon information provided by police officers or others. Sometimes that information may justify a refusal.

HON. MR. FROST: What section is that?

MR. SALSBERG: Section 11. At other times the information may be inaccurate and as a consequence a citizen might be unfairly denied the right of conducting a business and earning his livelihood in the manner he chooses. The people affected are those who apply for licences to operate restaurants, taxi cabs and so on. The police decline to furnish them with reasons why a licence has been refused. I believe that under the law they are entitled to do so.

I want to acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, the need for carefully scrutinizing applicants for such licences, particularly in the larger centres. Those holding licences of this kind should not permit the use of their business establishments for gatherings of thieves, gangs of underworld crooks and so on. Nevertheless, I suggest citizens should have the right to ask for an explanation of the reasons why an application for the licence has been refused and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 1 of section 11 of the bill be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

(1) Subsection 4 of section 263 of The Municipal Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(4) Subject to the Theatres Act, 1953, the granting or refusing of a licence to any person to carry on a particular trade, calling, business or occupation, or of revoking a licence under any of the powers conferred upon a council or a board of commissioners of police by this or any other Act, shall be in its discretion, and it shall not be bound to give any reason for refusing or revoking a licence except that a board of commissioners of police, upon request by the applicant or

holder of a licence, shall give to the applicant its reasons for the refusal or revocation.

Amendment put from the Chair.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I hoped the government would indicate its intention of this and not just let it go by a vote. May I say that this matter is of general concern. Some newspapers in our city have editorialized on it. I want to bring it to the attention of hon. members so that they may express their opinions upon it in view of the public interest in this section of the bill. I do ask that the government should express its opinion on this question, and if it is not in favour of the amendment, I hope it will explain its point of view. On the other hand, if it agrees with me, let us incorporate the amendment in the bill. It is in the interests, I think, of all citizens in our community.

MR. R. J. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): I do not want to take part in a debate, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) stated that the newspapers editorialized on this matter he referred to in his amendment. I have been following the newspapers very closely, and I do not think that any of the newspapers have commented on this question in the past month. I have seen no reference to the subject matter of his amendment.

MR. SALSBERG: I am inclined to disagree with the hon. member. I am trying to find the references.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Was this bill amended in committee?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, it was amended in committee. I think the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) himself moved an amendment, and it was carried, that the revoking of a licence could be appealed.

MR. OLIVER: How would the hon. Minister argue that one should grant an appeal in one case and not in another?

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Well, revoking a licence and issuing a licence are quite different things. I think a police commission should have great powers. If you are issuing taxicab licences you have to see that they are issued only to persons whose character is good enough to enable licences to be granted without risk to the public. We certainly must put some faith in the police commission. Its members are leading citizens of the community, and we have got to trust them to this extent, I think. If the right to question a refusal were granted, the commission would have to reply: "Well, you have been in Kingston"—and so on.

MR. OLIVER: If an applicant had been in Kingston penitentiary, he would hardly think it worthwhile to appeal.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member for St. Andrew's (Mr. Salsberg) proposed amendment does not touch the point that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is raising. All the amendment does is to say that the police commission has complete discretion, but it must give reasons for what it does if someone wants to know why his application has been refused.

I cannot understand how that is going to give an applicant any satisfaction or do him any good. But there is a fundamental distinction between the granting of licences and revocation. The police commission under this section, and under the section as it was, has complete discretion as to the number of taxicabs which should be permitted on the streets, and who should be allowed to drive them. Its members have to make up their minds as best they can, on the information they get, about the qualifications of any man to drive a taxicab on the streets of any particular city. A provision under this Act allowing an appeal to be made would simply mean that a Supreme Court judge would substitute his discretion for that of the police commission. I submit to this House that this is really not the sort of case which should properly go to a court.

It seems to me that this is a question of municipal policy—how many taxicabs

should be allowed, and what the terms and conditions should be—in order to protect the public. The police commission must have a free hand in acting upon any sort of information it can gather about any particular applicant. On behalf of the public, it should not take risks in deciding who should be permitted to drive taxicabs when it has some reason even to suspect that an applicant is not a fit and proper person to drive such a vehicle.

When an appeal from that sort of decision arises, the court sometimes decides that it must see what the evidence is if an applicant had no conviction against him, or if the evidence appeared to the judge as being too slight, he might use his own discretion.

I maintain that this is really a matter of municipal policy which should be in the hands of the commission. On the other hand, once a licence is granted it can be presumed that a man has invested money in the taxicab and in the business. Once the commission has decided that, so far as it can see, he is a fit and proper person to carry on that business. If the question of revocation arises it is quite a different matter and it seems to me proper that the onus should be shifted and that the commission should have very strong ground for revoking the licence.

Once they have given a man an interest and a financial stake, something he has had to pay for, and by the loss of which he might lose his livelihood. The loss is something which could be dealt with on appeal. But when a man first applies for a taxi licence, he has no interest built up, and is in a different position. That seems to be the explanation of the difference between these two situations, and I think they are sound.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the hon. Attorney-General spoke mainly about the taxi business to illustrate the point he wanted to make. I have no quarrel with that. I agree, if the Act is amended it will give a person, whose licence has been revoked, some recourse. But I cannot, for the life of me, see why a citizen who

desires to enter a business—which in many cases is a small business—should not have the right to be told by the police commission—even in private—why the application was refused.

HON. MR. FROST: What possible good would that do?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, what good would it do?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs said the police have all the evidence before the commission, but I suggest the police record may not always be a correct one.

HON. MR. PORTER: The commission does not act only on police records.

MR. SALSBERG: It acts on information from various sources channelled to it by the police. We cannot assume the police are infallible, or that there may not be some personal motivation. It is not impossible that could be the case.

It seems the least a person could expect, would be to be told, or his counsel be told for him by somebody in the police commission, why he is not given the right to open a cigar store, or operate a restaurant, or something like that. That is not interfering. I would say, with the normal operations of the discretionary powers of the police commission.

I agree with that. All I am saying is, that it is reasonable for a person to be told why he is deprived of the opportunity of earning his livelihood in a given business.

If the information is wrong, he might then re-open the case with the police commission, and perhaps convince the members they were wrong. As a result, he might get his licence.

The amendment negatived.

Sections 11 to 18 inclusive, agreed to.
On section 19.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on section 19, clause 7, on page 10: I notice that the

hon. Minister has increased the capital cost—the subsection E reads:

The capital cost or a part thereof to be levied against lands under clause “A,” shall be raised by a special levy against the lands in not more than 5 years in accordance with the schedule attended to the by-law.

I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister for raising that from 1 to 5 years. There was some discussion in committee about extending it a little more, up to 20 years, or 10 years at the least.

I was wondering if the hon. Minister would like to comment on that.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, it is quite simple. The Ontario Municipal Association discussed it fully, and recommended it be raised from 1 year to 5. That is what I was asked to do, and I agreed.

I am afraid if it were raised to 20 years, somebody would suggest 40 and make a “racket” out of it. A man could then buy a lot which would increase in value so much over a period of 20 years, he'd be able to hold it at a fixed assessment, or be able to pay for it in 20 years. He could not buy it on his own volition, but would have the municipality buy it for him, and he would pay so much money a year. I think that creates a very dangerous situation. When it was discussed in the meeting of the Municipal Association, it was pointed out that 5 years should be the limit.

MR. COWLING: I suppose when the parking situation is changed from month to month in all areas, further consideration will be given in another year.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Oh yes.
Sections 19 to 39 agreed to.
Bill No. 112 reported.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 113,
“An Act to amend The Assessment Act.”

Sections 1 to 12 inclusive, agreed to.
On section 13.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which reads as follows:

13. (1) Where, by reason of an annexation or amalgamation or the incorporation of an urban municipality or metropolitan municipality, undue hardship is placed upon veterans holding land in a local municipality under the Veterans' Land Act (Canada), the council of the local municipality may by by-law, subject to the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board, provide that such lands shall be assessed for such percentage of the actual value as the by-law provides.

(2) A by-law passed under subsection 1,

(a) shall apply only to lands held by veterans on the day this Act receives Royal Assent; and

(b) shall cease to apply to any land as soon as the veteran's ownership thereof is established.

We might as well give credit where credit is due, and I will tell the hon. members that this is known as the “Beach-MacKenzie Amendment.”

MR. SALSBERG: Will the hon. member explain the purpose?

Section 13 as amended agreed to.

Sections 14 and 15 agreed to.

Bill No. 113 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Is there any objection to calling Orders 28 and 29?

MR. SALSBERG: No, go right ahead.

THE CEMETERIES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 128,
“An Act to amend the Cemeteries Act.”

Section 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, is there any reference to

the percentage to be used for perpetual care? I have not had an opportunity of reading the Act. Just glancing through it, I cannot see any reference to percentages.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may explain to the hon. member that a full and complete report of the committee was presented. I think the hon. Minister of Health, (Mr. Phillips) felt, as did all of us, that there should be some immediate controls effected, therefore, this bill now before the House was introduced.

This does not profess to be the last word. The situation is being given careful study, but, in the interim, it was thought this matter should be held under control during the ensuing year, otherwise it might run wild.

Sections 4 to 7 inclusive, agreed to.

MR. THOMAS: Before the bill is reported I think the government should lose no time in setting up a commission.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. THOMAS: There are some of these cemetery operators who are really running "hog wild."

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. That is what we intend to do.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: That will be done.

Bill No. 128 reported.

THE PHARMACY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend the Pharmacy Act, 1953."

On section 1.

MR. SALSBERG: Is that not the same Act as last year with one amendment?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: That is about it. There are actually two amendments.

MR. SALSBERG: We enacted this law a year ago, but it was not proclaimed.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to. Bill No. 133 reported.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

The House in Committee on Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 6.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister. Is there anything in this Act which would help the tobacco growers of the Delhi area, who are at the moment in a veritable uprising against the methods of the tobacco corporation, which is a part of the entire marketing set-up? From the latest information I have, the buyer section of the industry is attempting to dominate the board in that very important field. The result is that the Delhi, and other papers of that area, are treating this as a major issue. The farmers are extremely disturbed and upset, and I am wondering if anything in this Act will provide some protection for the tobacco growers in that field.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, all the Act does is to set up the machinery so that a group of producers of any commodity can form a marketing scheme, provided they secure a sufficient number of producers to support it. This provides the machinery for them to market their own products.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): The marketing of tobacco is not in that agreement.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: No. They had a vote on it about a year ago, but it did not carry.

Sections 6 to 8 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 109 reported.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

On section 1.

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I would like to present.

I move,

That subsection 5 be amended by striking out the words "in any year" in the first line, by striking out the words "in that year" in the sixth line and by striking out the words "in that year" in the eighth and ninth lines.

These words are deleted in order that all persons, affected by the new provision may be dealt with alike, including a small group who have already made full payment in respect of their past services.

Section 1 as amended agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 131 reported.

HON. MR. FROST moves the committee rise and report certain bills with and certain bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report 9 bills without amendment, and 4 bills with amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES: THE DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

HON. JOHN FOOTE, V.C. (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting, difficult and instructive year for the Department of Reform Institutions. In some years we have had, in addition to our regular routine programme, riots,

jail breaks, and other notorious incidents. This year we have had a Select Committee of the Legislature.

It has been a difficult year for us in many ways; firstly, because it made very heavy demands upon my staff, which had to be met, in addition to their arduous and demanding routine tasks. I should like to say most emphatically that my people have been equal to the demands made upon them, and have cheerfully and efficiently co-operated with the chairman and his committee. I think the chairman of the committee (Mr. Stewart) will agree wholeheartedly with this laudation.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Hear, hear.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Secondly, I think it must be realized that because most of the hearings have been public and open to the press, many irritating observations have been made as the enquiry proceeded, which were never intended by the committee to be taken as final conclusions. Discontented employees, ex-employees, inmates, both current and post-graduate, have had ample opportunity to express their views, whether they were sound or unsound, foolish or sensible. Every detail of administration has been examined, and every weakness as well as strength brought to light.

I think this is as it should be. But in the process it caused a certain amount of dissatisfaction at times, which was inevitable. It is never pleasant to be criticized, and it is not conducive always to sweetness and light to have all one's weaknesses brought under the fierce light of publicity. Nevertheless, it is necessary, and it is right. It is the procedure which ensures respect and confidence in our democratic way of life.

I want to say that the chairman of this Select Committee had no easy job, nor did he have an easy time of it. I think at times he could have been much more suave and popular if he had made this enquiry an occasion for eulogizing this department or the government, and by giving a disproportionate emphasis to the things that were good and con-

structive. But what he did was an honest, diligent, fearless and intelligent piece of work which, if it uncovered weaknesses which were embarrassing, it also created public confidence in the government, and gave to this department a blueprint for the future, which, if it is followed, will assure to Ontario a plan second to none in the field of penology.

Perhaps one of the most difficult tasks that will follow a study of this report, will be the effort to be in complete agreement with the committee, and, at the same time, in complete agreement with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

What I say of the chairman is also true of the committee. To begin with, let me remind hon. members that this committee was not "wished upon us," it was proposed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), who, in his own day, administered this department. It was accepted by me as an honest proposition, to study a field which is admittedly controversial, and extremely complex. I was sorry that the hon. member for Brant was not a member of this committee, but the hon. members of his Party were good representatives, as were all the members of the committee, whether Opposition or our own.

Their gifts and abilities have been applied faithfully to the problems set before them. They have been frank, and I may say, at times unpredictable, but they have done a job which has received the acclaim of the public, and most of the press, and I thank them today most sincerely for it.

Before I finish with the committee, I wish to make an observation which I hope the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) will take in good part. I see he is not in his place today, but I spoke to him about it yesterday, and told him what I was going to say. He spoke of the "mess" which I had inherited. I think what he meant by that was that in the stage of our development in the department, we have been faced by many problems which had sprung upon us, due to the very rapid growth in population, and which it had been difficult to foresee or estimate, or some-

times cope with. I do not think the hon. member for Kingston would overlook the tremendous contribution which has been made in the field of penology, going back to the ministry of the hon. Mr. Hanna, and continuing through the ministries of the present Vice-Chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies), the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), and the former hon. Minister who represents the riding of Wellington South (Mr. Hamilton), and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

I shall never be able to repay my debt to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) for the very kindly and wise counsel he has given me, ever since I assumed the position as Minister of the department. The vision which he has shown in the department in the days when he was not only Provincial Secretary but also Minister of Game and Fisheries and of Municipal Affairs has been truly amazing. Following his studies of systems in England and Europe, he established Brampton on the Superior Borstal Plan, an institution which met, I believe, pretty well with the unqualified approval of the Select Committee.

More important, I think, we are indebted to him for his conception of the industrial farm system, whereby those who formerly languished in jails were transplanted to open institutions, where they could work at healthful employment, and be subject to reform influences which would turn them out, if they had any good response to make, as citizens who possess a new outlook on life. This was a wholly new conception of penology in this province, which I think should win for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs a lasting memorial, and be, some day, a crown to his long and distinguished career as an hon. member of this House, and as a Minister.

I have here quite a volume of observations that I could make, based on studies on this subject which date back in the province from the time of Egerton Ryerson, through a campaign waged by the hon. S. H. Blake, Q.C., in 1896, on to the various committees up to the

famous and valuable Archambault Report. And I think at this juncture I should say a good word for the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), and pay tribute to the very excellent work he did in connection with that report, and to the valuable influence of his distinguished father.

There are many interesting things in my file here, but I am not going to take the time of the House at present to deal with them. I am going to content myself with saying that in the first place I agree in the main with the Report of the Select Committee, and I shall do my best, during my tenure of office, to implement it.

Secondly, in the Estimates which I shall place before the House, I sincerely believe we are "going the limit" to put these principles into practice this year. We shall have a current expenditure of nearly \$9 million, plus a capital expenditure of at least \$2 million, which, in fact, may run higher. This, to my way of thinking, is the maximum proportion of our provincial income, to which the department is entitled, and I think it is in line with the suggestions of the committee that we adopt a progressive programme of augmentation of these suggestions, and I think the committee should take it as an act of good faith on the part of the government and of the department that this year's expenditure does provide a beginning for this programme.

When we attempt to evaluate our responsibility to the people of Ontario, I think our first consideration is to create a healthy, economic condition in which the young people of our province may find jobs and opportunities. I do not want them to be handicapped by spending an undue proportion of our income on people who are weak and unworthy of their responsibilities. I will treat all our unfortunate inmate population as fairly as I can, and I know that this will be the policy of my staff. I will encourage all those who want to accept a new way of life, and who will fight their way back bravely to the position of confidence which they have lost by their own betrayal.

I have heard a great variety of opinions expressed about the way to do this work, and indeed everyone who has a point of view seems to have great convictions and is very sure that he is right. I have said sometimes it is a little irritating to find people who know everything about everything. I have not heard the committee, though, say very much about the field of theology, and if I do not know much about reform institutions, I have had some training in theology, and about 20 years' experience in the ministry, and I will tell you it is theologically correct and sound that no person ever reformed anybody else. People are reformed by the Grace of God, and by their own determination to change their way of looking at things, and their outlook on life.

"Reform institutions" is a peculiar name; a name which I have never liked because it assumes that you could take the people of this province who were the least worthy and who have caused the most trouble—some of them with a career that has extended over half of their lifetime or more—and if you had a good institution and a good staff, you could turn these people out with a normal outlook on life as decent, honest citizens. The truth is you can do nothing of the kind; all you can do is to help the people who want to help themselves, and that we intend to do. We will be as fair and as constructive as we can, but no matter what opinions are expressed, and by which we may be bombarded, I will not pamper nor "toady" to those who make demands which are unsound and unreasonable—and I am speaking of our prison population.

As far as possible, there will be discipline and control, without sentimentality or weakness, and those people who find their way into our institutions will have to learn that no rehabilitation is possible unless they learn respect for authority and discipline, and are prepared to give something, and to work for the common good, with regards to the rights of persons and property.

The people who form the solid backbone and framework of our democracy are entitled to protection on the score

of their persons and property. I think that is a lesson which many people have to learn.

I have confidence the probation system will take the strain off our jails, and prevent some of the overcrowding that we have, but I think this field of probation may have some limitations. I think that is realized by the people who advocate it. It will be for people who are guilty of minor rather than vicious crimes, and who will be in for short periods. I think it should relieve the pressure by caring for those who have received relatively short sentences.

Mr. Chairman, there are many subjects left with which to deal, of which I could speak at this time, if it were not for the realization that, as we proceed with the Estimates, these subjects will come before you for consideration. I shall be glad to take time for a full and comprehensive discussion of whatever may engage your attention. So, with your permission, we shall now proceed to the consideration of our programme for the coming fiscal year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 164, Main Office, \$756,000.

Item 1. Salaries, \$212,000.

Item No. 1 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Statutory Item, Minister, R.S.O. 1950, chapter 121, section 3, \$10,000.

Statutory Vote agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 2, Traveling Expenses, \$30,000.

Item 2 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 3, Maintenance, \$35,000.

Item 3 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 4, Legal Costs and Expenses Covering Sundry Investigations, \$500.

Item 4 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 5, Prisoners' Rehabilitation Expenses, etc., \$22,000.

Item 5 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 6, Unforeseen and Unprovided, \$500.

Item 6 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 7, Prisoners' Removal and Other Expenses, \$90,000.

Item 7 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 8, Cost of Living Bonus, Entire Department \$150,000.

Item 8 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 9, Unemployment Insurance Stamps, \$6,000.

Item 9 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 10, Workmen's Compensation Board, Awards and Costs, \$7,000.

Item 10 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 11, Grants, \$203,000.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, Vote 164, item 11, covers grants. I presume these grants to training schools totalling \$173,000, are to training schools which are not wholly under the jurisdiction of the department. Is that correct?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: As the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) knows, we have private training schools, which are run by the Roman Catholic Church.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the training schools which are under the department?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: No, just the private ones.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, referring to item 11, I was shocked when I learned that children as young as 7 years of age are committed to these training schools.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: What age did the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) say?

MR. SALSBERG: Seven. I found this to be so at the meeting of the committee where the training schools report was given, but it is contained also in the report of the department on page 38, "Training Schools Committals and Admissions for the Year Ending March 31st, 1953."

I think it is somewhat alarming to find that children of such tender age should be taken away from home environments and institutionalized in training schools which, in my opinion, are unfit and unprepared to treat children of that age. The report of the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) gives the ages of children committed during the year as follows:

7	years	of	age	-	2
8	"	"	"	-	5
9	"	"	"	-	11
10	"	"	"	-	24

and so on; the numbers keep on rising until at the age of 15 we have 173, so the largest number come from ages of 14 and 15.

I must confess I was not very much impressed by the presentation made to the Committee on Commissions from the representative of the Advisory Committee, I think it is called, or the Advisory Board for Training Schools. The gentlemen on that board are undoubtedly well meaning, but I doubt they have the necessary approach to deal with the problem of juveniles of such tender age. I was further inclined to this conclusion, when the spokesman for the Advisory Board told us he believed it would be necessary to establish more recreational centres, but, he hastened to assure the committee, he was not suggesting the government spend money on them, but rather that we go seeking public-spirited financiers to establish such centres, in order to keep children of that age away from training schools and other institutions. Frankly, I do not "go for that," I think it is an extremely antiquated approach, an unprogressive approach which does not help.

So much for the Advisory Board, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) may want

to say something about that, whether it is performing any function, whether it is necessary, or whether it should be abolished.

We are told at that committee meeting that they have to approve every transfer of a child from the training schools to private homes and farms. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, it is physically impossible for them to have any knowledge as to what the individual case is like, what it requires, and to what place they are sending a child. They have to be guided by reports of officers of the training schools—I think that is correct—and that being so, I would be inclined to think that the department itself should assume responsibility and designate a capable person or persons to really have the responsibility, rather than to hand it over to this type of board which meets periodically and serves as a rubber stamp.

That is one aspect of the problem of training schools.

Secondly, I submit to the hon. Minister that we must find another way of handling children of that age. I know they are committed, and I know that no one would commit a child of 7, 8 or 9 years of age, without some conviction that his home environment is more harmful than an institution might be. I am not quarreling with that, but I suggest that children of 7, 8, 9 or 10, who have already committed some minor offence—and that is how I understand this happens, after they have committed some offence and are brought to court, and then are committed to a training school—I suggest they should be placed in the hands of some Children's Aid organization, an agency which is trained and capable of supervising the further development of children, who, through no fault of their own, but because of environmental conditions, social and economic conditions, have, perhaps, been roaming the streets, or have been associated with other unhappy youngsters of the same neighbourhood, and thus got into difficulty.

We do not solve anything by taking a "kid" of 7 or 8, and sending him away to a training school. Such children are

not of a type to be given training for a trade, taught to be bakers, shoemakers, and things of that sort. I feel this is so antiquated an approach that it is high time we changed it. Children of that age should go to specialized institutions, trained personnel should take care of them, and wherever possible they should be put in foster homes, instead of being sent to training schools at that age. But not necessarily out on the farms, Mr. Chairman; I mean approved foster homes, where they will find an environment that is warm, that makes them feel at home, that will help them to overcome the problems which led them, in the first place, to some violation of the law. I do not think the training schools are the ideal institutions for children 7, 8 and 9.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: I do not think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) should be surprised to find there are children in children's training schools. That is what they are for. We do not want them in such a school, if there is a suitable home or if there is any possibility of keeping them out. When such a child comes to the school, if he is young, he goes to a school for that age group, and the people who run the schools are trying to do exactly what the hon. member says should be done. They are trying to understand the child, and correct any incorrigible tendencies he may have.

There is no question of teaching a small child to be a baker, as the hon. member says. These children go into a training school, and they go to school just as other children do. They have what we hope would be the understanding direction of supervisors and house-masters, and of psychologists. They have psychiatric treatment, through the co-operation of our own Ontario Hospitals, and other specialists whom we have engaged for that work. But if the hon. member says that what he means is that the way the work is done in the schools is far from perfect, I agree. We have a lot to learn, and a lot depends on the staff. We have our own troubles, we have people who are utterly unsuitable, and whom we have to get rid of, but we try

to recruit people who are suitable, and we have a great many who have been very successful in this work.

As regards the Advisory Board, it has stood for a long time in a legal relationship to the child. The child is a joint ward of the Advisory Board and the government. There are people on that board who give their time, without any remuneration at all in the way of salary or expenses, and I am told that over the years these people have acquired very good skills in dealing with the children, through the records.

The Select Committee pointed out they thought this was a weakness, that the board did not see the children, and had not close enough contact with the school. I agree with that. However, I have not been too much worried about it, because the board takes, by and large, the advice of the superintendent and the people who have been dealing with the child. They have a report there, and in most cases they agree that a child shall go out for placement in a home just as soon as the school authorities say he has made a suitable adjustment.

I would certainly agree that a home is much superior to any institution for a child. Our placement officers do select these homes, not on the social position or wealth of the people, but on the basis of how the child is going to be fitted into the family life, and that they are people who show some affection and regard for him.

Again, all the foster homes do not work out well. Some are changed and taken off the list, and others are found to be excellent, and are used.

I do not think the hon. member is saying very much with which we do not agree ourselves, but a school such as this is the last resort. It is not as good as a home. If the home is possible at all, it is certain we will do almost anything to keep the child there, but it is a great blessing, when he has no suitable environment, that he has a place to go, where he has enlightened attention as far as we can give it to him.

I agree that the more you improve the social environment for these children,

the less trouble you will have. However, a great deal of it is mental. We have retarded children, those with very low IQ's, and we are inclined to think there is a certain type with whom we will have trouble no matter where we put him.

Admittedly, the better the social environment you can get for the child, the less trouble you are going to have with him. I do not take any exception to the remark made by the chairman of the board. He was not asking the government to immediately create these things. I think it is a good thing for our citizens who have the means, to make contributions to civic recreation centres.

As the hon. member knows, the government has also made its contribution to encourage these recreational centres. Surely all of us in public life have seen enough of the opening of these centres to be amazed at the number. It seems to me we have been continuously attending openings.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I wish I could say I agree with the hon. Minister, but I cannot, because he does not get the point I am trying to make, which is, while there are instances where you have no alternative but to send a juvenile to an institution, as you say, temporarily, I suggest that below a certain age, they should not be put in an institution at all.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Where would the hon. member put him?

MR. SALSBERG: At 7, 8, 9, or 10 years of age, put them in private homes. I suggest the department should have a list of homes to which a child of that age could go. The hon. Minister said a moment ago some of the children may be mentally retarded. That is true, but I venture to suggest quite a number of these youngsters are extremely bright and get into difficulties, not because they do not know better, but because they give unconscious protest to their environmental conditions, and are "hitting back" at society by doing some damage to property or to individuals. They require an appreciation of their difficulty.

If you put a bright youngster, who is "hitting back" blindly—hurting himself as well as he hurts others—with a retarded youngster in an institution, you help neither. The child with a high mental quotient will perhaps "take it out" on his retarded neighbour, who may be in the same building.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: They are not put together. They are separated as far as possible.

MR. SALSBERG: The point I want to make—and I repeat I am ending now with this—is the department should adopt a policy that below a certain age, children be not institutionalized, but rather they be placed in foster homes where more help will be given them to overcome their difficulties, and assume a normal way of life.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: I assure the hon. member that if we can place these children in homes, we will be very glad to do it. But I also assure him, these schools are as good as they can possibly be, and a great deal can be done for the child by people who know their business. It is not considered altogether a tragedy that children are sent to the junior schools. At the T.C.S. in my own riding, for instance, they are institutionalized, and in the Old Country, in England, the public school system has made a tremendous contribution to the life of the country by producing people who have been very sturdy and have been able to stand up to a great deal, and some people think it is the result of—

MR. SALSBERG: Cricket did that.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Some people think it is the result of putting children in schools such as that. To my mind, that is no more heinous than to send them away from home at an early age, to a boarding school. If we can send them to a home, that is where they will go.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I think if the hon. member for St. Andrew had been on the committee and interviewed some of the students in

training schools, he would realize the problem which is faced by the training schools. Many of the students are not amenable to discipline of any kind, and if they were placed in private families, I am afraid they would disrupt the orderly living of such private families.

To tell you of one instance we ran across, we were in a certain institution and saw a 7-year-old boy there. To us, that was shocking, as expressed by the hon. member for St. Andrew. When we saw this boy, we felt shocked to think he was confined in this institution; but upon inquiry as to the boy's background and history, we realized there was no other place for the boy. He had no home to go to, and had never been amenable to discipline.

MR. STEWART: He was chased out of his home.

MR. GRUMMETT: He was chased out of his home, yes, and in the institution, the boy was more than a master for boys double his age. In fact, in a quick snappy combat, he would drop 15-year-old boys; he could put them out.

That type of boy cannot be sent to a private home and be expected to be kept there. There is no other place than an institution for him. There were other similar boys whom we found in the same type of institutions, and that is the only place you can put them.

You cannot hope to have private homes take them in, and have children of this type mix with their families. It cannot be done, and much as it is to be regretted that children of that age have to be sent to institutions, we must face the fact that is the only place where they can receive the proper training.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): On Vote 164, item 11, "Grants to Different Organizations." Is any portion of that grant given to the John Howard Society?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: \$10,000 is given by the Province of Ontario, and I think the Federal Government gives them \$8,000 in addition. The rest comes from private supporters.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): That is out of the \$13,000.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Yes.
Vote 164, agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 165, Board of Parole, \$75,000.

MR. SALSBERG: On Vote 165, could the hon. Minister at this time tell the House how we stand with the Parole Board? I have not seen any announcement in the press or anywhere else, but I understand from what I have heard around the building, that the Parole Board has been disorganized, and that the chairman has resigned. I was not able to find out whether there was a new board constituted or whether a new board will be constituted. If I missed the statement in any public announcement in the press, I will stand corrected, but I have not seen anything about it, and I think it would be very good if we were enlightened now.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Parole Board retired because he had reached the retirement age; in fact, he stayed 2 years longer than the regular period. That is the reason for his resignation, and for this vacancy.

MR. NIXON: When did that take effect?

HON. MR. FOOTE: I think January 1st.

MR. SALSBERG: Was there an announcement made of his retirement anywhere?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: In the press?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Not to my knowledge, but it certainly was not hidden. There was nothing secret or furtive about it. I did not announce it—

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Minister will permit me, the reason I asked whether it was announced, was because I have not seen it anywhere. In view of

some irritation which had developed during the committee's hearings, between the committee and the former chairman of the Parole Board, failure to make his retirement public might lend itself to some speculation as to whether he was asked to leave because of failure to co-operate, and so on. I do not say that is the case, but I failed to see any statement anywhere about the man's retirement.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: I will make the announcement now, even if it is belated, that the retirement of the chairman was routine. It would have happened, whether he had agreed or disagreed with the committee. That had nothing to do with it.

We have not made any appointment because the government had decided to await the report of the Select Committee before considering this. As you know, in the recommendations of the committee, there is one that this matter of parole, probation and rehabilitation, might be handled by a commission. We have not decided what to do in regard to that, but in the meantime, the board may appoint someone to act as chairman.

I know it is not a very satisfactory situation and I hope we shall deal with it as soon as possible.

MR. STEWART: I would like to say in answer to the hon. member for St. Andrew, that the Reform Committee must accept a full measure of responsibility for the delay in reconstituting the board. The other gentleman, the former chairman, had completed his term of service, and the hon. Minister was quite anxious to make a re-appointment, but we expressed the opinion we were studying the matter, and out of deference to the committee, a re-appointment to the board was delayed. I repeat, that was our full responsibility.

MR. SALSBERG: How many members are there on the Parole Board now?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: Six. The Act calls for 7 but due to the chairman's resignation, there are now 6.

Vote 165 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 166, Ontario Reformatories, \$2,905,000.

Vote 166 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 167, Mimico, \$742,000.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): On that Vote, during meetings of the Standing Committee on Conservation this year, there was some discussion about using prisoners, and people in reformatories to assist generally in some of these great conservation projects throughout the Province of Ontario.

Many of the hon. members were of the opinion that possibly time could be very well and very constructively spent in assisting in this outside work. It was brought out in the Select Committee's report that one of the worst things they have to contend with is idleness in these places.

It seems to me—and it seemed to be the opinion of many of the members of the committee—that these people could be transported from the jail, in care of an armed guard, and perform a very useful duty, and at the same time, do healthy work outdoors, and do some good to the province.

I know that in many of the United States, I think particularly in Florida and Michigan, it is my understanding some types of prisoners are used for this conservation work.

MR. SALSBERG: That is called "the chain gang."

MR. COWLING: I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment on that?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: The hon. member is speaking of prisoners from jails. Does he mean jails or reformatories?

MR. COWLING: Either.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: To begin with, you cannot take prisoners from jails, who are awaiting trial and have not been found guilty of anything, and put them to work anywhere, unless they want to. There are some awaiting appeal,

and others accused of serious crimes but not convicted, whom we cannot take out.

In the reformatories, there seems to be a mistaken idea that we have a great excess of people who are not doing anything.

Perhaps one of the reasons these people are used more in the United States for conservation work than here, is that in the United States, they do not have the industries we have in our system.

For one thing, the trade unions have been very much against it in the United States. I have said a great many times, we have fine understanding and co-operation with the trade union people in this country, which has enabled us to go forward without very much difficulty. On the other hand, in return for that co-operation we try to keep our people out of competitive labour. It sounds good to say we should take these people from Mimico, and launch them on a conservation programme, but I do not want to do that, while there are men out of work in Toronto. Let them go there and be paid for this work.

We have no surplus of labour, in fact, at times we are very short of labour, because it is only the young, strong, healthy men who can do a great deal of the work which we have in our factory production. We have old men who have bad hearts, bronchitis, asthma, and all sorts of things, who simply cannot go into a productive line of work. Maybe these people could go into such a camp as the hon. member mentioned, and "putter about" if we could arrange to have supervision for them.

It is an interesting observation, but in practice, in the industries we have not too many men who can do a hard day's work. We are often short of these people.

We may investigate the possibility of sending some of the older ones out on the type of work you mention, but again, you are getting into competition with outside labour. Perhaps we could have the opinion of the hon. Minister of Labour on it, but it seems to me it is a point which you cannot press too far.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): It is nothing new at all. These men worked on the road from Matheson into South Porcupine. Prisoners were used on the building of that road and it was very unsatisfactory. It took more guards to watch them working through the rough land and bush, than there were men working, and the people in general, in the Province of Ontario, were not satisfied.

The road between Kapuskasing and Hearst was partially built by prisoners from Burwash, and the people in this province were not satisfied with that, and said they should not be used for the work, because they were taking work away from the ordinary good citizens, who were unemployed.

MR. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. member who has just spoken had any idea of promoting chain gangs. As a matter of fact, I have visited Westchester, in the United States not far from the City of New York. They have some 500 or 600 acres of farm land where a great many activities are carried on. They have a dairy farm, a laundry, an old folks' home and an isolation hospital. They are all there as one big happy family. They co-operate. They do work for each other on the farm, in the laundry, and in the hospitals. They really cut down the overhead costs. I understand perfectly well why it is not possible to do that here. It is because we have so many departments—the Health Department, the Reform Institutions Department and other departments, and they are not properly meshed together. But I will say again that these people can be put to work, because I have seen them put to work in the United States at Westchester, New York.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: I see that we had better have another Select Committee and put the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh) on it. I think it should be remembered that industrial output from Guelph alone is greater than the combined output of all the federal prisons in Canada. If the hon. member for Woodbine, and other

hon. members, would go to Guelph, they would find all those things happening which he was talking about. That is the trouble of this department. Very few people know what is being done, even hon. members of this House. I assure the hon. member for Woodbine that he will not be disappointed with the work we are doing there. We have a 1,000-acre farm where we are doing all those things. At Burwash, we have direct control of an even larger area, and there is a lot going on that I wish hon. members of the House would see.

MR. SALSBERG: I think there is total agreement that the inmates of our institutions should be given every opportunity to be occupied in doing useful work. I think what the hon. Minister said is absolutely true. He might have mentioned the brickyard in Mimico, and a lot of other things which are being carried on. But I hope we will never resort to what might be termed chain-gang methods. It is degrading and brutalizing to take men who are sentenced to 6 or 9 months out in gangs to work on highways or on conservation projects. Certainly a great conservation job was done in Guelph. Some of the most beautiful grounds that one can drive through are situated around Guelph, not to speak of the farm. But generally, men should not have to work outside. I think that would represent a return to the Middle Ages. They are only doing that in some cities of the Southern States of the U.S.A., and it is to be deplored.

MR. STEWART (Parkdale): The committee had no thought whatever of criticizing the industry being shown in the reformatories. The idleness complained of was confined to the jails, some in industrial farms, in circumstances which the hon. Minister has described. In days gone by, the jail had a smaller population and the inmates raised their own vegetables. Now they have not sufficient plots to enable them to do this. We are saying, however, that there should be some industry wherever it is possible to provide it. In one industrial farm the services of a part-time

doctor are employed. But when an inmate reports sick, what are you going to do about it? He says he is not well enough to go to work in the fields, and there is little that can be done about it. The committee had in mind the production of food for consumption in our own institutions, and something in the way of light industry. There is plenty of industry going on in the reformatories. The idleness complained of existed on one of the industrial farms where men were reporting sick.

The committee deplored to a man the conditions which are found in certain other countries, such as chain gangs. To introduce such conditions was the farthest thing from their minds. Persons in some of these institutions asked us: "Give us a chance to get out and work." I extolled the industry being carried on at Mimico and Guelph, but there is idleness in the jails, and I believe something should be done to deal with this situation.

MR. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Chairman, my comments were not critical of the hon. Minister, either. I was simply bringing to the attention of the House the discussion we had in the Committee of Conservation. Certainly, this is something which could be studied and thought over. As for chain gangs, that sort of thing may be going on in places like Russia and Siberia. But that is certainly not my idea. If hon. members can think of something more pleasant than working on a dam up in the Humber River in August, I would like to hear about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fishing in it.
Vote 165 agreed to.

Vote 166, Ontario Reformatories, Guelph, Salaries, \$770,000.

Vote 166 agreed to.

Vote 167, Mimico, Salaries, \$312,000.

Vote 167 agreed to.

Vote 168, Brampton, Salaries, \$165,000.

Vote 168 agreed to.

Vote 169, Mercer-Toronto, Salaries, \$194,000.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a general feeling for some time that Mercer should be torn down, and a modern institution for female prisoners should be built elsewhere. Has the department any plans for Mercer?

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: I am not in favour of tearing down buildings because they happen to be 50, 60 or 70 years old. If we cannot build so that our structures are going to last for 100 years, we may as well revise our building methods.

There is nothing wrong with Mercer from the point of view of the building. The location is not everything that might be desired, but this applies to many buildings in downtown Toronto. On the other hand, it has certain advantages. It is close to the source of expert medical and psychiatric services, and it is easy to obtain staff because of the central location. I do not think there is anything wrong with Mercer, and I would like to read the Grand Jury's report upon it:

On Thursday, September 17, 1953, the Grand Jury visited Mercer Reformatory. Every moment from our entering the grounds to leaving the institution was extremely interesting, informative and pleasant. The superintendent, Mrs. Burrows, and her staff deserve public recognition of their services. The entire atmosphere of the place is sunny and cheerful, no sullen faces here, but many busy hands.

Girls cutting and raking the grass, polishing windows and floors, painting walls and ceilings, operating a custom-type of laundry, sewing and kitchen equipment. There are class rooms, a hobby room, library, gymnasium, two chapels and many more wonderful facilities to assist the girls to regain their sense of values, and learn to live normal, healthy lives. Our recommendation concerning this institution is that the general public should be enlightened as to the entire appearance and character of Mercer,

and the meaning of the word "reformatory."

This was from a presentment made by the Grand Jury to Hon. J. C. McRuer, Chief Justice, and is signed by Mrs. J. Marie Ironsides, foreman.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. Minister read that. I could give him a statement made by the former Minister in charge of Reform Institutions in 1948, in which he said he had already selected a new site for a Mercer institution, and this one would be torn down. I am not going to read it, but I am sure the hon. Minister does not question it. That was what the former Minister said, and I agreed with him.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: I do not wish to be put in a position where I am disagreeing with my predecessor. I think he meant that the facilities for women in detention in the province should be enlarged. I think Mercer would be a good building to keep. I do not say the use being made of it today is the final use which will be made. I feel that later on we should have, for the women, a place which corresponds to Brampton. But I think we need these other facilities too. Mercer should be kept as a centre, and good use made of it.

MR. STEWART: The hon. Minister has agreed to give serious consideration to developing an institution for women on the lines of the one we already have for males at Brampton. At the same time, I think it would be well worth while for any hon. member of this House to go out to the Mercer institution and see it for themselves. It is spotlessly clean, well lighted, and under the care of a kindly matron. When you step inside, it is like stepping inside a ladies' college. The dining room is just as good as would be found in a ladies golf club. This atmosphere extends everywhere. It is only when one turns aside in the corridor and sees a row of old cells, that one realizes the purpose of the building. It is clean, it is cheerful, it is a credit to the province, having regard to the age of the premises. Though I believe that as, and when the proper time comes, the

institution should go to a new location, hon. members should bear in mind that there are many law-abiding citizens who are not living under such good conditions as are to be found in Mercer.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Hon. members may be interested to know that we had an offer from an industrial firm for the Mercer building. We felt we could, perhaps, get enough money from the sale to construct an entirely new institution outside the city. I went so far as to persuade the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) to expropriate land out at Maple in preparation for a move.

The first thing that happened was this: John Public intervened. No person wanted the Mercer out in York County. So I withdrew. We considered another site, and we met with similar objections. I was not finding fault with Mercer, but I did think that if we could get enough money from its sale to build a new institution, that would have been good business. But I have never condemned Mercer. I am well pleased with what is being done there.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs may have had in mind a good financial transaction. But in his public statement he said that Mercer did not offer possibilities for segregation. He said there were some "tough ones" in Mercer, and, for that reason, he wanted another institution where there would be opportunities for segregation and for the better treatment of the inmates.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: There is only one way in which you can have segregation. That is by building more institutions. And the Minister answered that question by saying it depended upon the hon. Treasurer supplying the money. It is no use talking about segregation when you have not got the institutions.

Vote 169 agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL FARMS

Vote 170, Burwash, Salaries \$666,000.
Agreed to.

Vote 171, Monteith, Salaries, \$135,000.

Agreed to.

Vote 172, Rideau, Burritt's Rapids, Salaries, \$137,000.

Agreed to.

Vote 173, Burtch, Bradford, Salaries, \$148,000.

Agreed to.

Vote 174, Fort William, Salaries, etc., \$155,000.

Agreed to.

ONTARIO TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR BOYS

Vote 175, Bowmanville, Salaries, \$203,000.

Agreed to.

Vote 176, Cobourg, Salaries, \$169,000.

Agreed to.

ONTARIO TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, GALT

Vote 177, Salaries, \$150,000.

MR. SALSBERG: On the subject of this Training Schools for Girls, I think it is time we should get some clarification on a matter which has become a public issue, and a bone of contention between two daily newspapers. The issue is whether the committee reported truthfully on conditions at Galt, or whether the committee did not report honestly upon them. One newspaper alleged that public funds are being squandered and that the girls of that institution do not even wash their own clothes.

MR. STEWART: We did not say that.

MR. SALSBERG: I said one of the newspapers said it. On the other hand, another newspaper, in an editorial, claimed that the first newspaper was libelling this excellent institution in Galt. We are given further information from a person who works on a Galt paper and who evidently was with the committee when it visited the institution. She denies the charges of the other paper. I overheard one hon. member, some minutes ago, ask why we should enter into a fight between newspapers. I have

no such desire or intention, but we, as hon. members of this House, should certainly read what newspapers say about institutions for which we are responsible as representatives of the people. When we read the Estimates, it is our duty to make inquiries so that the truth should be made available and no misunderstandings and confusion arise in the minds of the public at large, and I think at this juncture we are entitled to some clarification of that issue.

MR. STEWART: As far as the committee is concerned, we are passing no judgment on the newspaper articles. Here are the facts. I prepared an analysis of various institutions, asking for the unit costs, medical care requirements, training and so on. The figures in this report were inserted by the Department of Reform Institutions, who co-operated splendidly. I have in my hand a complete list of all the articles supplied to the girls, and the department's own figures.

Here is the wording, "Total cost of clothing while in custody, an average cost per inmate per year." There it is. \$205.82.

We did not say they did not do their personal laundry, we saw them doing that, and we gave them full credit. But these young ladies are potential mothers and housekeepers, and the committee was of opinion they should be encouraged to do more of their bed and table linens. I have a list of each article given to the girls, and it works out \$205.82 per year.

MR. SALSBERG: Did not the report say?—and I am reading now from an editorial in the *Globe and Mail*:

The average taxpayer must wonder at such cost, and make comparisons with what he can afford to spend on clothing for his own family, even when he realizes the clothing for the girls was purchased at wholesale or special prices.

If the committee did say that, it raised a serious question about the policy the department is pursuing in that institution. If it was merely to record cost,

without comment, then you could say it reported its finding, and it is up to the hon. members of the Legislature to draw their own conclusions.

MR. STEWART: Would the hon. member care to read page 246 of the report, and he will get the context?

MR. SALSBERG: I have the report, but the question is, if it made that statement, it questioned the policy of the department. If it did that, I think the House should be informed of that fact at this time.

MR. STEWART: Informed as to what?

MR. SALSBERG: As to whether there was unnecessary expenditure of money.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, may I answer the hon. member? The committee took this position: are the girls being furnished with clothing at an average cost per inmate, amounting to more in dollars and cents than the average family could afford when these girls are at home.

If the hon. member will not read the report on page 246—I will read it—

MR. SALSBERG: There is a definite implied criticism of the department. I am not saying whether it is justified or not.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: You mean by the newspapers, or by whom?

MR. SALSBERG: If the committee gave the newspaper the information upon which to base its whole case in the extract from which I quoted, I say that part of that report certainly is implied criticism. I am not, for a second, agreeing or disagreeing with that. All I say on this occasion is that the matter should be clarified.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: I think the matter is quite clear. There is no question but there was criticism of the department, and its policy regarding the Galt School, by the Select Committee. That is what the committee thought after

studying these things, and making its recommendations.

I have said I intend to carry out many of the recommendations which have been made, aside from newspaper criticism. It was recommended that the per capita cost in that institution is too high, \$4.30 per day, as compared with \$2.50 per day for another school. I think it was \$2.30 per day for a third one. That is the criticism, and I think there is something in it.

I believe we can cut those costs, and already we have made some effort to do so. I am not here to fight with the committee, and certainly it is not for any of our staff to engage in any controversy with either the newspapers or the Select Committee. I accept the guidance of this House, and the committee.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, it is quite easy to lift out an extract from a report, and use it, without reading the full text. If the hon. member will read page 73 of the report regarding the training school at Galt, he will see:

Page 73 (d) Clothing: The committee found that much the same situation exists for clothing as for food. Inmates are adequately clothed but two questions must be considered: Are they too expensively clothed, especially in training schools? Is there any justification for the disparity in clothing costs from institution to institution?

As with food, the aim for clothing must be adequacy without excess. This aim is carried out satisfactorily in adult institutions, but in the 3 provincial training schools there is cause for doubt.

At the Ontario Training School, Galt, an average of \$201.01 is paid each year for clothing for each girl. This figure includes \$144.52 for clothing during a girl's stay in the school—an average of 11 months—and \$56.49 for clothing issued her on discharge. Officials at the school point out that most girls have practically no clothing when they arrive and have to be completely outfitted; that it is in the interests of effective reformation

that they be well dressed; that it is essential to successful rehabilitation that they go out into the community, on discharge, with proper clothing so that they will be much the same in appearance as other youngsters.

Nevertheless, the average taxpayer must wonder at such costs and make comparisons with the amount he can afford to spend on clothes for his own family, especially when he realizes that the clothes for Galt girls are purchased at wholesale or special prices. While the committee is most anxious not to interfere in any way with policies that are conducive to reformation, and are, therefore, economical in the long run, there can be no doubt that clothing costs at Galt are altogether too high. It should be noted that the cost of clothing children in foster homes, admittedly lessened by the use of hand-me-downs from older children in the families, is about \$70 annually.

Then in another place we give the Galt school full credit for what it is doing.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I want to make this clear—I want it understood—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: You have made it abundantly clear.

HON. MR. PORTER: If you have not by now, you never will.

MR. SALSBERG: I believe that the girls of the school should be clothed properly, so that they won't be ashamed when they return home, or have to rush out to find the money for essential clothing.

But there is an implied criticism, and I am sorry the hon. Minister indirectly admitted there was a possibility of reducing the cost, because the department which has handled the situation well until now—and I hope it will continue—is being criticized. We must remember, Mr. Chairman, that I am not criticizing it for spending too much, but the hon. Minister has admitted, I believe, that there was over-spending.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: There is no mistake about that. The committee suggests that the per capita cost is too high, and wants it reduced. I also want it reduced, and I have issued instructions that the matter be very carefully examined.

MR. STEWART: There is no division between the hon. Minister and the committee in regard to that matter.

HON. MR. FOOTE, V.C.: One of the ways in which we consider the cost might be lowered is by having a uniform for the school. That may be objected to by some people as not being wise, but it is not objected to in the private schools where suitable uniforms are issued. I do not mean to supply these girls with anything ugly. A great deal of the increased cost is due to buying different garments.

Mr. Chairman, there is not, or will there be, any effort to avoid the issue in this regard. The criticism is there, and we will see what we can do about it, having in mind the good of the girls and the school.

Vote agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT moves that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the committee reports it has come to certain resolutions and begs leave to sit again.

The report agreed to.

ON REPORT OF COMMITTEE RE. REFORM INSTITUTIONS

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I will make a few brief remarks about the report. My remarks will be shorter than I intended them to be, because they follow the Estimates of the Department of Reform Institutions.

I want to say that I, like everybody else, welcomed the report, and I, like everyone else, want to congratulate the committee, and its hard-working chairman, for its diligence and devotion to the

task assigned to it. I think it certainly took its task seriously, and I think also that its handling of its work was done in such a manner that it barred the door to no one who had anything to say or anything to offer in this field, and that is very commendable.

I also join with those who congratulated the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon)—who, unfortunately, is absent, as is his whole group, from the House—but I congratulate him anyway, for having placed on the Order paper, the motion for setting up the Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker, you will understand I am not entirely unjustified in trying to place a few facts on the record. First, while it is true the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) moved the motion, this humble member for St. Andrew has been advocating the appointment of either a Royal Commission or a Select Committee of the House for a number of years before the motion, by the hon. member for Brant. I recall very well standing in my place and appealing to the government to appoint a Select Committee or a Royal Commission. I argued that riots, burning of institutions, and sending appeals to me, and perhaps to other hon. members, was indicative of something which required looking into.

Unfortunately, the government did not agree with my view, and, still more unfortunately, there were many hon. members who had no patience with my repetitious insistence on the appointment of a committee, and very often showed their displeasure at my suggestion by asking me to "Cut it out, and stop talking about it."

At one time, I was even told in this House by an hon. Minister that, "the Borstal system has nothing to teach us in Ontario; we ourselves are the most perfect in regard to reform."

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I went to the newspapers and pleaded with them to use their extensive influence to bring about the appointment of either a Select Committee or a Royal Commission, because I said, "When prisoners send me petitions signed by 300 or 400 of them, it is indicative that something

is wrong, and the least we can do is to investigate it fully."

Every time I made a statement in the press, I was attacked by certain newspapers for trying to besmirch the good name of one of our institutions. One newspaper, the *Sudbury Daily*, went to the extent of printing a series of articles to prove that Burwash was an ideal institution, and that prisoners there live better than taxpayers.

MR. STEWART: Some of them do—most of them. In fact, they all do. They all live better than many of the law-abiding citizens.

MR. SALSBERG: With that I will not agree.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Why does not the hon. member go up and see for himself?

MR. SALSBERG: The *Sudbury* paper, which had criticized me as if I were "digging up" trouble in that institution, really made it appear that nobody wanted to get out of there.

MR. STEWART: Some do not—and said so.

MR. SALSBERG: After having appointed a committee, and the committee having gone into a thorough examination of all phases of the work of this department, I think its conclusions more than justify my pleas for a number of years. That is the point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker.

I am trying to make the point that I was not seeking to make a case against the department. Every time I arose in this House, I prefaced my remarks by saying that the present hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is more amenable to new ideas about reform, than any previous hon. Minister, to my knowledge. I was not blaming him. But I never went as far as the committee in regard to some of its findings. All I did was to say that I have these facts and this information, which disturbed me, and disturbed everyone, and which called for a thorough examination.

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members who are still in the House, I want to say

at this time that when I come forward with a proposal, they should not be so quick to unhesitatingly reject it. —

I am conditioned, Mr. Speaker, to this sort of thing; that I advance an idea; it is first rejected; it takes a year or two, and then is given some consideration; then, after a couple of years more, it is taken over. Unfortunately, when it is taken over, I cannot recognize the original thought or suggestion. But, at any rate, it is taken over, and I am glad it is. I appeal to the hon. members to bear this in mind when I next come with a proposal for a Royal Commission or a Select Committee to investigate something, Mr. Speaker, I want every hon. member of this House to believe me when I say I have no personal design, intention, or interest, when I carried on for a few years the fight for a Select Committee. Please believe me, when I come again. It is not personal, and I would ask the hon. members not to be so hasty in their rejection of my proposals.

While other members of the committee who have spoken were very lavish with their praise of the other members, and their appreciation of what the committee had done, I want to say that during the session, I had some very disturbing moments. I think I was not the only one who had a feeling of alarm, because some of the members of the committee had expressed some very far-fetched, outlandish and undemocratic thoughts and ideas. I think that should be taken note of at this moment, when we are finalizing our consideration of the report, and generally expressing our opinions.

MR. STEWART: None of those thoughts are in the report. They were facetious remarks which were made at the time.

MR. SALSBERG: I hope they were only that, but some were very disturbing. Some people thought we should establish a woodshed in every court—

MR. STEWART: No, we never said that. A woodshed has its merits, but there should be no whitewash brush in it.

MR. SALSBERG: Somebody said we should establish a woodshed, and take some of these people who were charged with offences out into the woodshed and give them a good, old-fashioned spanking. I was shocked that such a statement was made.

MR. GRUMMETT: I think the hon. member would far rather put them up against a stone wall and have them shot.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Grummett) seems to feel that the cap fits him, so let him wear it. I am sorry if it does. I have not mentioned any names.

MR. GRUMMETT: The cap would not fit you.

MR. SALSBERG: It was the hon. member who has just spoken who suggested the woodsheds.

MR. GRUMMETT: I did not.

MR. SALSBERG: If he did not, I am very glad he did not speak as was reported in the newspapers.

MR. STEWART: He said the woodshed had its merits, and with that the committee agreed. It still has.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to have to interrupt the discussion, but may I suggest to the hon. member we are discussing a report before the House. I do not think we should have references to every little item which was in the report, or which appeared in the newspapers. The report is being discussed, and the institutions were being investigated. If we have to listen to all that, I think we will have gone far beyond good reason, tolerance, and patience.

The hon. member for St. Andrew has done a great deal of speaking on these matters this afternoon and I would request him to confine his remarks to the report which is before the House.

MR. SALSBERG: I view of your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and the lateness of the hour, and the statement by the chairman of the committee that none of these ideas were incorporated in the

report, I will conclude on that. But I do say that I do not agree with the report when it suggests that the failure to utilize corporal punishment was the cause of the riot in Guelph.

I do not believe that corporal punishment at any time prevents riots or outbursts, or that it educates or cures people. Hon. members may disagree with this, but that is my opinion. Corporal punishment has not yet reformed a single prisoner anywhere. I hope the committee takes that into account, too.

I should also like to make the suggestion that the report's treatment of drug addicts be improved insofar as any implementation of it is concerned, I have felt for a long time that the drug addict should be handled as a sick person, who should be treated rather than punished. I would go so far as to suggest that one or another department of the government be empowered to announce that any drug addict who is willing to be cured, may come and register with the department, place himself or herself in their hands, and then in the process of curing be given the drug so long as the department considers it necessary. I think if that were done, many unfortunate, miserable, people, who are victims of this habit, and who will steal and murder in order to get money for the drug, if they knew that they could come and get under medical supervision, as much of the drug as the medical supervisors would consider necessary to give them, and to lead them from there on to full treatment and recovery, we would have less hold-ups, thefts and other offences committed. I recommend this thought to the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) and to the government as a whole. I know it would require special legislation and I do not even know if we could do it without some arrangement with Ottawa. However, that is a legal matter about which I am not speaking. I do think, though, that this is a serious aspect of our problems, and it should be looked into.

In conclusion, may I say that the report has made two very outstanding recommendations. I think it was worthwhile having the committee, despite the

criticism I would like to make against its utterances—but those are secondary items—if only for those two recommendations. The first is that there be a panel of experts who will help the court determine the sentence for first offenders, and not leave it only to the judgment of the magistrate or judge. I think that is an excellent thing. It was advocated here before. I among others suggested it, and I hope this recommendation will be implemented as quickly as possible. I believe it will save many first offenders from becoming repeaters.

The second very important recommendation of the committee is the extension of probation. I think it is a shocking fact that the present jail population of this country and this province as well, is as high as it is. I think probation will not only be a good thing from an economy point of view, but that it will do a great deal to rehabilitate the people. I think these are excellent, worthy recommendations.

In conclusion, while expressing my appreciation of the work of the committee and its report—I could add many things and subtract many things, but so could every other hon. member if given a chance to do so—may I say there are some fundamental recommendations which, if implemented, will go a long way towards improving the situation. And I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) who is at present in charge, is as likely to respond favourably to those suggestions as any other member of the government side could be found to be.

MR. SPEAKER: There being no further speakers on this subject, I declare the discussion closed.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.00 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, April 5, 1954

Afternoon Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, April 5, 1954.

City of London, bill respecting, third reading	1186
Town of St. Marys, bill respecting, third reading	1186
Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, bill respecting, third reading	1186
Town of Oakville, bill respecting, third reading	1186
Child Welfare Act, 1954, third reading	1186
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, third reading	1186
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, third reading	1187
Municipal Act, bill to amend, third reading	1187
Assessment Act, bill to amend, third reading	1187
Registry Act, bill to amend, third reading	1187
Cemeteries Act, bill to amend, third reading	1187
Public Service Act, bill to amend, third reading	1187
Pharmacy Act, 1953, bill to amend, third reading	1187
Resolve to Appoint Select Committee re Highway Safety, Mr. Frost	1187
Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1188
Theatres Act, 1953, bill to amend, reported	1188
Legislative Assembly Act, bill respecting, reported	1190
Election Act, 1951, bill to amend, reported	1190
Voters' List Act, 1951, bill to amend, reported	1197
Controverted Election Act, bill to amend, reported	1197
Municipal Act, bill to amend, reported	1197
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, reported	1198
Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, 1943, bill to amend, reported	1200
Raising Money on Credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund, bill to authorize, reported	1201
Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario, bill to promote, reported	1201
Report Select Committee re Expense Allowances for Select Committees, Mr. Welsh	1203
Motion to Resolve Again into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1205
Legislative Act, bill to amend, as amended, reported	1205
Resumption of Debate on the Budget Address, Mr. Salsberg, Mr. Downer	1207
Recess, 6 o'clock	1223

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1954.

2.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Before the Orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) about another explosion in the Richard L. Hearn Generating Plant. This is the second explosion, as I understand it, within a very few days, and it calls for the most exhaustive examination.

May I ask the hon. Minister to make a statement about it, and also to say whether this plant was just last week put into operation after being changed from 25- to 60-cycle power.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I will answer the last question first. No unit has as yet been changed from 25- to 60-cycle. The unfortunate accident to No. 2 unit was practically the same as to No. 1 last week. Although the explosion was not as great, it is difficult to say whether it was fire then the explosion, or the explosion and then the fire. We have not been able to ascertain that as

yet, but I will say the damage was not quite as severe as was reported last week. Both units are totally destroyed.

In order to help us, on account of the insurance, and in order to find out what caused the trouble, we left the first unit as it was after the fire. We are still under warranty with the manufacturers, and they have sent their engineering experts over. They are taking the first unit down to find what was the cause of the fire, when the second explosion occurred. They were both rushed over to the plant, and they are there yet.

We do not know, and we cannot explain as yet, the cause of these explosions. They are the experts and it will be up to them to report the cause of the fire. The commission decided the best thing to do would be to close down the plant completely to prevent any further damage until we are able to find out exactly what the remedy will be. It is unfortunate, but because of this we have had to use tie lines to get 160,000 kilowatts from the Detroit-Edison, and 20,000 from the Niagara-Mohawk as emergency power. Unless there is some unforeseen emergency, we expect to carry on our load over the peak.

The warm weather and bright sunshine are helping us out to some extent, but there is no use minimizing the unfortunate circumstances. It is one of the things over which we have no control, but we hope to get the answer from the experts.

MR. OLIVER: We understand the machines are covered by insurance?

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): How many units are there?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Four.

MR. NIXON: Half of them are out now?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Yes. The third unit was the one which was being converted from 25- to 60-cycle. A fourth was in operation. It was carrying its load, but, because of the accident, we decided to shut the whole plant down.

MR. OLIVER: Does Hydro carry its own insurance?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: We generally do, but in this case, the boilers are insured privately because they require special insurance, and the plant and units are carried with a certain amount of private insurance, as well as our own contingency reserve. The generators are covered by the manufacturers to date.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): I wish to bring a matter to the attention of the House, not with the idea of prolonging it unduly, but because I feel, as a matter of record, I would like to bring to the attention of all the hon. members, a tribute to the head of this government, who is also the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

The remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, about this tribute is that it springs from a source of opposition to this government's policies, and one which rarely pays tribute to any members of the administration. Mr. Speaker, the tribute comes editorially from the *Toronto Daily Star*.

It appeared in the *Star* last week, and while it only reiterates qualities of the hon. Prime Minister which we on the government side have recognized all along, I feel I should quote it in full because it is brief and to the point. It is headed "Done With Natural Graciousness," and reads:

There was no doubt some justification for the resentment expressed at the city hall when it was announced

that Premier Frost, and not Mayor Lamport, would pull the lever to open the subway, a purely Toronto enterprise. But when the time came, Mr. Frost did a gracious thing when he varied the programme by calling the mayor over to join hands with him in that operation.

It was good politics. Of course it was. But it was more than that. It was the act of a kindly man whose natural impulses are friendly. He does the generous thing without affectation.

That, alas, is one of the things that make him so hard to defeat.

Even the hon. members of the Opposition will admit in all graciousness, I am sure, that the *Daily Star* is accurate on all counts in its tribute to the hon. Prime Minister, whose kindly actions and friendly impulses are well known far and wide by the people of Ontario. I sincerely recommend the final sentence of the editorial to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the other hon. members of the Opposition, with whatever comfort they can derive from it.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, how he figures the *Star* can be so dead right in this, and so dead wrong in everything else?

MR. SALSBERG: He has not figured that out yet.

The following bills were read a third time, passed and intituled as in the motion:

Bill No. 10, An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill No. 14, An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys.

Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Bill No. 31, An Act respecting the Town of Oakville.

Bill No. 77, The Child Welfare Act, 1954.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill No. 123, An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act.

Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Public Service Act.

Bill No. 133, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act, 1953.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK:
Notice of Motion No. 7:

Mr. Frost (Victoria): Resolution that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to study the problem of highway safety in all its phases, including the methods of accident prevention now in general use, methods of public education and control of traffic and to examine and consider any proposals designed to reduce the number of highway accidents submitted to the committee and to report on methods for the better control of highway traffic in the interest of greater public safety.

And that the Select Committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

Said committee to consist of 11 members, and to be composed as follows: Messrs. Nickle (Chairman), Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk), Leavine, Yaremko, Child, Root, Beech, Edwards, Manley, Gordon, Thomas (Ontario).

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion, and presenting it formally to the House, in view of what has been said in the House, I do not think it is necessary for me to elaborate very greatly on the necessity for such a committee.

The matter was referred to very directly by 2 hon. members, both of whom are members of the committee. It was also mentioned to a very great extent by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in his address last week.

My recollection is that we had between 1,000 and 1,100 deaths on the highways last year. I am quite conscious of the fact that the number is proportionately less, having regard to the number of motor vehicles, than was the case a few years before. The hon. Minister of Highways mentioned that, but, in addition, there were a great number of people who were injured and a very great amount of property damage occasioned. The hon. Minister of Highways mentioned the sum of \$25 million in property damage. That is a tremendous loss.

This is a matter to which much attention has been given, and a matter which concerns all America. In the House of Commons at Ottawa, the subject has been raised as affecting all the provinces of Canada. It was felt at that time, as mentioned by Hon. Mr. Garson, that the problem was one which probably came within the sphere of things provincially, and therefore, the matter should be in that field.

Of course, the Criminal Code, in various sections relating to manslaughter, criminal negligence, dangerous driving, and things of that sort, covers to an extent the subject matter.

However, it is a problem which concerns not only Canada, but all America. This was evidenced by the discussion in the House of Commons. It is something which very vitally concerns us in Ontario, when we have suffered between 1,000 and 1,100 deaths, approximately 24,000 injured and some \$25 million property damage.

I could not help but be impressed by what one of the hon. members said, that if you had an epidemic which took that number of lives, or caused casualties to that extent, it would be enquired into without delay. This is an opportunity for constructive statesmanship on the part of this committee. The opportunity for full investigation is there to bring this matter out and place it on the table, and let everybody see what the problem is. I should say that the publicity to this problem alone would do what the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) said relative to this problem, when speaking here a few days ago, that in the conferences in the United States they had come to the conclusion that it was very largely a question of individual care. I think I am quoting the hon. member correctly, at least that is the tenor of what he said. If it is true, Mr. Speaker, that the cause of this huge toll is individual carelessness, the very fact that it is being brought out into the open will have a good effect.

In moving the motion, I do so for the reasons I have mentioned. As I say, it is an important subject, and one upon which we could elaborate to a great extent. But it seems to me the reason for such a committee is there. It has been raised, and this is a great opportunity to let the people's representatives examine the problem and tell the public what it is all about.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I welcome the appointment of this committee, as the hon. Prime Minister has suggested. I think there is a very great job to do there.

I was going to suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that I think the committee will have to look outside the province, even outside the other provinces of Canada, in order to get a composite picture of this entire matter. In the United States they have had the problem in its serious stages, I suppose, longer than we have, and in many of the states of the Union, they have some very advanced ways of dealing with it.

Anyone who has read the recent issue of *Life* magazine—I think it was

the issue before last—will get some idea of the way in which they are tackling this problem. In my judgment, we would have to do a great deal of studying across the line, because they have accumulated a good deal of experience there.

HON. MR. FROST: In response to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has said on that point, I agree there has been a great deal of work done on the other side. The hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) mentioned attending a conference convened by the President of the United States himself, as a representative of the Good Roads Association. Representatives attended that conference from all over the United States and in a number of cases, I believe, the Governors were present. These things give us the opportunity of considering and discussing this problem, and I am quite in accord with what the Leader of the Opposition has said in that regard.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to move another two motions, but I find that an amendment is required to the second motion, so I will hold them over for a short time.

Mr. Speaker, I move you now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. T. R. Dent (Oxford) in the Chair.

THE THEATRES ACT

Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend the Theatres Act, 1953."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of saying what I should have said before the Orders of the day. There will be a night session tonight.

On section No. 1.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): I move an amendment, Mr. Chairman, that sections 1 and 2 be struck out and be replaced by the following:

1. The Theatres Act, 1953 is amended by adding thereto the following section:

54a. The director shall not approve the plans for the construction of a "Class D" theatre unless there is submitted with the application for such approval a copy of a resolution of the council of the local municipality in which such theatre is proposed to be constructed authorizing the construction of such theatre in the municipality, and such approval shall not be deemed to be a licence under section 12,

and that section 3 of the bill be renumbered as section 2 of the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the bill be passed as amended?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I say, before we pass the bill, I think it is a good bill. I think it is one which is reasonable and sensible. Drive-in theatres have become something of the way of life we are leading, whether this is a good thing or not. I would say to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) that it is part of "the rural way of life," but it is inflicted on the rural people anyway. In some localities there does not seem to be any objection, while in others, there is very great objection, and I think it is desirable to give a Municipal Council something to say about it.

The board has endeavoured to do that in the past, but there have been some legal obstacles in the way. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has referred in this House to the situation in Brantford Township. In that case one of the difficulties was a legal technicality. The Board of Censors has been in the habit of consulting the municipalities, but in this case the municipality had not been zoned. And therefore, I think, there was an application for a writ of mandamus to make the township issue a licence.

This bill rectifies that situation and gives a township the right to say whether it wants a drive-in theatre or not. I can

assure the hon. member for Brant that since this matter comes under the Treasury Department it has caused me a great deal of concern. I would not care if they never allowed one. But some people and some localities want them. Others do not. I think this gives a field for self-determination and I am in favour of it.

MR. NIXON: I may say, Mr. Chairman, that in the Province of Quebec they have never allowed one of these drive-in theatres to become established. I have here an interesting report according to which certain interests sought to circumvent the law there, by establishing a drive-in theatre on an Indian reserve. But Mr. Duplessis said he would not permit this to happen.

The ban in Quebec on open-air theatres was applied in 1947, and persons wishing to stage an open-air showing limit it to a single performance.

In the case I have in mind, certain interests sought to establish a drive-in theatre last year, east of the City of Brantford, but this intention became public knowledge and the people objected very strenuously. It was found that the area was zoned. Last November certain promoters appeared before the Township Council without anyone having any advance knowledge that this was in the offing. They asked for a building permit, and, by a strange coincidence, the clerk of the township had been advised by long distance telephone from Toronto that afternoon that the Theatres Branch had approved this application. Therefore, the Township Council had no option whatever but to give the building permit to the interests concerned. On the strength of that, and their local advice, they passed a resolution. When the report of those proceedings appeared in the local newspaper the next day, it was the first time anyone in the community learned of the drive-in theatre being established. The whole community, although it had been known as "Tranquility" for 150 years, rose in righteous indignation against it. The proposed building was to be established in a growing section of Brantford Township. The population in that district is increasing

rapidly and a very large school was recently built there. Two large super-markets have been established in this area.

The outlet for the proposed new theatre opens onto a main road, so the project was regarded as a road traffic hazard. Ultimately, the council revoked its resolution granting the permit, but in spite of that the interests concerned still proceeded to build the theatre and its approach road. This was rather amazing. I arranged for a deputation to go and see Dr. Chester Walters of the Treasurer's Department, as I was unable to get the hon. Prime Minister on the telephone for two days. Certainly the residents of Brantford Township regarded the matter as extremely serious. One drive-in theatre was already established in the same township, just west of Brantford.

The deputation came back satisfied that the theatre was not going to be forced upon the citizens. The next thing was this motion for a writ of mandamus, which was issued as a matter of course, under the law as it stands under the Theatres Act.

I consider it very unfair to make the Township Council the "goat" in this matter. The wrath of the residents was centred on the council, but when the writ of mandamus was issued it had no opinion.

These are the circumstances which motivated me in introducing the amendment to the Theatres Act, and I am very glad indeed that it has been possible to agree on this form of amendment, which, in my opinion, covers the situation satisfactorily.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Will the bill make it possible for a municipal government, county or township, to refuse to renew a licence, and in that manner put out of commission an existing theatre?

HON. MR. FROST: No.

Amendment agreed to.

Sections 1 and 2 as amended agreed to.

Bill No. 124 reported.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 78, "An Act respecting representation of the people in the Legislative Assembly."

Sections 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 78 reported.

THE ELECTION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend the Election Act, 1951."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

MR. OLIVER: In section 3, it says that section 17 of the Election Act, 1951, is amended by striking out the words:

Or who is maintained in whole or in part as an inmate receiving charitable support or care in a home for the aged or house of industry.

I agree with that, but I want to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) what machinery is provided in order that these people may exercise their vote? Is there any change in the Election Act which would facilitate their voting?

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): They would be enumerated in the same way as any other voters. An arrangement could be made to have a polling subdivision right in the institution if this were warranted.

MR. OLIVER: That is where the residence is?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, they vote where they happen to be—in the institution where they are.

Section 3 carried.

Sections 4 to 7 inclusive carried.

MR. OLIVER: On section 8, can the hon. Attorney-General say how he intends to appoint these returning officers? May they be appointed in "staggered time"?

HON. MR. PORTER: Either one at a time, or 9 or 10 at a time, or all in a bundle. That is the ideal situation.

MR. OLIVER: Why does the hon. Attorney-General say that that is an ideal situation?

HON. MR. PORTER: Because it gives great flexibility and provides for cases where an early appointment may not be desirable. In some cases no one is ready to take the job. This is a much better system, I submit, than having to appoint at the time the writ is issued. I think it a very effective way of improving the situation which exists at the present time.

MR. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (Peel): I think it is most desirable to have your returning officers appointed early in some places. In an election we had 2 weeks ago there were 1,102 votes in 1 polling subdivision because the deputy returning officer did not have time to divide it into 3 or 4 subdivisions. When new subdivisions are being created, you must have a man appointed some months ahead at least in order that he may have time to separate the old polling subdivisions into new subdivisions which will cater equally for the voting population.

MR. ALBERT WREN (Kenora): Has every endeavour been made to secure a returning officer who is resident in the riding concerned at the time a writ is issued? I have in my own riding a situation where, in the last 2 elections, a man has been brought in from Southern Ontario. He was at one time a resident, but he has got out of touch with local conditions, and, as a result, there is constant confusion in the setting up of polling divisions. Has consideration been given to requiring returning officers to be residents in the riding? I think it should be.

HON. MR. PORTER: The difficulty, of course, in confining the qualifications of a returning officer to residence within his own riding, is that very often there is not a suitable person who is willing to act, while there may be one in some neighbouring riding. And if there is not one available even there, what is the difference, as long as he carries out his

duties properly, as to where he happens to reside? We want a good job done, that is all.

MR. WREN: It has not been done, though.

MR. OLIVER: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) has a point here. Surely in every riding in this province there is a man with capabilities of being a returning officer, and surely there is a man possessing such capabilities who is willing to take the job. I think it is a reasonable request, to say that every returning officer should be a resident of the electoral district for which he is returning officer.

HON. MR. PORTER: That was not the report of the committee, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) was a member of that committee.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): This was not the committee's report either.

HON. MR. PORTER: The committee's report on the point that the hon. member (Mr. Wren) is speaking of at the moment, was that it should not be necessary for returning officer to be resident in the electoral district.

MR. NIXON: I thought we were going to have permanent returning officers. That was the committee's point.

MR. OLIVER: You turned the picture all around.

HON. MR. PORTER: This is a much better solution.

MR. OLIVER: In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, I want to argue with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) about this. After all, according to the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Ward-robe), he is a reasonable man. I think there is some substance in the argument that every returning officer should be a resident of that electoral district.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Does the hon. member (Mr. Wren) know of any case where that has not been the case?

HON. MR. PORTER: It often happens in Toronto.

MR. OLIVER: If there are cases where that does not apply, then what it does is point up the fact that the riding is not possessive of a man capable of being a returning officer, and no riding is going to admit that, surely. There are lots of men in every riding who have the capabilities and who would be willing to be returning officer.

Moreover, the man who is returning officer in the electoral district has the advantage that he knows that riding much better than anybody coming in from outside possibly could. In all seriousness, I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to consider that.

HON. MR. FROST: If I thought there was any possibility of someone from outside Grey South being appointed returning officer there, I would at once come to the support of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver).

MR. NIXON: How about Victoria-Haliburton?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, there would be a revolution.

HON. MR. PORTER: Could it not be left to the good judgment of the chief election officer?

HON. MR. FROST: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) will see it might lead to complications and difficulties. In a city like Toronto, for instance, where we have, what, 11 members?

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): 13.

HON. MR. FROST: There are 2 or 3 in Hamilton, and some other places. In a number of cases, they have municipal people, the clerks, for instance. There is nothing political about the City

of Toronto, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, and the result is it might be desirable in such cities as Toronto, Hamilton, and Windsor, there should be a wider discretion given than simply to follow the definition of the riding boundary. I have never heard of a case in a rural constituency where a resident of that constituency was not appointed as returning officer. I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) would agree it would be a fatal thing for any person to nominate a person from outside the riding.

MR. WREN: Mr. Chairman, might I point out to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that it has happened on 2 past elections in the Kenora riding, and there has been a great deal of confusion as a result. There are up there a good many capable people, even Progressive Conservatives, who can carry on that job. As you know, Sir, in the next election there will be for the first time the Indian vote. There are some 7,000 Indian residents in my riding; in fact, I have the largest Indian population in Ontario. If the same kind of man is selected again, having been brought from 800 miles away to be returning officer, it is going to compound a confusion.

HON. MR. FROST: When did this happen, may I ask?

MR. WREN: In the 1951 and 1948 elections.

HON. MR. FROST: And from where did he come?

MR. WREN: From somewhere around Orillia. I am not just sure of the town, but I think it is in the hon. Prime Minister's riding.

HON. MR. FROST: I plead not guilty, Sir.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, not only do I want to support the objection raised by the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), but I want to suggest that even in Toronto the practice

should be one of appointing a returning officer who resides in the constituency. If we really want to have a staff composed of people who know the district they are responsible for, then we should go out of our way to get such people. I might say in my riding the Tories found no difficulty in getting returning officers who live in the riding, in fact they had battles on their hands. However, I speak now on the general principle of the matter, and I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) another point which I raised when this bill was before the House on a previous occasion. That is, that we appoint returning officers who are as impartial and as objective as can humanly be found. In other words, that we do not give these appointments to political supporters and political hangers-on, but that we select people in the community who are known for their fairness and objectivity. I suggested on a previous occasion that perhaps ministers of the church could be chosen to be returning officers. Not that there are not ministers who are partisans and who are very active in politics—in fact, I am sorry to say there are a few here on the government side; I would no reserve it so much if they were on the Opposition side—I would not mind taking a chance on people of that sort to establish and operate an impartial election machinery rather than to proceed as we do now, and have some of the experiences we have had for instance in the riding of St. George on a previous occasion. That matter, hon. members will recall, came to the attention of this House. While I do not blame the hon. the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), who comes from that riding, for all that happened or transpired there, nevertheless, it was a very unpleasant experience, and there was quite an investigation of what happened.

I think we would do away with all that if we were to go outside the ranks of political supporters of the government of the day, and find people who can be depended upon to give a very honest election to the candidates and citizens involved.

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, may I point out this section received quite a discussion at the committee, as I am sure the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) will recall. It was indicated in the larger sections, especially in Toronto, a person very capable of being a returning officer might move from the riding into the Greater Toronto area, and we thought it would be advisable to word the section as it is today in order to cover such cases.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, one would think that Kenora is one riding, of all ridings in the entire province, where a resident returning officer would be almost essential.

HON. MR. FROST: Certainly one would.

HON. MR. PORTER: That might have had something to do with the result of the last election at Kenora. It may not have been entirely due to the qualification of the hon. member who is now sitting there, in fact I should have thought he would be the last person to complain. However, we will see next time, perhaps, that we do not have a man from 800 miles away, and then the hon. member will be "licked."

MR. WREN: I assure you, Mr. Chairman, it was not the reason that I won or lost. I gained a Tory seat. The expenses of conducting an election in Kenora, for all Parties, are very great, and the means of getting around are very difficult, and all that is being accomplished by sending up men from the "Banana Belt" to look after our election is—

HON. MR. FROST: I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Wren). I do not think that should be the case.

MR. WREN: I do not think so either, but why do you not correct it?

HON. MR. FROST: However, I should imagine there is an explanation for what the hon. member mentions as having happened there. Probably the

man was a returning officer, and perhaps moved away to live with his mother-in-law, or something of the sort, and then came back to conduct the election. I do not know whether that was the case or not, but I suppose there was some particular circumstance about it. Certainly, I agree thoroughly with the hon. member (Mr. Wren). I think returning officers certainly should come from the riding. I am sure there are people who are capable of doing the job, and I know that I would not like it very well if someone were brought in from some other riding to Victoria, and I know other hon. members here feel the same way.

The only point is that the situation does affect the larger places, and perhaps there should be some elasticity. But when you do that it is difficult to get it right down into words without causing some difficulty. However, I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Wren) that we will—particularly in view of the fact that there is some opportunity given now for appointing a returning officer beforehand, see that these situations do not occur.

Sections 8 and 9 agreed to.

On section 10.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) the definition of "private building"? I supposed that would mean the residence in which the returning officer had his office. It might be a private house, it might be his office, it could mean that the nomination of candidates would be held in the returning officer's office, could it not?

HON. MR. PORTER: It could mean that, yes, although it is not limited to that. It may be that the only convenient place available might be some private dwelling which is rented for the purpose of holding the nomination meeting. I think the point of the section is to broaden it as much as possible in case the court house, municipal hall, or public building, for instance, might not be available. I might point out the section is exactly the same as it was in the old Act in that respect.

MR. OLIVER: There has been no change, then?

HON. MR. PORTER: In that respect there has been no change. The only change occurs at the very end, and has to do with the time.

MR. OLIVER: Yes.

Sections 10 to 21 inclusive, agreed to.
On section 22.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, section 22 deals with the dissemination of information. I feel there can never be enough dissemination of information to the electors, but have we thought of dissemination of information for the candidates? What I mean, Mr. Chairman, is this, I think if a candidate in any election has always been urging the electors to come and vote, whether they vote Liberal, Conservative or CCF is immaterial to me, as long as they exercise their franchise, but I think it is a common experience that even at best, the proportion of electors who vote is 55 per cent. It has been thought, at one time, to make voting compulsory. I do not think that is the solution. I do not think we should compel people to vote if they do not want to vote.

HON. MR. PORTER: We are not doing that, of course.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Oh, there is a way of encouraging them to come out.

MR. CHARTRAND: Perhaps, in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar) riding. But I have been wondering for some time if it would not be a good idea to have disseminated the information as to the people who are voting and those who are not voting? I think it could be easily arranged for the deputy returning officer to send each candidate a list of prospective voters and next to each name would be an "X" to indicate those who have exercised their vote and those who have not exercised their vote. I think that would be a dissemination of information which possibly would encourage, all but compel, people to exercise their franchise. I think possibly we

have reached a stage in The Election Act whereby an amendment may not be in order if the government does not want to accept it. Nevertheless, I think if the government would look into this matter and arrange for dissemination of information as to who is exercising the franchise and who is not, we would be going a long way toward having people exercise their franchise.

HON. MR. PORTER: I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Chartrand) that the government will look into the question. Whether the dissemination should be artificial or natural, I am not prepared to state.

Section 22 agreed to.

On section 23.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I feel that this clause is totally inadequate, will in no way meet the requirements, and will permit the continuation of the illegal practice that has been traditional until now.

HON. MR. PORTER: What practice is that?

MR. SALSBERG: You see, Mr. Chairman, the section provides that a report be made of moneys collected, contributions made, and so on, in excess of the amount of \$50, and that a detailed statement be given. I think it is universally recognized that the "old line" Party candidates spend enormous amounts of money which are never included in their official reports to the chief electoral officer. That is so federally, and that is so provincially. Not only that, it is universally acknowledged that the "old line" Parties never make public their "slush" funds, or election campaign funds, or whatever name one may give to those accumulated amounts of money which are used in time of election to help re-elect or elect the followers of a government Party. To be more specific, Mr. Chairman, it is generally known that the "old line" Parties gather millions of dollars which they use at election time, and that those amounts of money are never accounted for publicly. I have yet to see the Liberal Party or

Conservative Party give an annual financial report to the public, and print it in all the newspapers, of how much money they collected from one corporation or another, or all, and what they did with it. Yet everybody knows that these millions of dollars are collected for the purpose of electing the "old line" candidates.

Some of the candidates, of course, feel they are violating laws, and that they are engaged in something unethical, and that they are, in fact, breaking the law. I quoted at an earlier date in this session from an article in *Maclean's* dealing with this question. The author of that article quoted members of both "old line" Parties who confided that they felt very unhappy about it; that they felt they had started their parliamentary careers in a dishonest way; that their first report was dishonest because they did not give a truthful and accurate accounting of the money they had collected or the sources they had collected it from, nor how they had used it.

I think this is, of course, an evil with which it is about time to cope. I, for one, believe you will not eliminate it entirely, so long as there are privileged interests who have a good reason to want to influence legislation, and to retain a determining voice over government policy. So long as that exists—

HON. MR. PORTER: It would be of very great interest to this House, if we knew something about the financing of the Communist Party in this country, and from where the funds are coming.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General is not original. In his absence, a humble supporter of this government raised the same question. I made a reply, and I will make it again. Any candidate who runs on the Labour Progressive ticket will be glad, at all times, to make known to the government and the public at large, the source of every dollar used in the election, and from where it comes. It is known that the working-class candidates have, as a rule, no large election funds, and that the money collected usually comes from the pockets of the working people in

dribblets, of dimes, quarters, and half-dollars, and there is a great deal of free labour involved in an election.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is what the hon. member says.

MR. SALSBERG: I am telling you at the time of an election, I have people who work day and night distributing literature, and being around the committee rooms, for which they receive no pay—

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member is not the only one who does that.

MR. SALSBERG: As I say, they work without pay, and besides that, they make a contribution to the campaign. We have people of artistic talent who come in and draw signs, and other things, and they not only do not get paid, but they make their own contributions, whereas the candidates of the old-line Parties know they have to pay for every step taken by their supporters—

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, the statement by the hon. member for St. Andrew is entirely untrue.

MR. SALSBERG: If it is untrue—

HON. MR. PORTER: It is as untrue as most of the other statements made by the hon. member, since he has taken his seat.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General reduces the value of most of his statements by recklessness and the making of sweeping statements.

MR. GEORGE PARRY (Kent West): So does the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. SALSBERG: Thereby he nullifies anything he may be saying. If it is true that the old-line Party candidates do not spend money for most of the work done for them in an election campaign, then they are misleading the banks, and misleading the large corporations to whom they go for election funds.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): We do not.

MR. SALSBERG: One of the back-benchers says "We do not."

MR. STEWART: Why does the hon. member not speak for himself?

MR. SALSBERG: Perhaps the hon. members from the back benches do not, but the hon. members on the Treasury benches do. I am quoting now, Mr. Blair Fraser—

HON. MR. PORTER: Who is he? What does he know about it?

MR. SALSBERG: He is one of the outstanding journalists in the magazine field. He is not a politician, to my knowledge, let alone a supporter of my Party.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Where did he run?

HON. MR. PORTER: What does he know about it?

MR. SALSBERG: He does not run. He watches. He wants to know what makes it run, and who is greasing the chariot at the time of an election.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: He does not know any more about it than the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. SALSBERG: You say Mr. Fraser does not know? Will the government members deny that they collect election funds? Or are they just elected on their good looks?

HON. MR. PORTER: Because we give a good government.

MR. SALSBERG: Do they get page after page of advertising space in the dailies and weeklies, free of charge? Do they get every available space on the radio free of charge? They do not get these things for nothing. When they put in these page-long ads, they pay for them, and they run more than one page. We know that in the past few years the Progressive Conservatives had all the money. At one time the Liberal Party

had it. But, recently, that Party cannot afford all this advertising. Do not tell me you are getting all this advertising and radio time for nothing.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member is changing his mind, just "slithering" around.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. members cannot deny they are paying, then they must get the money from somewhere. Then you are misleading the public, and not telling them the whole story.

I will cut this short, Mr. Chairman, and say this section does not solve the evil. If it is left pretty well as it is now, that means that funds will be accumulated. Parties will go to the sources from which they have received their money in the past, and probably secure more.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for St. Andrew gets better all the time.

MR. SALSBERG: They get full-page advertising, and never report it; they get radio time, and it is never reported, and the electors do not receive honest reports which this section leads them to believe they will receive.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to have to go into such lurid details. I had no intention of doing so, if it had not been for the hon. Attorney-General—

HON. MR. PORTER: We have not had a single detail as yet—

MR. SALSBERG: It is acknowledged, however, that they pay—

HON. MR. PORTER: —by the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General wanted the details, and I have given them to him. I hope that will get as good results from him.

Sections 23 and 24 agreed to.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce an amendment which will be numbered "25," which reads as follows:

Paragraph 2 of section 18 of the Election Act, 1951, is amended by striking out the words, "double indent," whether he or she is not an Indian, franchised or unfranchised, and of wholly or in part of Indian blood,

in the 7th, 8th and 9th lines.

New section 25 agreed to.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to introduce a second amendment, and I move a new section, which will be numbered 26, be added to this bill, as follows:

That section 22 of the Election Act, 1951, is repealed.

Those 2 new sections are to provide for the right of Indians to vote.

HON. MR. FROST: The emancipation of the Indians.

HON. MR. PORTER: I further move, Mr. Chairman, that sections 25 and 26 in the bill be re-numbered: "27" and "28."

New section 26 agreed to.

Section 27 (formerly 25) agreed to.

Section 28 (formerly 26) agreed to.

Bill No. 136 reported.

THE VOTERS' LIST ACT, 1951

House in Committee on Bill No. 137, "An Act to amend the Voters' List Act, 1951."

Sections 1 to 20 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 137 reported.

THE CONTROVERTED ELECTION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 138, "An Act to amend the Controverted Election Act."

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 138 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 140, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act."

On section 1.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): On section 1, Mr. Chairman, subsection 8, where it gives the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council power to confirm the decision of the Municipal Board, or to require the Municipal Board to hold a new public hearing, before such members of the board as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may designate: What is the purpose of putting that in? You have 7 members on the board, and you might say there should be 2 designated to hear a case. Why limit it to 2?

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. Leader of the Opposition has just turned it the opposite way. Our intention is, there might be 2, sitting on the board, and making a decision, and we might order there be 5 or 7 and that the chairman must be present. It is to increase the number on the board, not to decrease it.

MR. OLIVER: It will work both ways.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that no government would decrease the size of the board.

MR. OLIVER: Well, I am not sure about that.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): There is no intention, by this amendment, to designate members of the board by names?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We might not mention them by names, but we might say "the chairman." I will speak very plainly; I want the chairman to be present at the hearings—the senior man.

I would expect the candidate to say that the chairman should be present at the re-hearing. That would be reasonable, I think.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

MR. ARTHUR CHILD (Wentworth): Is there not an amendment to come into this particular bill?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: This had to be passed, before we came to the Hamilton bill.

MR. CHILD: It comes into the Hamilton bill?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes. This was done in order that it might fit in. Bill No. 140 reported.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON

House in Committee on Bill No. 5, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton."

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

MR. R. E. ELLIOTT (Hamilton East): I move,

(1) That section 4 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

4. [1] For the purposes of subsections 14 to 20 of section 14 of The Municipal Act, the order of the Ontario Municipal Board dated the 31st day of December, 1953, P.F.M.—1175 shall be deemed to be a decision providing for an annexation, and a valid notice of objection shall be deemed to have been filed with the clerk of the Executive Council, and subsections 17 to 20 of the said section 14 shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the decision and the notice of objection.

[2] If,

- (a) the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council confirms the said order of the Ontario Municipal Board; or
- (b) the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council orders a new public hearing in respect of the annexation and the Ontario Municipal Board thereupon orders an annexation of part of the Township of Saltfleet to the City of Hamilton,

any lands of 2 acres or more, in the portion of the Township of Saltfleet annexed to the City of Hamilton, used on the effective date on the annexation for agricultural or gardening purposes, shall, so long as so used, be assessed in each year for a period

of 5 years at such amount as may be agreed upon by the Corporation of the City of Hamilton and the person assessed or failing such agreement as shall be determined by the Ontario Municipal Board.

(2) That schedule F be struck out.

This amendment removes the section of the bill that confirms the Municipal Board's annexation order set out in schedule "F" of the bill. The effect of the new section 4 will be to make applicable to the board's orders the new provision under which the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may authorize or confirm the decision of the board or require the board to hold a new public hearing.

MR. CHILD: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment, I would say that I am very well pleased with the over-all picture, because at one time we were rather concerned, both in Hamilton and Saltfleet, that the ruling of the Private Bills Committee might have gone through. My own opinion is that it is much better to deal with it this way, that is, by sending it back to council, than to the Private Bills Committee. There, of course, we did not have sufficient time to study it.

On these two applications, from Hamilton and London, which were more or less brought in together, I was wondering how it is going to affect future annexations, which may be brought up, because I feel that Hamilton will, in another year, be asking for another 1,000 acres from another township.

It is quite possible, in fact, it is almost certain, that will happen.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, as a solution of this annexation problem, with all due respect to the Cabinet, that it could better be handled by a planning authority, and that we amend the Municipal Act to take the annexation hearings away from the Municipal Board, and set up a planning authority, to look after the interests of all annexation applications all over the Province of Ontario. The Municipal

Board could be consulted regarding the financial aspect of annexation.

Possibly a man like Doctor Faludi, who is an expert in planning, might help this authority.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Then you would pollute it all right.

MR. CHILD: I understood that Doctor Faludi was a consultant to the Department of Municipal Affairs, but I could be wrong in that.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Not that I have ever heard of.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): It says so in the paper.

MR. CHILD: There it is on March 27th, in the *Globe and Mail*. It says, "Dr. E. G. Faludi, planning consultant for the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs."

MR. SALSBERG: Sometimes a clipping is a good thing.

MR. CHILD: I am beginning to see that there is something in these clippings after all. I suggest that possibly an authority composed of an engineer, a doctor, one lawyer—no more—an educationalist, a medical health officer, an industrialist, and a farmer, should be on the board. Let those people decide regarding all annexations.

I say that for a very good reason. One of our council members—and I will not mention his name for obvious reasons—when asked if his opinion on the need for annexation, was based on the study of expansion experience in Ontario generally, replied, "My opinions are based on information supplied by our officials. I am not interested in Ontario, but only in Hamilton and its surroundings."

It seems a rather ambitious local or municipal politician might have an annexation put through council, not in the best interests of the province, but in the best interests of his particular municipality. For that reason, I would suggest something along the lines of a planning authority to be set up in the future.

As I said, these present applications could possibly go through if we had a set of standard rules, the same as for the Liquor Licence Board, providing that before you could apply for an annexation, for instance, the taxpayers in both municipalities should be consulted by way of a referendum.

Every one of us here trusts the electors at the time of election. What is wrong with trusting them with something which will affect the dollars and cents in their pockets? They are the people who have to decide. We have a great deal of faith in them when it comes to an election, and I see no reason why we should not trust them with something which deals with their pocketbooks.

All efforts should be exhausted before they apply for arbitration. Some of them do not even bother to arbitrate, but feel they are too big to talk to a small municipality.

Another rule we might have would be that if a municipality does have an annexation application granted the people in the small area—the small home owners—should not be put in a position where their taxes could be doubled and tripled overnight, simply because one day they live in the township and the next day, when the annexation goes through, they live in the city, and their taxes are automatically increased.

We have many cases of previous annexations, 4 and 5 years ago, where people still do not have city services, but their taxes have been doubled and tripled. In one area, bus service has been taken off because the roads are so bad the bus company refused to operate. Those people are taxed city rates, and are paying city taxes, but they have no water, no sewers, and now, no bus service.

I submit the same thing as has been mentioned in relation to agricultural land should apply. It is an excellent idea, but I do believe we can go farther, and protect the little fellow, too, because many of these people who moved out there are carrying on on a strict budget. They have budgeted for 5 or 10 years, and \$150 makes a great deal of difference to them.

We have, I believe, taken a step in the right direction, but, I firmly believe, had there not been a certain amount of controversy and fight put up as far as Hamilton and Saltfleet are concerned, we would not have had this legislation. It is all for a good cause, and I do believe is in the interests of the province, not of any one municipality.

I think an authority should be set up so that hereafter decisions will be taken out of politics altogether. I do not believe there should be any "lobbying" at all, but a set of 4 or 5 rules should be complied with first.

Another rule might be that 75 per cent. of all previous annexed land must be serviced with sewers, water, and reasonable roads, before application for another annexation; otherwise, some municipalities could be annexed, and the council putting through the annexation 2 years from now might not be the same council, and there would be a tremendous burden left on the taxpayers for 15 or 20 years.

I am very pleased with the amendment and I hope it will be carried farther than this at some time in the future.

Section 4, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 5 and 6 agreed to.

Schedules A, B, C, D and E agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 5 reported.

THE ONTARIO CANCER TREATMENT AND RESEARCH FOUNDATION

House in Committee on Bill No. 141, "An Act to amend The Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation of 1943."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3.

MR. SALSBERG: Was this bill discussed with the Medical Associations and all others interested in cancer work?

HON. MR. FROST: I would not say it was discussed with the medical people, but it was discussed with the

chairman of the Cancer Research Foundation, and with 1 or 2 others.

Section 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 141 reported.

THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

House in Committee on Bill No. 142, "An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

On section 1.

MR. SALSBERG: I have a question to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Is it really necessary to make these loans annually? Would it not be possible to save the rather large interest charges, since it is only a bookkeeping entry at the bank, and I understand it refers only to short-time loans?

HON. MR. FROST: These are not short-term, they are long-term.

MR. SALSBERG: These are long-term loans?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 142 reported.

FAIR ACCOMMODATION PRACTICES IN ONTARIO

House in Committee on Bill No. 139, "An Act to promote Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Section 4, subsection 1, states that the hon. Minister may require the officer to inquire into the complaint of any person that a contravention of this Act has taken place. Why not amend the Act so that the Minister "shall" require the officer to make the inquiry?

HON. MR. PORTER: These sections dealing with procedure, I believe, are identical to the procedure which was set up in the former Act, "The Fair Employment Practices Act." I think I am correct in this, although I have not

it before me, I think the word "may" has been used throughout because it gives the Minister some discretion as to whether it appears to him to be a frivolous case or otherwise. That was adopted before and I think it has worked out.

MR. SALSBERG: It was questioned when the other bill the hon. Attorney-General refers to was before us. The government at that time insisted on retaining "may" rather than "shall."

Sections 4 to 7 inclusive, agreed to.

On section 8.

MR. GRUMMETT: In section 8, this refers to a penalty for a conviction of a violation of section 3. Section 3 is the section covering the old Act, but section 2 is the new part, which was put into this Act, and I do not find anywhere in the Act where there is any penalty for a violation of the new section of the Act. Why not, then, amend section 8 by saying, "Where a person has been convicted of a violation of sections 2 and 3, the Minister may apply by way of originating notice to a judge," and so on.

HON. MR. PORTER: I think the difficulty would be this; section 8 provides for an injunction to prevent somebody from doing something.

MR. GRUMMETT: From carrying on a violation.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, to prevent someone from doing something, as described in section 3, of publishing or permitting to be published or displayed. It is a positive Act which can be restrained by injunction, but it is somewhat different, where a person refuses to admit somebody. The proper remedy would be a mandamus, if anything, and that would be a very inappropriate and impossible remedy under these circumstances. It would be a double negative, an injunction to prevent people from preventing people from coming in.

MR. GRUMMETT: Why not put in another subsection to section 8 providing for the offence which might be committed under section 2?

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not think it is appropriate to have either an injunction or a mandamus to apply to that sort of offence. I do not think it would be workable. It is a very simple matter to make an injunction workable to the offence of putting out a sign by saying, "You must not have that sign there, and you are prevented from doing that as long as the order is in effect," but to conceive of an injunction which says that you must not prevent certain types of people from coming into your premises, that is a very vague type of order which I think would be almost impossible to enforce.

It is for the reason of practical difficulties, that that type of procedure was not applied to this case, any more than it is applied to the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to move an amendment, and I would just say a few words before doing so, in the hope that the government will agree to it.

I have already had occasion to welcome this bill, and give full acknowledgment to the government for introducing it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you mind putting your amendment so we will have something to speak to?

MR. SALSBERG: As you say. In response to the request of the chairman, I will now read the amendment.

"I move that the following additional section to be known as section 9, following section 8 of the bill, be added:

The Minister shall appoint a representative anti-discrimination commission whose members are to serve without remuneration and whose duties it shall be to plan, promote and carry on educational programmes on a province-wide scale, explaining the spirit and purpose of this Act as well as of those other Acts which seek to eliminate discrimination practices, with a view to eliminating entirely

the incidents of any and all forms of discrimination from our midst and that the Minister shall further appoint local or regional anti-discrimination commissions wherever necessary to work under the guidance of the provincial anti-discrimination commission,

and that sections 9 and 10 as now printed in the bill be changed to sections 10 and 11."

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is quite evident. As I said before you called on me to read the amendment, while having welcomed the bill and given full acknowledgment to the government for introducing it, I do say at this time it can be strengthened by the appointment of some such commission to carry on the necessary educational work among the people of this province against the evils of any and all undemocratic practices engaged in by any section of our population against another.

As I have already stated, in the United States there are commissions appointed in a number of states, and there are full-time commissions, paid to devote themselves entirely to this type of activity. I am not suggesting that we have a paid commission here, but I do suggest that the government appoint a committee of representative citizens of all walks of life and of all sections of the populace concerned with this problem, to carry on this task in this province.

I was hoping the government would agree to the amendment. If it does so, I shall be very happy to let it stand in the name of the government or any member of it. If not, I do feel that I am duty-bound to move the amendment in my own name.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I may say concerning the principle of what the hon. member wants, which is to continue the education of the people along the lines of anti-discrimination, that I am in favour.

The hon. member must remember, however, that the problem which we have

in this province is really quite different from that in the State of New York, for example, and many other places. I think it unnecessary to set up a commission of that sort, without pay, and, to an extent, without power, other than that it would have powers of propaganda. We are really getting the benefit of that now, Mr. Chairman, through a great many organizations, the churches, schools, and other agencies.

I think the benefit of legislation of this sort is that it is educational. It is, as a matter of policy, that the people of Ontario say there should not, and shall not be discrimination. I think that is as far as we need go at the present time. This information is always a matter of interest to the public, to our great agencies, the churches, schools, universities, service clubs, and all kinds of organizations who keep this problem before the people.

With the objective of what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has in mind, I am in agreement. But I do not think we need go as far as he suggests. If we should find, later on, that something of this sort is required, it can then be done. At the moment, we have this declaration. The other day, in moving the second reading of this bill, I referred to what a great churchman had said on this subject. He told me that he felt a declaration by this government and this parliament was sufficient to meet the situation generally, for this reason, that if we were to leave the question with the municipalities, for example, it would be found that small segments of certain municipalities would, perhaps, assert certain points of view. It might then be difficult to overtake that in the municipality itself. But once we say: "This is the policy of all of the people," then people will gladly accept it.

I think that was apparent in some of the big department stores on the other side. The stores did not employ coloured girls to wait on their customers. That was an old tradition which had grown up, I think, over a great number of years. They were fearful about

changing it in case it might have some effect on their customers. But when the State itself—the State of New York—changed the law and made a declaration of policy on the part of all people, then the stores themselves were delighted to accept it and to go ahead with abolishing discrimination in their shops.

The general declaration, Mr. Chairman, has been provided. In this case I do not think we need to add machinery and complications to such an Act. Our experience has been very satisfactory under the Fair Employment Practices Act and we think this will work satisfactorily now. I have discussed the matter with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). I said the other day I was hopeful he would take over the administration of the Act. He has now agreed to do so. So we can count on there being no discrimination in this question.

Amendment rejected.

Sections 9 and 10 agreed to.

Bill No. 139 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: I move the committee do rise and report certain bills with and without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills, with and without amendments, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to revert to the presenting of reports by committees.

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit the first and the final report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the question of allowances for expenses payable to members of Select Committee sitting in the interval between sessions of the Legislature, and the provisions of section 63 of The Legislature Act, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The Select Committee recommends that the per diem allowance payable under section 63 of The Legislative Assembly Act, be raised from the present twenty dollars (\$20.00) to thirty dollars (\$30.00) for members of the committees, and thirty-five dollars (\$35.00) for chairmen.

The Select Committee further recommends that in the case of inspection tours made by such Select Committees, provision be made to pay the members' actual transportation costs, including sleeping accommodation, while travelling, in lieu of mileage.

The Select Committee further recommends that the present mileage allowance be discontinued, and, in lieu, twenty dollars (\$20.00) per diem be paid, as a travelling allowance, and out-of-pocket expenses for berths, meals, gratuities be paid, on voucher, excluding payments for transportation by rail, plane, bus or boat.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry but I cannot vote for this motion or approve of this report. I want to say right at the outset that I have always recognized the increasing cost which must be borne by hon. members from out of town when they serve on Select Committees, and I have always felt that their remuneration should be higher than the remuneration paid to hon. members who live in the City of Toronto. I still believe that it is a sound approach. At the present time, however, I do not think that we are morally justified in increasing the per diem allowance, regardless of the facts which may be presented to justify such an increase, so long as we expect old-age pensioners to live on \$40 a month. I cannot in my own mind justify an increase to \$30 a day when we have old people who are asked to live on \$40 a month. Certainly, the disparity is glaring and will, I believe, meet with general disapproval in view of the failure of the Legislature to bring about an increase in the allowance for old-age pensioners.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to have to bring the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) back to the discussion. But the discussion is concerned with the rate of expenses which should be granted. I do not think there is anything concerning old-age pensioners under discussion. We must stick to the report of the Select Committee which is before us.

MR. SALSBERG: If I bring in the case of the old-age pensioners, it is only by way of comparison, and I think such a comparison is absolutely necessary. As long as we expect a very large and important section of our people—and, as is generally recognized, a most deserving section—to live, or exist, on \$40 a month, then we cannot increase the per diem allowance of hon. members on our committees to \$30 a day.

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to comply with my wish, and with my ruling that this discussion must take place on a specific item. We cannot allow hon. members to wander all over the place. We must deal either with the old-age pensioners or with the matter of the \$30 allowance.

MR. SALSBERG: In view of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will discontinue making any remarks. I think I have made my position clear, and I have given my reasons why I shall vote against the report of the Select Committee and the motion which is before us.

Report of the Select Committee agreed to.

HON. MR. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 46th annual report of the Ontario Municipal Board to December 31, 1951 and the 47th annual report of the Ontario Municipal Board to December 31st, 1952.

HON. MR. FROST: I see a notice of motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). Now that the hon. member has obtained everything he wanted, perhaps he will withdraw this.

MR. NIXON: When I placed this notice of motion on the Order paper, it was with a view of getting material to support the amendment which I proposed earlier on. Having received the co-operation of the government in getting that amendment passed, it is rather pointless to press this matter, so I move that the notice be withdrawn and the Order discharged.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: I wonder if the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), having obtained substantially what he wanted with regard to Order No. 7, would agree to move for the discharge of that Order?

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I entirely disagree with the hon. Prime Minister when he says I have obtained substantially what I wanted. I have obtained approximately one-half of what I wanted.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is substantial.

MR. GRUMMETT: A half is never substantial, hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). I wanted the same attention paid to houses as has been given to public places and places of public accommodation, but in view of the fact that the government has brought in the bill I move that the motion standing in my name be withdrawn. Perhaps next year, the government will be willing to amend the Act to cover the other point I had in mind.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Since such a complete state of unanimity appears to exist in the Legislature today, I wonder if the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would like to follow a similar course in connection with Order No. 4?

MR. SALSBERG: Cannot that be tabled?

HON. MR. FROST: I will make that an Order for return. I will see if we can lay it on the table.

MR. SALSBERG: I will gladly accommodate the government. I saw no reason why I should have placed it on the Order paper, except that I was advised, more or less, to do so by the department. But I wanted to see what the responsibility of the department was toward these workers.

HON. MR. FROST: I would point out to the hon. member that there is apparently no seconder of this motion, and it would, therefore, automatically go by the boards.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know that. I shall have to appeal to hon. members. This is a very simple matter.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, we will let it stand for the moment.

I have here answers to some questions—numbers 9, 30, 50, and 51.

There is another matter here, if hon. members should desire to look at it. It can stand until tonight, or tomorrow morning, but this gives an opportunity of getting it before the House. I move, Mr. Speaker, you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Dent (Oxford) in the Chair.

THE LEGISLATIVE ACT

Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend the Legislative Act."

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

HON. MR. PORTER moves that sections 10 and 11 of the bill be re-numbered as sections 11 and 12, respectively, and that the following be inserted as section 10:

SECTION 10.

Sections 63 and 64 of The Legislative Assembly Act are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

63. There shall be allowed to each member of the Assembly in respect of 4 trips per annum from his place of residence to the seat of government at Toronto, 10c. for every mile of

the distance between the place of residence and Toronto, which distance shall be determined and certified by the Speaker.

64. (1) There shall be paid to each member of a committee of the Assembly, other than the chairman thereof, an allowance for expenses of \$30, and to the chairman thereof an allowance for expenses of \$35 in respect of every day during the interval between sessions of the Assembly (a) upon which he attends a meeting of the committee or (b) upon which he is absent from home and is engaged on the work of a committee, other than days spent travelling to and from meetings of the committee.

(2) There shall be paid to each member of a committee of the Assembly an allowance for travelling of \$20, and his actual disbursements for berth, meals and gratuities for each day spent travelling to and from meetings of the committee.

(3) In the case of an inspection tour by a committee of the Assembly, there shall be paid to each member thereof his actual disbursements for transportation, and sleeping accommodation.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat my opposition to these amendments, on the same grounds that I opposed the committee's report, namely, that so long as we continue to expect our old age pensioners to live on \$40 a month—

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is out of order here.

MR. SALSBERG: He is not out of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe Mr. Speaker ruled the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) out of order on this subject.

MR. SALSBERG: I beg the Chairman's pardon, you cannot rule me out of order. I am not out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: You never were in order.

MR. SALSBERG: Pardon? On what grounds, Sir?

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. SALSBERG: I ought to know whether I am in order, Mr. Chairman, not you, and I assure you I am in order, and I want to repeat that my opposition to the amendments is on the same grounds that I opposed them before the committee that so long as we expect our old age pensioners to live on \$40 a month—

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing old-age pensions. The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is out of order.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, this was voted on, and the same matter was discussed before.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I give the same reasons.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that this is not an increase, when the whole picture is studied.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: When the mileage is done away with, as it is under this bill, and the increase established from \$20 to \$30 a day, I defy the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to say it is an increase, because in all cases it would be a decrease from what hon. members were getting before.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) for clarification of subsection 2. How does he interpret the last two lines?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I must say I understood that this was a recommendation of the committee. Was the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) not a member of that committee?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Grummett) is wondering about the wording of it.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, of subsection 2.

HON. MR. PORTER: Allowances for travelling?

HON. MR. FROST: What is the point the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) raised?

MR. GRUMMETT: How do you ascertain the day? It says "for each day spent travelling to and from meetings of the committee."

HON. MR. FROST: The Provincial Auditor would cover that. I think "a day" is considered as a day or part of a day. If it takes a day and part of another day to reach home, that would be two days.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know whether it would include night.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No, there is no double pay or overtime.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know whether it includes night, it says "day." It is in the present Act.

MR. OLIVER: It is in the present act. We never understood what it was there, either.

Sections 10, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 11 and 12, formerly sections 10 and 11 respectively, agreed to.

Bill No. 129, as amended, reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do rise and report a bill with amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole reports one bill with amendment, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, it is now my turn to participate in the Budget Debate. In rising at this time I am conscious of the fact that the session is in its last days, if not hours. That all it can expect from history has already been accomplished, and, that of necessity, subjects which perhaps earlier in the session required a lot of elaboration, will no longer require it. I am therefore going to make brief observations in retrospect, take a sort of backward glance at the session which is now coming to an end, and make a few general suggestions for the government's consideration, even though they may not be adopted by the government until after the session.

At the start, Mr. Speaker, I think we should take note of the fact that the motion of the Official Opposition to the Budget Address is of a rather unusual character. I doubt whether any time before in the history of the House has a motion of that type been made. I want to refresh the memory of hon. members by reminding them that the motion of the Opposition is critical of the government for its extensive borrowings in the United States of America. I doubt whether ever before was a government criticized on the budget on those grounds. I think this motion is an indication of the changes that are taking place in our midst, changes in thinking and changes which have produced a greater national consciousness and eagerness to stand on our own feet rather than permit the process of rising U.S. influence, and rising U.S. controls in the country from proceeding unchecked.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I fully agree with the motion. I could have suggested to them perhaps the inclusion of other items, but they did not ask me for advice, and I consider

the motion as it is, a very important contribution to public thinking and to government policy, and will therefore support it.

Speaking of the Official Opposition, I want to say that we in this House are fully aware of the fact that there is a leadership race taking place among the supporters of the Liberal Party. That, Mr. Speaker, is a good as well as a bad feature. It is good because the race obliges the candidates to seek issues and to arouse public attention to themselves and to the issues they raise. As far as that goes, therefore, it is a welcome development. But I feel that it also has its disadvantages in that the several candidates vying with each other are apt to make statements and pledges which they do not necessarily live up to.

For instance, on the question of the check-off. The first statement in favour of the check-off policy was made by the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren), and he was soon followed by a statement of the House Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) along those lines. That was good, but both failed to vote for the bill for the check-off, and that is bad.

I think that experience could be duplicated or could be extended in other fields. On the highway issue I might say that I think those in the Liberal group who make this the dominant issue before the electors, are making a grave mistake. I do not think even the supporters of the Liberal Party will agree that the highway issue, important though it is, should be allowed to overshadow the very many critical social and economical issues which confront the people in this province at this time. Failure to deal with other issues does not apply with equal force to all the candidates for leadership of the Liberal Party, but it does apply to some of those who are candidates.

Insofar as the government and its supporters are concerned, I am obliged to say that I sense a certain frustration among the government's supporters. I think they are sort of getting into each

other's hair, and are causing many of their friends to stumble over each other. It is due, on the one hand, to the very large number of government supporters in the House, and on the other, to failure of government to come to grips with some of the problems which the hon. members feel in their constituencies are dominant and important.

You see, Mr. Speaker, there are many supporters of the government who feel they cannot wait much longer before they get elevated. Quite a number have expected elevation, and a move to the Treasury benches. So far, that call has not come, and that causes impatience, frustration, irritability, ill-humour, and a general disagreeableness. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is generally recognized that there is a need for re-organization.

I am not going to be personal; I am not going to mention any member of the Cabinet as requiring a change or release from heavy duties. But I think it is generally recognized that there is a need for re-organization of the Cabinet, and a moving up of people who have been clamouring at the door, some with their fists, and some wooing with such intensity that it sometimes becomes embarrassing, I am sure, to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

There is a persistency in that demand. I have my own idea that the failure of the hon. Prime Minister to re-organize the Cabinet is due to the fact that we are going to have an election this year. I want to say to my very good friend, the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Dempsey) who spoke about the need of holding by-elections here shortly, that he is mistaken. There will be no by-elections, even though there is a need for having no less than 3 of them immediately. I want to advise the supporters of the government—and I think my advice will prove to be very sound—that there will be no by-elections, that the government is not prepared to test public reaction at this time, and that they had better get ready for a general election some time in the fall, preferably around November.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister Without Portfolio): That's the time to hunt.

MR. SALSBERG: That will be the biggest hunt of the season, I assure the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott). I think the government, because of the many things that have been touched upon in this House during the session, is afraid to test the reaction of the people in a by-election in 3 constituencies. It would rather take the plunge as a whole before the Opposition Parties get into stride. The Liberals will elect a leader in another week or so; the CCF has only recently elected its leader, and I think the government will allow the present vacancies to remain vacant.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That was a leader at large they elected. He was captured the night before last up at Parry Sound.

MR. SALSBERG: And he will have an election in the fall. There was an occasion here when I told the supporters of the government there was going to be an election, and they were so sure there was not, they offered to lay wagers. But I am not a gambling man, and I never take bets. You should have seen the surprise on their faces, when, out of the blue, without prior warning to Caucus or anywhere else, the then Prime Minister, arose in his place in this House, and in a dramatic fashion on a certain Friday afternoon, announced a general election, and stalked out of the House to repeat the same performance for the movie cameras the next morning.

The hon. members were surprised; even the hon. members of the Cabinet were surprised, because not every member of the Cabinet was taken into the confidence of the then Prime Minister.

The present hon. Prime Minister will not handle it so roughly; he will, undoubtedly, inform the Cabinet, but the "back-benchers" are getting their information from me now, and they had better pay attention, and be guided accordingly.

I repeat, there will be no by-elections; there will be no re-organization of the Cabinet at the present time; there will be a re-organization late in the summer, and there will be an election in the fall.

These irritations and frustrations, of which I have spoken, amongst the hon. members of the government benches, have expressed themselves during this session in their inability to accept criticism.

I want to remind the hon. members of the House, that there is a numerically small Opposition, and there is really no reason in the world for the government to be impatient, or to show impatience toward any hon. member of the Opposition, even this humble member of the Opposition, though I may speak more often than some government supporters consider necessary.

The tempers of the hon. members of the government are getting so short, and their unhappiness is evidently so great amongst themselves, that it makes itself apparent in such a situation.

If I speak about the need for extra funds for cultural activities, hon. members shout that I am making a "subversive proposal—a Communist proposal," not realizing that they are making culture almost subversive, by so doing. That is how far their irritation goes.

We had an example of that when I was referring to the crime comics. The hon. members will recall how unreasonable the government supporters became when I spoke about it, forgetting there are important segments in the Conservative Party who feel the same way, and Mr. Fulton, a Conservative Member of Parliament, is actually leader in the House of Commons in regard to the same problem for which I am endeavouring to win support in this House. But the outcry was terrific when it was raised in this Chamber.

This applies also to much more important issues. For instance, we have a Committee on Commissions. That committee was agreed upon in the House a few years ago, as a means of acquainting the hon. members with the operations of government commissions, which are in charge of tremendously important

phases of public activity. Until that time, we really knew very little about the work of the commissions, such as the Hydro Commission, the Liquor Commission, the Ontario Northland Railway and so on. This Committee on Commissions was appointed as a Standing Committee, and it was my good fortune this year, to be put on that committee. But I am obliged to say, with all due respect to the chairman of the committee, who is one of the very earnest and well-meaning hon. members of the House, that my impression of the Committee on Commissions is that it does very little more than sniff and smell around, and, at best taste little bits here and there. In no instance did the committee sink its teeth into the work of any given commission. That is not entirely the fault of the hon. members. There is this irritation and resistance to anybody in opposition trying to open something which the supporters of the government consider a private preserve. This, I think, results in the very ineffective work on the part of the commission.

If a member of the Opposition raises a serious question, or expresses a desire to go deeper into some of the workings of the commission, he is immediately met with resistance and hostility, as if it were not the business of a member of the Opposition to ask such questions, or seek to do what he is striving to do.

I have a feeling it would be far more valuable, if we had a roving Committee on Commissions, which would function between sessions, and spend a few weeks on one commission's operations, and become familiar with every phase of that commission, rather than proceed the way we are doing now.

We may consider Hydro as an example. Hon. members on the government side take the attitude that if a member questions the operation of Hydro, he is an enemy of Hydro, which is, of course, an unwarranted accusation. Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I reject any suggestion that I am opposed to Hydro. I take a second place to none in my support of Hydro, but I do say, and I will continue to say, the Committee on Commissions not-

withstanding, is ignorant of the work, the operations, and the methods of The Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario. And in saying that, I am not opposing Hydro. I reject any idea that Hydro is synonymous with any individual, whether he be a Cabinet Minister, the chairman, or the manager of Hydro. There is no such situation.

Hydro has gone on, and will go on, regardless of changes which may take place in government, and in the personnel at the head of Hydro.

I repeat, we do not know enough about it, and I have a feeling we are remiss in our duties, if we do not seek to acquaint ourselves with every aspect of the operations of Hydro.

At a meeting of the Committee on Commissions, we have two hours at the most, to hear a report, which takes an hour at least. Then we ask questions for a few minutes, and then go from the meeting. That is the end of our dealing with Hydro. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unsatisfactory.

We must bear in mind that Hydro is now in the midst of a reconversion programme, which will require the spending of over \$1½ billion. Yet the representatives of the people cannot in all honesty rise before any audience of electors, and say, "I know how Hydro functions." I repeat for the thousandth time, that in saying this I am not endeavouring to make a case against Hydro, and I repeat for the "nth" time, that if I were chairman or vice-chairman of Hydro, I would welcome the appointment of a Select Committee of this House to go into the minutest examination of the work of Hydro.

There are many questions which are asked, and, I suggest, the answers given are not covering those questions.

I listened attentively to the report of the vice-chairman of Hydro, as given to this House. He gives it every year. I must say that while the facts and figures he presents are valuable, it is not the type of report that should be given to the hon. members of this House. I say so, with all due respect to the vice-chairman of Hydro.

The chairman of the Hydro Commission gives substantially the same facts many times during the year, at local Hydro conferences, and on many other occasions.

The vice-chairman should tell us the things which hon. members of the House generally want to know. Not simply as statistics, in regard to the increase in kilowatt hours, for instance. Yet, that is what we get.

Let us take one example: I raised in this House earlier in the session—and tried to raise it in Committee on Commissions—the question of giving the bulk of the reconversion work to one company, namely, the Canadian Comstock Company Limited. I pointed out that contractors have been complaining that they are not given an opportunity to engage in the conversion work, that they sent a complaint to the chairman of Hydro, but there is still a great deal of dissatisfaction.

The chairman of the Committee on Commissions, said there were such complaints, and that he had written to the Electrical Contractors' Association, and his latest proposals were quite satisfactory.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these explanations are not satisfactory, and I have been advised by responsible members of the Electrical Contractors' Association that the replies of letters sent to them are not satisfactory to the association.

Mr. Speaker, I am not standing here as a defender of, nor representative of, the Contractors' Association. Of course not. In any dispute between Hydro and the contractors, I am with Hydro, but I do not know enough to say the contractors are wrong. That is the point. Nor do I think does any hon. member of this Legislature.

The fact is, the Canadian Comstock Company has become an enormous corporation, even though it came into being very recently. The Canadian Comstock Company Limited, under its present ownership, and administration, was re-organized in 1944, a time which corresponds with a coming into power of the Party which is still in power in this province. That does not necessarily

mean that there is anything wrong, but it is a fact this company, which was re-organized in 1944, when the Conservative Party came into power, has received and retained the bulk of Hydro work, and has grown into an octopus which controls many corporations. While it is a private corporation, and does not publish all its profits, it is known it now has assets running into many, many millions of dollars, whereas the capital structure of the company and its reorganization was very modest, only about \$25,000 or so.

How come this corporation has managed to grow and become so decisive in industry, practically solely on the work of Hydro? Contractors now claim that Comstock, because of its enormous profits from Hydro work, is now able to under-bid them for private electrical work. Competing contractor firms say Comstock is able to under-bid them, because it pays less income tax. We have not the answer to that. The session is coming to an end, and we are not any farther ahead than we were on this question. Yet we have no answer, and I think we should have.

I do not know why the headquarters for conversion is in St. Catharines. I do not think St. Catharines is the logical centre for the reconversion programme, but that is where its headquarters are. I have heard it said, that it is because Comstock owned the building there, and we are paying rent for a building to Comstock for the headquarters of conversion in the province.

I have not the answer to that, and I do not know that any hon. member in this House has. I suggest this is our business. I am told it costs Hydro a very large sum of money on account of the headquarters not being in Toronto, but in St. Catharines; that the telephone bills are running into astronomical figures, which are all incorporated in conversion charges.

I suggest, if any part of this is true, there is a great deal of explanation owing to the people of Ontario, and to this House.

A question was asked today of the vice-chairman of Hydro concerning

insurance on a plant which had an unfortunate experience just a short time ago. I might tell the vice-chairman of Hydro that I have heard complaints, and plenty of them, about the inability of insurance companies to secure business from Hydro, and that companies have to be favoured in order to gain a portion of Hydro's insurance. Matters such as these cannot be delved into on less than one hour's discussion on Hydro, in the Committee on Commissions. I repeat, it is necessary, in my opinion, for either a Select Committee, or a Committee on Commissions, to work between sessions on one—and one only—of the several spending commissions, each summer. I recall, Mr. Speaker, the words of the hon. Minister of Highways the other night. In his efforts to explain some of the developments in his department, he said—and I think he should have said it—that the increase in expenditures on highways has grown so vastly that it was impossible for the department to perhaps keep apace, organizationally speaking, with these new expanding enterprises which the department was involved in. That sounds reasonable to me.

If you jump from a \$30-million to a \$40-million budget, to a budget of \$130 million, you do need a reorganization of the whole department in order to avoid any misdeed, mistakes, or miscarriages. When the hon. Minister of Highways said that, I thought to myself how much more does that apply to Hydro, which is now spending not \$130 million, but expenditures running into astronomical figures. How do we know it has kept pace with the new responsibilities it has undertaken? How do we know?

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the dissatisfaction coming my way from the other side of the House, I say in all earnestness that we do not know, none of us, but we ought to know.

There is another commission which came up before our committee, and that was the Ontario Northland. The Ontario Northland is something of which we are all proud, just as we are all very proud of Hydro. Let me tell

you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, the vice-chairman, that when I am outside the province, I boast as much as anyone else about our Hydro and our Northland.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: The hon. member should leave Hydro alone when he is outside the province.

MR. SALSBERG: I will not leave Hydro alone. I do not think it should be left alone. It is not a private affair of the hon. Minister.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member should leave Hydro alone outside the province, and it would be better for Hydro.

MR. SALSBERG: To you, "leave Hydro alone," means to leave it to you.

HON. MR. FROST: He says "leave it alone outside the province."

MR. SALSBERG: If I go elsewhere and I have occasions to speak to Hydro, I will speak of its great accomplishments, just as anyone else in the province, and I will not ask the vice-chairman for permission.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I question whether you could get into Hydro projects.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister is becoming nasty.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: No, just factual.

MR. SALSBERG: He is becoming very, very nasty, and very ungentlemanly, and he becomes very unfair.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Just factual.

MR. SALSBERG: It is true I am criticizing a field of work in which the hon. Minister is mainly responsible as a Cabinet Minister, but that is no reason for him to be unfair.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I am not unfair, I am just factual.

MR. SALSBERG: I repeat, I am as proud of Hydro and the Northland as any person in this province, but I doubt again whether we go into the Northland sufficiently. Remember, in Hydro, as well as the Northland, the Provincial Auditor does not examine the books.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The Provincial Government appoints the auditors for Hydro. There again, I say, "be factual." In Hydro, the auditors are appointed by the province, and they report to the Provincial Government direct.

MR. SALSBERG: My position on the auditors has been at all times—and I have never been told that it was wrong—that there is a private concern auditing Hydro, and that hon. members of this House cannot have access to Hydro operations through the Provincial Auditor, as we can to any ordinary department of government, and I think we should have that.

About Northland, it is true that while it has a wonderful record, we do not have enough information. If I talk a lot, that does not mean I am the only one who raises these questions. They are raised by me in the House; they are raised outside often by other members. We have not had a chance to go in and find out whether it is operated most economically, whether certain lodges established are necessary, whether they are profitable, whether it was necessary and advisable to build a new private car when we had an old private car. After all, it is a small railroad. I think a committee should have an opportunity of going into many such things.

MR. ROBERT MACAULAY (Riverdale): I wonder if the hon. member would allow me to speak on a point of privilege in relation to the committee which he has discussed. I do not think the hon. member would suggest for a moment that as chairman of the committee, I at any time cut off any questions he wanted to ask. I also think it is fair to point this out to him, and he will admit it, that the chairman of the Hydro, the chairman of the Ontario

Northland Railway, and the chairman of many other groups who appeared before that committee, indicated to the hon. member who has just spoken now, that if he had any questions, all he had to do was request that information and they would be delighted to see him and tell him anything he wanted to know.

MR. SALSBERG: In reply, I can say that the hon. member (Mr. Macaulay) as chairman of the committee, was as fair or fairer than any chairman before him. I cannot say he "cut me off" regarding Hydro, but I can say that I did not finish my questioning. I think that will be an honest statement. That I did not finish my questioning because we had to leave, and so on.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the committee (Mr. Macaulay) that I was hoping the committee would convene and make a report. I did have reason to think that was everybody's intention, rather than let it, like the old soldier, not die, but just fade away. I do not think that committee should fade away. I think that committee should make certain observations to the House as a result of its sittings and its experience.

MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made reference to not letting the work of the committee just die, and I think every member of the committee agrees with that. Therefore, tomorrow, if my friend had shown the patience he shows in other matters on other occasions, he would have noted that I intend to table the minutes of the committee, which were kept for that purpose. I think the minutes and the reports which came forth from this committee will then be printed and sent to the departments concerned, and I think they will produce much of great value in any event.

It is an innovation; it is a new problem, a new type of committee, which has not much tradition behind it. I felt this was the best way of dealing with our committee this year. Next year, if the chairman thinks he should call the committee and offer resolutions, he may do

so, but I do not think the hon. member should suggest the work this year is going for nothing, because we kept elaborate minutes which along with all the statements, will be tabled.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very glad to hear it. I did not want to be critical of the chairman, because he is a very zealous, eager and sincere hon. member of the House, and whatever committee he is on, he wants to be of service to the province.

I do not want to be critical of him, and while the presentation of minutes is better than was my experience in the past, my own individual opinion is it would have been still better if the committee had collectively expressed certain opinions, and presented them to the government.

In speaking about Hydro, or the Northland, or the Committee on Commissions, I want to be very frank and say this, that I am not imagining my remarks at this time will change anything during the session. As I said at the outset, I speak in retrospect—

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. member we constituted the Committee on Commissions simply to meet the situation which the hon. member has spoken of here. I am certain this committee has given the fullest opportunities to the hon. member to ask questions and to probe into the operations. When the chairman of these various commissions told him they would be glad to give him any further information, what more does he want? It is an opportunity which never existed before in any government enquiring into these commissions.

In the days of previous governments, the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) was a member of one of those. I do not think the hon. Leader of the Opposition was a member at the time, but the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was, and I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, they did not tell you very much about those things. We did have a Select Committee on Hydro, but that was for a specific reason.

Now, you can ask all manner of questions, and examine in any way you like. What does the hon. member want anyway? He always wants a little bit more.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister had waited a moment, he would have heard me say this: That the Committee on Commissions is certainly an improvement, and that the opportunity of asking even a few questions is an improvement.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member was able to ask all the questions he liked.

MR. SALSBERG: No, you cannot.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh yes, you can.

HON. MR. PORTER: Who ever stopped the hon. member?

MR. SALSBERG: What I was going to say was this: that speaking at this late hour of the session, and bringing the attention of the House in retrospect to what happened, I do so, not with the illusion that changes will take place in the next couple of days, but simply in order to leave some of these thoughts with the hon. Prime Minister.

I am very frank in saying this in the hope that he will, after another day or two, when this session is over, perhaps give some thought to some of these suggestions, and perhaps implement part, if not all, of them in days to come. I have a feeling one must continuously plough and seed. If one seed out of 100 thrown into the ground will rise, then it will have been worth-while. That is all.

That is all I have in mind. I would like things to be different, I might say, but I think it would have been wrong not to touch, not only on Hydro, but on the Committee on Government Commissions.

Certainly, we had a good chairman, but there is the need for more. An hour and a half on Hydro is just a snuffle, a whiff, when what we need is an opportunity to sink our teeth into it.

Let me go to the budget itself. I must say that the whole session and the budget underlines very markedly the absence of two essentials; first, the absence of independence of thinking and action, and secondly, a failure to give leadership.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Does the hon. member know anything good about the session?

MR. SALSBERG: Quite a few things. I will in good time mention them, but not necessarily now or here.

MR. STEWART: Is anything right in the world?

MR. SALSBERG: No, but we must try to make it ideal.

MR. STEWART: Is there anything right?

MR. SALSBERG: We must try to make everything perfect. At the moment, we can by our striving for perfection, try not to slide back.

MR. STEWART: The hon. member is a good slider.

MR. SALSBERG: By drawing the attention of the government to the two shortcomings which, I think, are underscored by the budget, I am trying to say this: It is one thing to be partisan, but it is another thing to lack independence.

MR. STEWART: And be verbose.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not advocating a partisanship of the type we have had in years gone by in this House, but I do say that it is shocking to find that on the most cardinal question before us, this government trails behind Ottawa. It is a lack of independence which, to me, is shocking and which must be labelled as an indication of the fact that the two old-line Parties, on basic questions, are really not apart from each other.

We are confronted with the threat of a crisis which has already assumed serious proportions. All that we are told

and have been told until now is that we are waiting for Ottawa to indicate the course, that as soon as Ottawa tells us that it is serious we will undertake measures to meet that serious situation. I think that is a reflection of trailing behind Ottawa, and a reflection of lack of independence of thinking and action on the part of this government.

What we need is bold action, bold policy, to meet new challenges which have arisen. The budget does not contain any awareness of these changes which have taken place. The government members are happy that they have the biggest budget ever, and that we did not increase taxation. With all due respect to all hon. members who emphasize this point, let me say this: the amazing thing is not that we did not increase taxation; the amazing thing is rather we did not reduce taxation, because with an income of that size, we should have been able to reduce taxation.

However, I do not advocate reduction of taxation. I think the bigger and more important thing at the moment is the utilization of the surplus of the very buoyant financial position of the government to meet the social welfare conditions of the people. That is what I thought should be done. I said when we discussed the bill here, that I disagreed with the way we are hastening the paying-off of the mortgage, when old-age pensions are kept down. I do not think the people want that.

The question was one of using the surplus for the basic needs of the people of this province, so it is not a wonderful accomplishment not to increase taxes. It would have been more logical to reduce them. But above everything, the budget does not reflect this awareness of the situation, and I want to speak for a few moments about unemployment.

The unemployment situation is serious when there are over 500,000, close to 600,000, unemployed. Ottawa fails to recognize the seriousness of the situation, and I do not think Mr. Howe should set the policy for this government.

I think this government and this House should act independently with regard to the growing difficulties of an increasing number of people. Let me say on this question of independence of action, as opposed to trailing behind Ottawa, that there is a woman who is, in my opinion, the wielder of perhaps the shrewdest journalistic pen in Canada—I say this with all due respect to others—and her name is Judith Robinson. She has a little column that I clip and I should like to read a short extract from that column. It is called “Gone are the Days,” and this is very appropriate. She mentions the fact that a member of the House of Commons tried to remind the Conservatives of their past. Judith Robinson says, with reference to this member:

He gave them Sir John A. He gave them Sir Robert Borden. He gave them Sir Thomas White and he gave them R. B. Bennett. They tittered. He reminded them of days when their Party was more interested in preserving a free association of British people than in preserving the orthodoxy of the Canadian banking system. They laughed.

He recalled a time when Conservatives did not hang around with the Liberals waiting for fiscal handouts from Washington's back door. They laughed louder. He quoted them line and paragraph from the words of Tory leaders in greater days and gave them the hour and the occasion of deeds that matched the words. They laughed and laughed.

“Wherefore, Cacullus, wherefore dost thou delay to die? Or if you must live wherefore not start a public subscription for the purpose of buying Tory MPs, those that can read, a copy apiece of Creighton's *Life of Sir John A. Macdonald*?”

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot underlying those words. I am not, of course, making it my job to revivify the virtues of the Conservative Party. But I am obliged, as a member of a House dominated by the Conservative Party, and one which has a Conservative

government, to bring such quotations to the notice of Ministers in the hope that they will stop hanging around, at the doors of the Liberals who go to Washington, for a little handout. I hope they may inspire Ministers to act independently, and recognize that Mr. Howe does not today present the national picture as it really is. There is a crisis. Hundreds of thousands of people are not working. Delegations have come here and some of them looked underfed, hungry. I am sorry the hon. Prime Minister was not able to go down and see the delegation of Toronto unemployed. I am not blaming him. I am told he was busy, and I was also told the delegation did not have a proper appointment with him. But had he gone down, he would have seen the faces of hungry men who had been given a bowl of soup in the morning at the Scott Mission, and who went in the afternoon for a cup of tea at another Mission. And, afterwards, at 7 o'clock in the Victory Mission, they stretched out on the floor for the evening.

There is no reflection in the budget of difficulties such as these. No sign of independent action, no suggestion that we are going to deal with the question of creating employment opportunities for our people. No provision of funds to take care of those who are exposed to the pangs of hunger because they have no other income, neither unemployment insurance or anything else. There is no provision in the budget to give cash relief to these people or to share with the municipalities the cost of supporting the unemployables who must go to the municipalities for assistance; no indication of any effort on our part to open markets for our agricultural and industrial products; no indication that the government is going to press for a radical solution of the housing crisis which in itself would provide employment for thousands. Finally, I suggest, no leadership in the fight for a seaway and an all-Canadian pipeline of a sort which would guarantee not only continued and permanent control of these two very important developments, but which would also provide jobs for our unemployed.

I am sorry that this is so. I feel we should draw the necessary conclusions now that we are nearing the end of the session. Again, I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this government should declare war on Ottawa. But I am suggesting that this government should stop waiting for a lead from Ottawa. I see that an Anglican Board for Social Services has appealed to the hon. Prime Minister to take some action on the question of the unemployed. The unemployed themselves are doing this. The unions in Toronto are calling a special conference and inviting all hon. members of this House to attend and discuss the plight of the unemployed. I mention these things to indicate the seriousness of the situation and to suggest that the time has come to take bold steps.

Mr. Speaker, I have on the Order paper a motion for which I hope I shall find a seconder. What is the motion which I have on the Order paper? I would plead that the hon. Prime Minister should take it over. It suggests, that, in the opinion of this House, an emergency conference of the Government of Canada and the governments of all the provinces should be convened forthwith to deal with all aspects of the problem of price recession, depression, unemployment, and so on. I would like this government to take over this motion, and carry it in this House tomorrow. I think if the government were to do that it would arouse national interest in this problem more than any single speech in this House could do. And that is exactly what is lacking today — government leadership and action. Why should not the hon. Prime Minister make a speech on a motion like mine? Why does he not say tomorrow that he calls upon the Ottawa Government to agree to convene a conference of all provincial governments, together with the Federal Government, to deal with this critical situation, and find a solution to the major national problems before us? Will the government do that? I do not know. I hope it may do so by tomorrow. That will not be a declaration of war on Ottawa, but it will be an action which will cer-

tainly compel Ottawa to change its present position of indifference and refusal to face the realities of the national situation. It will compel Ottawa to come to grips, even at this late stage, with the problems before us. And so I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to read the motion I have put on the Order paper and to agree to introduce it in the name of the government. I predict, further, Mr. Speaker, that if the government fails to do that it will have good reason to regret its failure. I am not threatening the government. I am not in a position to threaten the government, but I assure hon. members that if nothing is done about this, the government will have reason to regret its failure to take a leading position on this important question.

In conclusion, may I list a number of actions which I think are necessary in the face of the present situation.

First, the calling of a national conference of the Government of Canada and the government of all the provinces to deal with the serious situation in the field of unemployment, the question of markets, the agricultural situation and all matters which apply to that central issue.

Second, that we increase the assistance given to the old age pensioners by \$15 a month as a supplementary allowance.

Third, that we should provide complete medical, dental and hospital care for all old-age pensioners in our province.

Fourth, that we increase Mothers' Allowance by 50 per cent. in order to meet the rising cost of living and the immediate requirements of such families.

Fifth, that this government undertake the responsibility for developing a housing project which will result in the building of at least 25,000 low rental and subsidized homes a year in the next 5 years.

Sixth, that no less than 50 per cent. of the cost of education in any municipality be paid by the Provincial Government to the municipalities.

Seventh, that we relieve the municipalities of all costs of unemployment relief, hospitalization costs for indigents and post-sanitaria care of tubercular patients.

Eighth, that we eliminate the amusement tax. We do not need it.

Ninth, that we impose a tax on all nickel production in Ontario, the revenue from this tax to be used for welfare and educational needs.

May I remind hon. members of this House that the International Nickel Company has, in the last 25 years, paid over \$700 million in dividends to its shareholders, the vast majority of whom are not residents in this country. The headquarters of the International Nickel Company are, as hon. members know, literally in Wall Street. I suggest that a tax on nickel would be a very well worthwhile tax and would provide funds for useful purposes in the province.

Tenth, that we place a tax on an increase basis on all iron ore exported from the province, and take all necessary steps to halt the alienation of our resources to foreign interests, and to compel the processing of our natural wealth to a far greater degree in our own province, and help establish a steel industry at the Head of the Lakes.

Eleventh, that this government undertake independent and aggressive action to open markets everywhere in the world for our agricultural and industrial products.

Twelfth, that this government establish a Forestry Resources Commission, as promised to the people of this province, so as to administer the forest wealth of Ontario in the interests of its people now and in the future. This is a matter about which I have spoken every year since 1944.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the government to pay some attention to these proposals. In totality they constitute, I respectfully submit, a programme of independent action in the face of a serious national crisis now developing. Failure to do so will, of course, mean that this government surrenders all

independence, trails behind Ottawa, ignores the needs of the people and agrees to allow the continuation of suffering and hardship in many important areas. Failure to take action will mean failure to maintain what the hon. Prime Minister has on many occasions referred to as the most important of all our resources in this province—its human resources.

The hon. Prime Minister usually ends his budget speeches in a very moving way. The last speech ended with a quotation which was referred to many times. I suggest we should popularize it everywhere, and ask our people to insist on such policies, and give reality to these words.

On another occasion the hon. Prime Minister referred to Ontario as being equivalent to the Biblical land described as "a land of milk and honey," and I agree that this province has all the natural resources for providing its people, and many more, with all that is required for a happy life. But I must also remind the hon. Prime Minister that it is, indeed, a tragedy if in this province, which is a land of milk and honey, people are allowed to go without bread and without a roof over their heads. Then of course, we appear as guilty, and as failing in our elementary obligations. I hope the government will take all the steps necessary not to remain so guilty.

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I would be most remiss this afternoon if I did not express my regret at the passing of 3 very able hon. members of this House, the late members for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey) for Leeds (Mr. MacOdrum), and for Russell (Mr. Nault). I would like to express to their loved ones my personal sympathy, and, I know, the sympathy of every hon. member of the House.

The first duty of any government, federal, provincial or municipal, is to look after and plan for the peace, prosperity, security and happiness of its people.

This, the present government in Ontario is doing in a magnificent

manner. Far reaching legislation has been presented during this session and passed almost unanimously, proving beyond a shadow of a doubt that everyone in this House believes in what the government is trying to do. The general principle of the main bills has been acceptable to the Opposition and that is a healthy sign and a sure sign that the government is moving in the right direction. The government has proved to be a benevolent one, over the past 11 years, since almost 35 per cent. of our revenues have been passed on to the municipalities, helping them keep down municipal tax rates. If it weren't for the municipal road subsidies, unconditional grants and generous grants to education, the taxes on real estate would be almost twice what they are at the moment. However, I would like to see the government go further, by assisting municipalities in meeting the increased costs of operating Children's Aid Societies in this province. This cost has increased tremendously over the past few years. In the County of Simcoe it was \$16,000 a few years ago and today it is well over \$120,000 and the municipalities are finding it increasingly difficult to carry this burden. I note that the cost is larger due to the number of children coming from broken homes and I would like to congratulate the counties in setting up family courts, as I know these courts mend many a broken home, and take the children off the Children's Aid rolls.

I would suggest that we do something more definite by introducing in our secondary schools a course that will provide our children with information about marriage and I also suggest that we do something in a very real way to remind parents of their responsibilities. In this way we might in the long run overcome a very serious situation in the province.

I would like to congratulate and commend the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) on the forward-looking policy of his department. During the past 10 years, great advances have been made and the promise to pay 50 per cent. of the cost of education has been carried out. More important than the cost has been the goal of providing an equal

opportunity to every child in the province to get an education and this objective has been realized. During the past 10 years over 2,000 new primary and secondary schools or substantial additions to these schools have been built, and not only that, but the curriculum has been modified and brought up-to-date instead of lagging behind as it did for so many years. Ontario now stands in the forefront as far as education facilities are concerned. As you drive about this province, you cannot but be proud of the school buildings, and the type of education provided.

During the past 5 years, 3 new area high schools have been built in my constituency—in Alliston, Orangeville, and Collingwood—and 75 per cent. of the cost of constructing these schools has been paid by the province. These 3 schools are modern, efficient and well-equipped, and the young people who attend them are given there the equipment to face life mentally, morally and physically.

Just to remind you what the Department of Education has done for the province, I would like to say that in 1942 only \$13 million was given in grants by the department, whereas this year over \$80 million will be distributed. In 1942, \$1,800,000 was given to the universities of the province and in 1954 over \$5 million will be given to the universities. I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister on this great record, but I would like also to recommend that free text books be provided for every child in the schools of Ontario. I know from experience that a great many parents find it difficult to provide the text books necessary. The provision of free text books would not only overcome this difficulty, but make it possible for every child to have a text book in reasonably good condition.

I read the other day in the press that we are looking forward to finding 500 new teachers in England for the schools in Ontario. I am not making any criticism of that move; we have got to find teachers somewhere; the school population is increasing; the number of school-rooms are being added to almost daily,

and we have got to do something. However, I think we could do something to help the teaching profession here. I think we could, perhaps, encourage young people to go into the teaching profession, and, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) does not mind, I should like to pass along a few ideas along that line.

First of all, I think the entrance requirements could be raised. Let us put education on a competitive basis with all the other professions. I do not think the teaching profession is a challenge today, and, because it is not a challenge, our young people do not want to enter it. It is not a question of money, it simply does not represent a challenge.

Secondly, the public must be educated. Do hon. members know that we have a wonderful branch in the Audio-Visual Section of the Department of Education? We have marvellous films which I think could be sent all over the province to parent teacher groups, so that the parents might, through the films, see the advantages of the teaching profession.

I think, too, there should be graduation exercises at the end of the teachers' training course which would serve to emphasize the importance of the profession, and draw the attention of the public to it.

May I throw out the suggestion, too, that we give all our teachers a uniform text book to keep them informed on the subjects they are going to teach. In talking to teachers, I find a great many of them cannot find the data they need to assist them in the preparation of the course of study for their pupils. They have not got the information at their fingertips, and if we had some sort of "teachers' help," something which had the seal of the Department of Education upon it, it would help the teachers a great deal.

The children should be trained to do more on their own than they are doing today. We are spoon-feeding our children. I think we should let them express themselves in statements, not just using one word. I believe there is a little book

used in the schools which is called: "Think and Do," where all the child has to do is answer yes or no—they can guess at half of it. Let us give the child an opportunity to express himself in statements.

Above all, a child should be taught to read our language properly. I am not entirely in favour of doing away with homework, although I think sometimes they get too much of it. Homework has its value, it links the home and the school, but we should not give the child too much.

I agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) as far as "frills" are concerned. In the past we glorified physical education in this province. I think sometimes we have even gone the limit and put a premium on physique and a penalty on brains. We keep quiet about the bright child, the clever boy or girl, and pay tribute to the athlete, the sport. Let us pay more attention to the bright boy, and the bright girl.

Then, I think, perhaps we are overdoing things in our efforts to help the subnormal and below-the-line boy or girl. We are going overboard in this direction. Why not bring our standards up to the level of the top student, and enable the brilliant children to progress, allow them to bring their own ideas to the fore?

This may not have general acceptance, but I would bring back the Entrance examination. I do not think the teachers are equipped, either to write the examination or to mark it. There is a lack of uniformity all over the province, and I do not think we are going to get that uniformity back until we have a general provincial or departmental examination.

And while we are talking about "exams," I think the examinations in teacher training should be made a lot more difficult than they are. The idea should not be allowed to prevail that anyone can pass the teacher training examination. If we are going to keep education in the forefront, something must be done, and done quickly. I am not offering these suggestions in criticism at all; I am simply passing them along as ideas.

I would like to pay my tribute to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) and to say that we, in this province, appreciate the great things he is doing for the people of Ontario. We have an excellent record in the field of health. Our Department of Health is alive to the needs of the people of Ontario. It is giving more in grants to hospitals and putting more effort into the promotion of public health than ever before.

Under a previous government in 1942, health expenditures in this province were about \$9 million. This year, over \$60 million will be spent, made up of \$48 million on ordinary expenditures, approximately \$7 million on rehabilitation grants and \$5 million for construction. In other words, our Department of Health is giving to the people today, almost 7 times as much as it did 10 years ago and despite population growth and the rising cost of services, our annual per capita expenditure on health in the past 10 years has risen from less than \$3 per capita to nearly \$12 for every man, woman and child in the Province of Ontario. The department has raised the standard of care and vastly increased the grant to public and general hospitals. In my own particular area, Orangeville will receive a special capital grant of \$75,000 and a special capital grant of \$300 per bed will be given to Alliston, Collingwood and the Crippled Children's Home, amounting to \$9,600 for Alliston, \$19,500 for Collingwood and \$13,200 to the Crippled Children's Home. These grants will vastly improve the service rendered by these hospitals.

For the control of cancer, we have two government agencies, one for the investigation of cancer remedies and reports on remedies that claim value in the treatment of this disease, and the Cancer Research Foundation. In 1953, over \$2 million was given to that foundation. We have also provided \$8½ million for a cancer radiotherapy centre at the Wellesley Street Hospital. Under the foundation's guidance 8 cancer treatment centres and 3 cobalt bomb cancer treatment centres are operated in Ontario, and I want to say that, just as soon as personnel and equipment become available, several additional centres will

be opened up. The object of the cancer control programme is to find out, just as early as possible, history of the patient's disease and to encourage citizens generally to avail themselves of the services provided for in the diagnosis of the treatment of cancer. That is the first thing, and the second thing is to continue to search for newer and better methods to detect and combat this dreadful disease. There are as many as 10,000 new cases of cancer each year and our citizens must be trained and educated to make use of the services provided. Under the present hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) great advances have been made and I would like to commend the hon. Minister for the great work he is doing in the Province of Ontario. Along this line, may I say that the hon. Minister, has made it possible to establish wards in hospitals, in order that disturbed patients or mental patients, need not be kept in jail, awaiting the verdict of the magistrate, or awaiting the decision of two doctors for certification and then be transferred to mental hospitals.

We have at Orillia an Ontario hospital for the children. I think every hon. member in this House realizes that the waiting list for that hospital is tremendously long. One has to wait three and six months to have a child admitted. I submit, Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for another such hospital, it is long overdue. I believe there are twice as many children awaiting admission, and who need the same sort of treatment, as there are at present in the hospital. We have a fine place for such a hospital at the Town of Collingwood, on the Blue Water. However, I would not quarrel with the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) if he were to build it in Owen Sound, in his own riding of Grey North. That would be a perfect setting, too. I would like to see another hospital constructed for the children of the province who need it, and I plead with the hon. Minister of Health to have such a hospital built.

I would like to commend the Department of Health for the increased grants to our hospitals and for the extra special

capital grant of \$300 per bed, which amounts to over \$7 million.

Again we can pay tribute to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. Hydro has made great strides and has contributed much to the welfare of our people. In 1941, only 16 per cent. of the farm people in the County of Dufferin had hydro. In 1953, almost 80 per cent. were enjoying the benefits of hydro-electric power in that county. There are still other things of course that I would like to see done. I would like again to plead—I have been pleading for this for years and years—for equal rates in the Province of Ontario as far as hydro is concerned, so that industry can locate in the smaller centres. The small villages and towns in this province have the right to expect a similar rate to the one that exists in the larger cities. These smaller communities are interested in having industry located in their areas, but how can industry locate in these smaller towns, when they have to pay from 25 to 50 per cent. more for power than is charged in the larger cities? Not only would equal hydro rates enable industry to locate in smaller centres, but would make for much sounder economy. Many of our towns are one-industry towns and that is a very serious situation when there is a slump. Then we should be thinking of the future as a whole. It is time that industry was decentralized. When one thinks of the tremendous power of the hydrogen bomb, you have a good idea of what I mean when I say we have to decentralize industry for our own preservation—industry should not be centralized in the larger centres. If there were equal rates for hydro power, the towns in my constituency would be able to secure industries and thus provide employment for the citizens, and the movement from the smaller communities to the cities would end. In general, people would rather live in smaller communities.

Now, I would like to say a word regarding our shipbuilding and Canadian coastal trade. Canadian coastal trade is the carriage by water of goods or passengers from one place to another in this country. Our Canadian coastal trade operators do not enjoy the same protec-

tion that foreign ships, operating at a much lower cost as to salary and wages and so forth, enjoy. I know of course that Commonwealth ships are supposed to have equal access to one another's coastal trade, but Australia and New Zealand narrow the opportunities by requiring ships engaged in their coastal trade to pay wages current in their countries and to comply with rules and regulations that have the practical effect of confining the business to their own ships. We have no such regulations and foreign ships operate at will on the Great Lakes. Our high-wage Canadian ships cannot compete with these low-cost vessels on the Great Lakes. In 1953, two ships the *East Dale* and the *East Side*, operating under British registry, with crews made up of non-Canadians, spent the season carrying grain on the Great Lakes, between Porth Arthur and Collingwood. The crews, as I say, were foreign crews and not Canadians. As a result, many of our Canadian sailors could not find work. The crews on these ships were also made up of non-union men, not complying with union rules and regulations—yet I have never heard a word about this situation from the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. SALSBERG: I would have mentioned it, had I known of it.

MR. DOWNER: I bring it to the attention of the hon. member now.

MR. SALSBERG: I am glad you are doing that.

MR. DOWNER: In the U.S.A., only ships built, owned and registered in the U.S.A. can enter the coastal trade. For Canada, with the St. Lawrence Seaway pointing to further access to our inland waters by foreign ships, unless something is done, all the shipyards on the Great Lakes will be closed, except for repair work.

We should make strong representation to Ottawa to have laws enacted that will give protection to our Canadian sailors and Canadian shipyards. Ships are now being purchased in Italy and Germany for inter-coastal shipping, and, due to

the lower standard of wages and living, these ships can be purchased at a much lower rate than they can be built for in our shipyards at Collingwood, Port Arthur, Kingston or Midland.

Now about the Department of Public Welfare. I do not think any of the government is closer to the majority of the people than this department and the hon. Minister is to be congratulated on the very excellent and efficient manner in which he is carrying on his work. However, there are two or three things that I would like the department to consider.

As far as old-age assistance is concerned — that is, assistance granted to people between 65 and 69. I have found that when the application is made, their assets are then in a sense frozen and the pension is paid from that moment, on the basis of what they possessed at the time of application. It is understood that conditions change sometimes very quickly, and it is my view that if a person on application has assets of \$3,000 by way of a house, bonds or cash, and then because of sickness or a change in condition the assets are spent, then the case should be reviewed and the pensioner get an increase in pension according to his financial position. I know of one case where a man was receiving \$24 a month, because of his assets. The following year he spent all of his assets as a result of medical bills and hospitalization, but he was not able to get an increase in pension. I would like the

hon. Minister to look into this whole matter.

I would like also to ask for the Disabled Persons Allowance Act to be reviewed and I would plead that the basis for assistance be substantially widened.

This legislation is fine in theory but in actual practice it does not go far enough. At the present moment you almost have to have your death certificate in your hand before it is granted. I would also like to suggest that the payments from this source should be continued to the disabled persons while they are in hospital or in nursing homes. There is no need for me to elaborate on this, because every hon. member knows the difficulty and the need.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member (Mr. Downer) that it is 6 o'clock. If he would like to continue, we might continue after the recess. He could complete his address, and then the House could consider the remaining Estimates tonight. However, if the hon. member expects to finish very shortly—

MR. DOWNER: It will take me about 10 minutes.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, would you then call it 6 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the Chair.

It being 6 of the clock the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Monday, April 5, 1954

Evening Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Monday, April 5, 1954.

On the Budget, continued, Mr. Downer	1227
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Murdoch, agreed to	1229
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1230
Estimates, Department of Public Works, Mr. Griesinger	1230
Estimates, Department of Travel and Publicity, Mr. Cecile	1239
Government Notices of Motion, No. 8, No. 9, agreed to	1248
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1252

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1954.

8 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The Committee resumed; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

ON THE BUDGET (CONTINUED)

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): When the Act was introduced it was said that this allowance would remove many from the relief rolls of the province, but if the allowance was continued while the disabled persons were in hospital, it would substantially cut down on the indigent costs of the municipalities. I have known of several cases where the allowance was refused and at the same time no ordinary person could say other than that the person was disabled. In one particular case, a young man had his right leg off at the knee and his left arm off at the shoulder, and yet the application was refused. I know that we should not pay an allowance to people in the Ontario mental hospitals, but I believe legislation could be introduced to look after this situation.

Human life is the end product of everything and human life can be of little value when you cannot enter into the ordinary activities common to all. Therefore I plead with the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to broaden the basis of this allowance.

There has been some criticism of the Department of Highways during this session, but I think everyone will agree that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has done a fine job for the Province of Ontario. Our highways have

been improved year by year and compare favourably with any highways anywhere in the world. The hon. Minister of Highways knows this province better than any other former Minister of Highways has ever known it.

He is the only Minister of Highways who realizes their needs and requirements, but he also is trying to meet these needs, and this government has given greater assistance to the country and municipal roads than any other administration. Each one of us is interested in his own area, and I would like to ask that definite consideration be given to some roads in my constituency. Consideration should be given to roads where there is a very heavy volume of traffic and to roads that connect villages and towns to the main arteries of travel in the province. For example, we have a county road leading from Angus, at Camp Borden, to Creemore and connecting with Highway No. 24 at Maple Valley. This road carries a very heavy volume of traffic and should be included in the highways system.

Then we have Highway No. 89, connecting Highways No. 27 and No. 10. This road is completed except for 10 miles between Rosemount and Primrose and is a vital connecting link between Western Ontario and the new four-laned highway to Barrie. I believe that if this road were completed, it would take a heavy volume of traffic from the roads that run further south. I would particularly ask the hon. Minister of Highways to give this road priority as far as con-

struction is concerned this year. It is also my opinion that villages of at least 500 people should be linked by provincial highways to the main highways. We must not allow the suspected irregularities in the Department of Highways to overshadow the fine record chalked up by the Minister. I am sure that a Select Committee will sort out the trouble and get to the bottom of the matter, and the sooner this is done the better. Let's get on with the job. There is no need for charges or counter-charges in this House. Either there are irregularities, or there are not. If there are, then those responsible should be brought before the courts and prosecuted to the full extent of the law. If the irregularities are the result of poor methods and laxity in administration, then it is up to the government to see that the situation is rectified. I am sure that this will be done. I have absolute confidence in the hon. Prime Minister of this province and in his honesty and integrity. There are hundreds of law-abiding employees in the Department of Highways and I would like to pay tribute to the excellent men in that department. I have every confidence in the government and, I am sure, this matter will be completely looked into and dealt with to the satisfaction of every citizen of Ontario.

We have great problems in this province, and the one having to do with highways is not the greatest by any means. The figure \$17 million was mentioned here the other night. I venture to say that the irregularities are so small they will sink into insignificance when the report is tabled in this House a year from now.

We have problems in the province, but one of the greatest problems today is with agriculture. The prosperity of this Dominion depends upon the prosperity of the farmers. You cannot raise the standard of living unless the purchasing power of the farmer can be increased. I remember a statement of Dr. Christie who said that if the farmers of Canada were getting reasonable prices, they would put every factory in the country to work on a 24-hour day. Something must be done to guarantee

the farmer a fair return for his produce. If the farmer is given an adequate return on his labour, unemployment will shortly disappear. This government has done much to improve the lot of the farmer and I believe that representation should be made to Ottawa to prod it to seek new markets for our farm products. Unless our farmers are prosperous our economy is bound to suffer. The farmer is not asking for charity, but for justice. We should have trade missions in every country where there is a possible chance for a market for our farm products, and also for the products of our industrial plants.

Every hon. member of this House should be vitally interested in this subject. England, of course, is our greatest potential market, but we are finding it difficult to deal with due to non-convertibility of sterling. I believe we could work this out and sterling could be made convertible if we really were serious about it. Our farmers must be given a fair return for the produce they have to sell.

I would like to revert back to the hon. Minister of Welfare, not to offer any criticisms, or say anything derogatory about his department, but just to commend him for something he said the other night. He mentioned the debt we owe to the charitable foundations in this province, particularly, he pointed out, the debt we owe to the Atkinson Charitable Foundation. I would like to mention the J. B. Bickell Foundation as well, because the Bickell Foundation is doing comparable work, too. I would like to pay tribute to the Atkinson Foundation myself, because I have read its report, which is magnificent. In 1953, some 167 boys and girls received bursaries in our schools and in our universities from the Atkinson Foundation. Some \$41,000 was given towards youth development and youth culture. Substantial grants were made to the Boy Scouts, and there is no finer organization in the world than the Boy Scouts.

Grants were given to the Ballet Guild, Shakespearean Festival at Stratford. Tremendous amounts of money were

given to health and health practices. Some \$158,000 was given by the Atkinson Foundation to medical research, and \$38,400 was given toward medical education. When it comes to nursing education, there is a sad lack of nurses in this province, and we found that the foundation gave \$100,000 towards the School of Nursing, and 62 nurses or prospective nurses have benefited thereby. Grants were given to a multitude of hospitals to buy hospital equipment and to replace obsolete equipment. Grants were made to rehabilitation research of \$61,000 and last, but not least, substantial grants were given to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind.

I commend these foundations, the Atkinson Foundation and the Bickell Foundation, and I would like to remind you of a great philanthropist of this province, no longer living, the man who made possible, the Sick Children's Hospital. He was the owner of the *Evening Telegram*, John Ross Robertson. You and I will never be able to pay the debt owed him, and his memory should be kept green in this province forever.

In closing, may I say that it was my privilege along with many other members of the House to attend the Coronation of the Queen in London last year. In common with the others, I came back with a keener and deeper sense of the responsibilities of our parliamentary institutions than when I left. However, I am deeply alarmed at the loosening of the ties that bind us to the Motherland. The Fathers of Confederation had an ideal of a Canada loyal to the Crown. It was part of their plans to sever our connections with the Motherland. During the past 20 years, however, Canada has abolished appeals to the Privy Council, removed the word "Dominion" from the title of our country, taken the word "Royal" from the mail boxes and the Crown from the badges of the Air Force, and is now seriously considering changing the flag. I believe that all these things loosen the ties that link us with the Motherland. Let us always remember that Her

Majesty the Queen is also the Queen of Canada. How does she feel about the cutting of the ties that bind us to her? I believe that the ties instead of being severed should be made stronger. In these days when so many new people are entering our country, it is more and more important that we keep these ties strong and remind them of our precious heritage as part of the Commonwealth.

Canada must remain a part of the Commonwealth. The old flag, the Union Jack under which this country has grown, developed and prospered, and holds the vision of a great and expanding future, is the keystone of the Commonwealth. I say—hands off the flag. This trend towards separation tends only towards one thing—the erection of an independent state. It has happened in other parts of the Commonwealth—it must not happen here.

I would like to quote the words of Rudyard Kipling:

No easy hope or lies,
Shall bring us to our goal,
But iron sacrifice,
Of body, will and soul.
There is but one task for all,
One life for each to give,
What stands if freedom fall,
Who dies if England live.

In the words of Sir John A. MacDonald, our first Prime Minister:

A British subject I was born,
A British subject I will die.

We are fortunate indeed to have a man such as hon. Mr. Frost for Prime Minister. Under his guidance and direction, Ontario will remain strong, her people happy and contented. Our hon. Prime Minister has produced another balanced budget with no new taxes. This is the eleventh balanced budget—a record unsurpassed anywhere in the world. I am sure "Old Man Ontario" appreciates a government that is strong, progressive, humane and dependable and British to the core.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South) in the absence of Mr. R. E. Elliott moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before moving that you do now leave the Chair, I would like to table answers to Question No. 59.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. T. R. Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 80, Department of Public works, Vote 151, \$900,200.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Estimates for Public Works at the last session for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954, I gave a brief outline of the work projects that were under way at that time. Now, I should like to inform the hon. members concerning the progress that has been made during the interim. May I first of all deal with:

OFFICE ACCOMMODATION IN TORONTO FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS

Yardley Building: The Yardley Building is being renovated and upon completion will be occupied by the Department of Labour and other units, the Ontario Labour Relations Board having been temporarily accommodated on the seventh floor and will shortly occupy the main floor of the annex section, which is now being fitted up to suit their purposes.

Ontario Government Building—70 Lombard Street: Renovations to the building at 70 Lombard Street have carried out and the Registrar-General's Branch was moved into this building last November. The building is of fireproof construction and is suitably located in the downtown area for citizens requiring birth, marriage or death certificates. An addition is now under construction to

provide accommodation for the rapidly increasing records of this branch that should take care of its requirements for a number of years.

New Treasury Building: A contract has been awarded for the construction of the new Treasury building to house the Treasury and Audit offices. Excavation work is now being carried out and rapid progress will be made with the approach of milder spring weather.

This building will be 6 storeys and basement in height, of stone construction, and will make an imposing addition to the government office buildings around Queen's Park Crescent.

New Government Office Building—Queen and York Streets: The province has acquired during the past year ownership of such parcels of land not previously vested in the Crown in the block bounded by Queen, York, Richmond and University Avenue in downtown Toronto.

A portion of this block fronting on Queen and York Streets has been cleared and a contract awarded for the erection of a new office building, which will accommodate the Public Trustee and other units of the Department of the Attorney-General, and will relieve congestion at Osgoode Hall.

No. 7 Queen's Park Crescent: The School of Nursing of the University of Toronto, which has occupied No. 7 Queen's Park for a number of years, vacated this building last September. This large residence building has been renovated and fitted up for office accommodation.

Athelma Apartments: The Athelma Apartments located on the north-east corner of Grosvenor Street and Surrey Place, adjacent to the East Block, was purchased last October. This purchase was considered essential to secure the area adjacent to the Parliament Buildings for future government expansion. It will be operated as an apartment building until required for governmental purposes.

Wellesley Street Property: To provide also for future expansion, a block of

land known as 70-72, 74 and 78 on the north side of Wellesley Street between Bay Street and Queen's Park Crescent, has been acquired.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Favourable progress has been made with construction of the new Ontario Food Terminal Building in Etobicoke Township and it is expected that this project will be completed and ready for opening early in the new fiscal year. We hope that may be sometime round the latter part of May or early June.

At the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, a continuing programme of new construction has been in progress and the construction of a large addition to Macdonald Institute has been completed with interior finishing work now being done. This addition will provide facilities for setting up a 4-year degree course in Domestic Science.

A contract has also been awarded for the erection of a seed processing laboratory building and work at the site is under way.

Plans have been prepared for the construction of a 500,000 gallon water reservoir to provide an adequate water supply for fire protection. Tenders are to be called for this project in the near future.

Preliminary arrangements have been made for the construction of a new sewage disposal system that will serve both the Agricultural College and the Ontario Veterinary College.

At the Agricultural School, Kemptville, construction was completed this year of the new Agricultural Engineering Building which was officially opened on January 5th, 1954.

At the Western Ontario Agricultural School, Ridgeway, an assembly hall, with seating accommodation for 400 persons, was built this year and turned over to the Department of Agriculture on June 4th last, and a contract has been awarded for the erection of a school building which will provide classrooms, library, offices, etc.

A contract has also been awarded for the construction of a fruit inspection station at Schomberg on the new

Toronto-Barrie highway, and work will be started shortly.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Considerable progress was made on a continuing programme of new construction for the Ontario Provincial Police. District headquarters buildings, detachment buildings and housing units for field personnel are included in this programme.

At Chatham, a building was purchased and renovated to provide a new headquarters for this district in place of the old quarters in leased premises. At Port Arthur, a site has been selected and preliminary studies are being made regarding plans for a district headquarters building in place of the present quarters in the court house.

Detachment Buildings: A detachment building with cells and a garage is being provided at Little Current.

For the Pembroke detachment, a 3-car garage with living quarters above is now under construction.

At Smooth Rock Falls, Longlac, Ignace and Sioux Narrows, sites have been arranged and plans prepared for the construction of new detachment buildings in 1954.

Housing Units: A start was made on a large-scale housing programme to provide living accommodation for field personnel of the Ontario Provincial Police. Sites were acquired and commitments made in respect to some 35 units at points in Northern Ontario.

Registry Offices: Plans and specifications are being prepared for the erection of a new registry office at Port Arthur, and, at Sudbury, renovation of the registry office building and construction of a new addition is well advanced.

A contract has been awarded and the work started on construction of a new registry office at Bracebridge on the same site as the old registry office building. The rear section of the new building will be completed and the registry office temporarily accommodated in this part of the building. When this move has taken place, the old building will be demolished and the remaining portion of the new structure completed.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Plans have been prepared and a contract awarded for the construction of a new Toronto Teachers' College on a site on Carlaw Avenue adjoining the existing Normal School on Pape Avenue in Toronto's east end. Construction work is expected to start shortly.

A site has been selected near McMaster University for the erection of a new Teachers' College, and plans are being prepared.

The new Junior Residential School with hospital wing at The Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford, was completed and opened last September.

Continued progress was made on the erection of a 1-storey addition to the Provincial Institute of Textiles at Hamilton.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

At the request of the Dominion Government for defence purposes, the province is vacating the buildings occupied by Division 6 of the Department of Highways and other departmental units at 1200 Sheppard Avenue, and favourable progress has been made on the re-establishment of these offices in new buildings located at Keele Street and Wilson Avenue in North York Township. Three of the buildings were completed, the garage, the paint shop and display building, and the heated and unheated storage building, and these have been turned over to the Department of Highways. The remaining 2 buildings, the central storage building and the office and laboratory building, are now under construction.

An addition was constructed to the Ontario Government Building at New Liskeard to provide additional office space for the Department of Highways at that centre.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Construction of the new modern office building for the Workmen's Compensation Board at 92 Fleet Street was completed and officially opened on September 15th.

DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

New construction and improvements to existing buildings and works were carried out for the several divisions of the Department of Lands and Forests.

Division of Fish and Wildlife: At Codrington, a new fish hatchery building was erected, outside rearing tanks were constructed in concrete, and other improvements made. Major reconstruction work was started at the fish hatchery at Sault Ste. Marie, and this work is now in progress.

Division of Forest Protection: A new Chief Rangers' headquarters building was recently completed at Trout Lake near North Bay providing offices, work shop, garage and storage facilities. A similar building for a Chief Rangers' headquarters was also constructed at Sault Ste. Marie.

At Port Arthur, work is continuing on the renovation and remodelling of a building acquired to provide a district headquarters for the Forest Protection Division.

Division of Research: A new forestry Pathological Forest Building at Maple was completed.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Cobalt-Temiskaming Testing Laboratory: Alterations were completed to establish a Mines Rescue Station in the basement of this building, and office space was provided on the second floor for the geological staff.

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

At Markham, a 2-storey brick house was purchased and fully renovated to serve as a dwelling for the mechanic in charge of maintenance and repairs of the department's machinery and equipment.

Two new buildings were erected at Markham this year, one a storage building, and the other a workshop building.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Port Arthur: Construction work was continued on the new Ontario Hospital at Port Arthur which, when completed,

will provide a total of approximately 1,200 beds. The first unit, providing 394 beds, is now being equipped to turn over to the Department of Health. Work on the second unit is well advanced and this comprises two more patients' pavilions of 360-bed capacity, and a laundry building.

Smiths Falls: Work was continued on the 2,200-bed hospital school for mental defectives in Montague Township near Smiths Falls.

The second hospital group, known as "A-2" group, was completed and, with the exception of one wing which is being used for Public Works offices and stores, has been turned over to the Department of Health for patient occupancy.

Group "A-5" buildings — medical, clinical and surgical group—was started in December, 1951. Structural work has been completed and interior finishing work is in progress. This group will have bed accommodation for approximately 400 patients.

Group "A-6," garage building, was completed in February.

Group "A-8," Nurses' Residence, and Group "A-9," Administration Group, were started in September, 1953, and work is in progress.

Construction of 2 root houses was started in August, 1953, and this work is well advanced.

Brockville: At the Ontario Hospital, Brockville, continued progress was made under a programme of expansion to provide accommodation for an additional 700 patients and a new central kitchen and dining rooms along with related facilities.

Major expansion work is also being carried out in respect to the various services, including the power plant, water supply, sewage disposal, distribution of water, steam and electric current and laundry. A surgical operating unit is also being provided.

The progressive programme of fireproofing and re-modelling of the main building was continued.

North Bay: Following a decision to establish a new 1,200-bed Ontario Hos-

pital at North Bay, surveys and tests and other preliminary work is being carried out in connection with the selection of a suitable site.

I may say, at this point, that the original site selected at North Bay was rejected due to a request by the Air Force, who felt that it might be a little too noisy for the patients. This was concurred in by the Department of Health, and we have now chosen another site between North Bay and Callender which we hope will be suited to our requirements.

Kingston: The progressive programme of fireproofing of patients' quarters at this hospital was continued.

A number of important capital improvements have been, or are being, carried out including an extension to the coal dock at the water front, installation of stand-by electric generators for emergency power and major improvements to the power plant.

Orillia: Construction of a fireproof extension to the main kitchen and dining room is under way.

A progressive programme of fireproofing, similar to that undertaken at other Ontario Hospitals, has been continued. One of the larger fireproofing jobs involves cottages "L" and "B," and the work will be started as soon as arrangements can be made for the temporary moving of patients.

Major improvements to the heating system are planned, and initially, an automatic steam generator unit is being installed. Contracts have been awarded and the work is well under way on the construction of a reception and dormitory group; also an isolation building. These new buildings will provide a total capacity of 376 additional beds.

Toronto (Queen Street): Preliminary steps have been taken to effect major improvements to the steam generating system at this institution and will involve the placing in operation of 2 new complete steam generating units.

Contracts were recently awarded and the work started on construction of a new administration and reception building. This building will provide admini-

strative offices on the main floor and facilities for reception, treatment and diagnosis on the two upper floors, with bed accommodation for 100 additional patients.

General: In addition to the above new-bed programme, many major capital improvements were carried out at all Ontario Hospitals as required, including fireproofing of buildings and fire prevention work.

DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

A site has been acquired, and plans have been prepared for the construction of a new jail at Millbrook, Ontario.

For the industrial farm at Burwash, plans and specifications are being prepared for the construction of a new fire-proof dormitory building at Camp 5 which will replace an old non-fireproof building.

Arrangements are under way for the construction of a new central heating plant at Camp 2. An addition to the public school at Camp 2 is now under construction.

For the Ontario Reformatory at Guelph, the new 53-bed hospital for inmates has been completed and is being supplied with the necessary furniture, furnishings and equipment. Major improvements to the power plant were carried out, which included the installation of a new steam generator unit.

For the Ontario Reformatory, Mimico, a new dormitory building providing accommodation for 120 inmates is under construction. Inmate labour was used to some extent on this project.

DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY

Plans are under way for the erection of a new tourist reception centre for Point Edward near Sarnia.

Re Dams, Docks and Locks: In addition to the construction of new buildings, this department has under its direction the carrying out of various engineering projects, mostly in the northern parts of the province and consisting of the construction of dams, docks and locks. The building of storage dams serves the im-

portant function of maintaining water levels for navigation, hydro, for aid in the propagation of fish and wildlife, and also in the interests of Ontario's lake-shore summer residents generally. It should be noted that this type of work has great value in assisting to promote tourist traffic throughout Ontario's summer vacation areas.

This year, favourable progress was made with the reconstruction in reinforced concrete of the main locks at Port Carling. The reconstructed locks are fitted with steel gates, steel stoplogs and external sluice valves and its operation will be entirely electrically controlled. This project is of considerable importance since it will assist in maintaining navigation by steamer, tug and pleasure boat between Lake Muskoka and the upper lakes.

Reconstruction of 7 storage dams was carried out or for the most part completed this year in the following districts: Victoria County, Nipissing, Thunder Bay, Muskoka and Algoma.

At the Provincial Forester's Station at Orono in Durham County, a start was made on the reconstruction of the dam and bridge as well as major repairs to the embankment.

To continue this work programme, including the many capital improvement items too numerous to mention, the sum of \$20 million has been placed in the Estimates under Vote 161, item 1, and in addition the sum of \$7,525,000 has been added to start new projects, making the total amount to be voted for public buildings and works \$27,525,000.

NEW WORK TO BE STARTED DURING FISCAL YEAR 1954-55

These new projects will include items for the development of the mental hospital new-bed programme, other large additions to many of the existing institutions, as well as renovations, fireproofing, and other capital improvement work, which is briefly mentioned as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph:
New vehicle storage building.

New paint shop.

To start new science building (preparation of plans and preliminary work).

Sewage disposal plant.

Ontario Veterinary College:

To start new clinical building for Department of Medicine and Surgery (preparation of plans and preliminary work).

Demonstration Farm, New Liskeard:

Construction of a new administration building.

Miscellaneous items for capital improvements for all agricultural buildings.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Ontario Provincial Police:

District Headquarters Building—to start construction of 2 new headquarters buildings.

Detachment buildings—to start construction of 2 new detachment buildings at Essex and Kaladar.

Housing—to provide an additional 25 units.

Registry Offices—alterations and improvements to office at Fort William. To start new Registry Office building at North Bay.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ontario School for the Deaf, Belleville:

To start construction of a new heating plant.

Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford:

To start construction of a new assembly hall wing to the main building.

Miscellaneous items for capital improvements for all educational buildings.

New sites for teachers' colleges, as may be required.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Ontario Hospital, Hamilton:

To start new patients' building to accommodate 600 beds and a new nurses' residence for 125.

Ontario Hospital, Kingston:

To start construction of a 500-bed unit which shall include an administration building, medical-surgical building, 2 infirmary buildings, and a new central kitchen and dining hall building for the whole institution, as well as a new assembly hall and nurses' residence of 30 beds.

Ontario Hospital, Brockville:

To start construction of 2 buildings for disturbed patients, each to accommodate 130 beds.

Miscellaneous items for capital improvements for all hospital buildings and works.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

To provide office accommodation for Division No. 16 at Cochrane.

To start construction of an office building for Division No. 5 at Owen Sound.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Swastika:

To start construction of office building for the Mining Recorder, Inspector, Resident Geologist and staff.

Alterations to Temiskaming Testing Laboratory at Cobalt.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Construction of a new office building at Kemptville to provide accommodation for staff of several departments.

Renovation of building to provide General Headquarters for the OPP in Toronto.

DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Ontario Reformatory, Mimico:

Construction of dormitory building No. 2.

Ontario Reformatory, Brampton:

To start a progressive building programme for permanent buildings to replace deteriorated wooden buildings.

Industrial Farm, Monteith:

To start construction of new dormitory buildings with 200 capacity for first unit.

Miscellaneous fireproofing and capital improvements for all reformatories.

DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL
AND PUBLICITY

Niagara Falls:

To provide a new reception centre.

DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

New district office building at Kapuskasing.

New ranger's headquarters at Pembroke.

Store and restaurant building at Rondeau Park.

Miscellaneous DLF improvement projects.

This brief résumé of our work programme for the new fiscal year will, I trust, give the hon. members of this House an outline of the extensive and province-wide programme of works, not including many repair jobs, that are now under way or are planned to be started during the fiscal year commencing April 1st next.

Mr. Chairman, in closing these remarks may I place on the records of this House my appreciation and thanks for the loyalty and support so freely given me by the senior officers and all staff members of the Department of Public Works during the past year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 151, Main Office, \$900,200.

On Vote 151.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, just a question in regard to item 4 of Vote 151, "Insurance." I was puzzled by the following fact: the item calls for an expenditure of \$13,000 this year; the same item was \$15,000 last year, and \$40,000 the year before. This means either a reduction in coverage, lower rates—or what is it?

HON. W. GRIESINGER: When the hon. member mentioned the figure of "\$40,000," that was 2 years ago, and was covering the insurance premium on this particular building in which we are tonight. It is a 3-year policy, and does not become due until next year.

The insurance item we show at the present time of \$13,000, is made up of a fleet policy in the amount of \$1,200; a boat on Muskoka lakes for \$250—these are yearly premiums; 88 College Street, in the sum of \$634.35; 67 College St., \$2,478.30; 1200 Sheppard Ave., \$1455.92; 72 Wellesley St. (approx.) \$127.40; 74 Wellesley St., \$41.00; 78 Wellesley St., \$213.03. These last 3 items total approximately \$380.00 and make a grand total of \$6,400.

Then we have a contingency of \$6,600, making the total of \$13,000. The contingency is for new construction we probably will have, and upon which a certain amount of insurance will probably have to be taken out.

MR. SALSBERG: Just to follow that up, Mr. Chairman, I notice that none of the other departments have any item for insurance. Does that mean that they do not require any, or that the Department of Public Works covers all government-owned buildings and property?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Actually, that applies only to the building we are in tonight, upon which we carry insurance. The rest is carried by the government itself.

MR. SALSBERG: No insurance?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: That is right.

Vote 151 agreed to.

Vote 152, General Superintendents' Salaries, \$175,000, agreed to.

Vote 153, Lieutenant-Governor's Apartment, \$7,800, agreed to.

On Vote No. 154.

MR. SALSBERG: Just an inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Item No. 4 "A Maintenance Staff," and the figure is a bit surprising in that more than two-thirds of the expenditure goes for temporary or casual labour, and only one-third, or thereabouts—perhaps even less—for the permanent staff.

I may say that in former years we had some lively arguments about this question. We stopped them, and I was

hoping by now the majority of employees in that branch have become more permanent than it appears they are.

I suggest that it is not a good policy, and is not fair to a great many of those people working for years without enjoying the benefits of a permanent employee. These figures would indicate this has hardly gone forward.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: I could answer that question in this way: The first year of employment is casual; the second year is temporary, and if they are found suitable, then they go on the permanent list.

MR. SALSBERG: After 3 years.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Yes.

Vote 154 agreed to.

Vote 155, Osgoode Hall, \$132,000, agreed to.

On Vote 156.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister indicate the estimated cost of the Millbrook institution? What will be the estimated cost.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Around \$2 million is estimated.

Vote 156 agreed to.

Vote 157, Ontario Government Branch Office Buildings, \$507,500, agreed to.

Vote 158, Maintenance of Locks, Bridges, Dams, and Docks, etc., \$100,000, agreed to.

Vote 159, Aid to Drainage, \$30,000, agreed to.

On Vote 160.

MR. SALSBERG: On 160, "Miscellaneous." Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister at this time whether his department is the one which keeps tab on all our works of art. As the hon. members know, I display an interest in our art works a few times at each session. I am wondering whether anybody knows what we possess, whether they are catalogued, whether they are indexed, and whether they are

numbered, and whether they are recorded somewhere? We have added, in the past few years, a number of original works. As I said on one occasion, it was our hope we would eventually gather a sufficient collection of works of Ontario artists to constitute a provincial collection, which might be used for public displays, not only here, but elsewhere.

MR. SALSBERG: This is as good a night, perhaps, as any, to inquire whether the Department of Public Works is responsible for them and, if so, whether we have a catalogue of them.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Yes, I think there is a sort of divided ownership, if one wants to put it that way, between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Education. However, I can assure the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that we have a 100 per cent. card index system, and we know where they all are and the condition they are in.

MR. SALSBERG: Are they indexed according to titles or artists?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: I suppose that is the way it would be done—and artists.

MR. SALSBERG: I suppose an hon. member could come and look at the index?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: I shall be glad to show it to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg).

MR. SALSBERG: Yes.

Vote 160 concurred in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 161, Public Buildings, \$27,525,000.

Item 1,

To provide for the construction of new buildings, and works, purchase of lands and buildings, including additions, alterations, equipment and extension of services to existing buildings and works, and the purchase of construction plant and equipment and expenses in connection therewith, \$27,525,000.

On item 1.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I have a very simple question to which I confess I have not got the answer. Are the large-scale construction jobs carried by the department itself, through its staff and the use of its machinery, or are they contracted out to private construction firms?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: All the large contracts are now let out for tenders and by contract.

MR. SALSBERG: And the tenders are advertised?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Yes, they are advertised in the *Daily Commercial News*, and the Toronto papers, unless it is an out-of-town job, in which case it is advertised in the local press.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 161 concurred in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 162, Dams, Docks and Drainage Works, \$320,000.

Item 1, "Municipal drainage, including grants-in-aid thereof, \$20,000.

Item 1 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 2, "Storage Dams and Docks, \$300,000."

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 162 concurred in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 163, Miscellaneous, \$2,155,000.

Item 1,

Grant — City of Sudbury — grant towards the cost of a flood control and drainage scheme, known as the Nolins' and Junction Creek Drainage Works, in the City of Sudbury, \$1,000.

Item 1 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Grants, Conservation, \$2 million.

Grant towards the cost of further development of works of the Grand River Conservation Commission, \$1,250,000.

To provide for grants to Conservation Authorities, as may be approved by the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council, in accordance with The Conservation Act, chapter 62 R.S.O. 1950, section 39, \$750,000.

On item 2.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) say what jobs under The Conservation Act are in progress now, or are contemplated for this year?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: In the case of the Mitchell Flood Control Scheme, there is a total estimated cost of \$310,000, and the total estimated grant is \$116,250. The St. Marys Flood Control Scheme amounts to \$290,000. The Ausable River Construction Authority, estimated Ontario grant is \$262,500. Then there is the Conestoga Dam for which we have set up a sum of \$1,250,000; the Fanshaw Dam and Reservoir, with a balance of \$180,000; a balance on the Brampton Flood Channel of \$50,000; Reforestation, \$50,000; and Engineering, \$35,000.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask one further question? What is the state of progress as regards the dam on the Conestoga? Has it been completed?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: I understand the agreement has been signed between the two senior governments, but I do not know whether tenders have been called for the contract work itself. That is done by the Conservation Authority itself.

MR. OLIVER: The work has not started yet, in any event. Not that I know of.

Item 2 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 3, "Grant to the Government of Canada of 50 per cent. of the cost of dredging in the Muskoka District, \$30,000."

On item 3.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) what is the explanation of item 3?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: That is provided in case we have to do any dredging in that district.

MR. OLIVER: Is it an annual Estimate?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: It is set up annually, provided if we have to do any dredging there.

MR. OLIVER: Was any spent last year?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: No, so it is set up again this year. We may have to do some work in there.

MR. OLIVER: Did you ever use any money out of this item?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: I do not think any has been used during my year as Minister, but I understand it has been used in previous years.

Item 3 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Item 4.

Grants to provide for remedial works to alleviate flooding conditions, erosion of farm lands and other damages, as may be directed by the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council, \$124,000.

On item 4.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, item 4, "Aid—Remedial Works, etc." This year is for \$124,000, which is the same as last year. According to the Public Accounts for the year ended 1953, we spent \$7,482. Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) expecting to spend a lot more this year?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: The sum of \$124,000 is provided in case any serious floods take place, in which a grant can then be made immediately. It is quite true we may not spend a great deal of that sum during any particular year, but if, in some section of the province, a severe flood condition occurs, and we want to make an immediate grant or match dollar for dollar what the Dominion Government will do at the

same time, then we have this item set up for that purpose.

Item 4 agreed to.

Vote 163 concurred in.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY

HON. LOUIS CECILE (Minister of Travel and Publicity): Mr. Chairman, this is the sixth occasion that my privilege has been to address the Assembly in very practical terms about my department, and to ask the Assembly's continued practical support of a work which I sincerely believe has an importance to all our people that could hardly be exaggerated.

Honourable members may be disappointed when I say at the beginning that I am asking for no more monies than were generously voted for the past fiscal year.

Perhaps I should remind the House at the outset that the Rentals Administration matter which has been my responsibility for a few years, has now been resolved in ways familiar to all concerned. My request tonight refers only to the advancement of the "travel and vacation" business which we all enjoy in Ontario, and which, in my belief, brought in to our province at least \$225 million last year.

From time to time, Mr. Chairman, it is not a bad thing to remind ourselves of first principles, and to review the legal sanctions under which we act. In the case of my department, the Assembly, in 1946, laid down the following terms of reference:

The objects of the department shall be to develop the tourist industry in Ontario by encouraging and promoting improvement in the standards of accommodation, facilities, and services offered to tourists, and to undertake the publicizing of the tourist industry and of the resources, attractions, and advantages of Ontario.

That is what we try our best to do, and that is all we may do.

The first Minister to hold this portfolio, my friend the present Provincial

Secretary (Mr. Welsh), in 1946 set up such a well-considered organization that the 8 years which have passed have indicated no need for any particular alteration. I believe that the machinery of the department is well-gearred to carry out the terms of reference I quoted a minute ago.

Ontario is the only jurisdiction on this continent, provincial or state, which has established a department of government to foster and promote its travel and vacation business.

In our other provinces and in the various states, you will usually find engaged in this work, a bureau or branch of some large department such as "Trade and Industry," "Highways," "Health," or other.

I feel convinced that the decision of 1946 was a sound one for two main reasons. First, I am constantly meeting American officials who say to me: "I wish our state had a set-up like you have in Ontario."

Second—the proof of the pudding is in the eating—we have enjoyed for 8 years an annually increasing record volume of tourist business with all its resultant and wide-spread benefits to all our people. We should not be afraid of seeming to boast in this matter. Ontario enjoys well over half the tourist volume recorded for the whole Dominion, and I may tell you, Ontario is the envy of most of the States of the Union to our south.

Now, Mr. Chairman, do not think for a minute that I am claiming sole credit for my department for this happy state of affairs. Far from it.

If there is any business in the world where co-operative and joint effort brings results, the tourist business is that.

The credit is shared by many—by other government departments, by transportation interests, by chambers of commerce and similar bodies, by municipalities, and, very importantly, by individual operators who now realize they are in a big business with a splendid future. We can all help each other, and we all know it and we all try to do it.

I would be remiss indeed if I did not mention at this time the basic part played in our tourist scene by our network of highways. The question often arises: "Which is cause and which is result?" Or is it sometimes stated: "Which comes first—the hen or the egg?" In this case, do we build highways because the motorists demand them, or do the motorists come to explore the highways that we have already built for them?

Myself, I think the latter, and, looking at the map of Ontario, with the expansion of the last few years in mind, I think we are well justified in believing that the map at which our grandchildren will one day look, will show thoroughfares to the north rivalling our more southerly network.

Just as fine firm highways attract motorists, so do modern hotels and other accommodations attract vacationists. The increase of first-class motor courts here in recent years has shown that.

It is my hope that private capital may once again be attracted to the field of hotel and resort construction of the most up-to-date type for I feel that the future will bring a sure return.

To descend to particulars, I ask you to watch, this year, the traffic over our new road to Atikokan. This gives road access for the first time to the environs of Quetico Provincial Park. That whole area is "a natural" for investment in first-class hotels, resorts and motor courts, and I hope that private enterprise will take advantage of the opportunities.

We have in Ontario about 1,000 hotels, about 1,500 angling and hunting camps, and over 5,000 summer resorts, motor courts, tourist homes and so on, but the benefit of traveling and vacationing is by no means restricted to these operators or to other caterers or retail merchants. The tourist dollar, so-called, passes through many, many hands and creates a benefit at every step.

Particularly let us remember the simple fact that most people eat 3 meals a day, therefore, a great part of the benefit goes to producers and processors of foodstuffs of all kinds, as well as to

those who prepare and serve it. Let us remember also the thousand and one articles of equipment and supplies which are used in those big modern industries represented by hotels, motor courts and so on, and also let us remember how our tourist visitors help us through the media of the gasoline tax, the hunting and angling licences, and also through those excise taxes levied by the Dominion Government. With that in mind, it will be seen that the tourist dollar spent in one corner of our province benefits to some degree those who live in the farthest opposite corner. One might even take it farther than that, and in respect of a federal excise and other tax factors, one may correctly say that we benefit here in Ontario from the tourist expenditures made in every other province. I have perhaps laboured this point at too great length and I hope I have not bored the House, but I like to stress it because I so often meet otherwise fully enlightened citizens who think that the tourist business is something that only concerns the operators of fishing camps in the north or summer resorts in Muskoka, or similar special groups within our commercial fabric.

Perhaps at this point I should refer to the well-known fact that during the past few years or so, our own Canadians visiting and vacationing in other countries have for the first time been spending an even greater sum than visitors spend here. I do not think this so-called adverse balance will be quite so pronounced when the final figures for 1953 are announced. In fact, I have been told that the adverse balance has been reduced from \$37 million to about \$25 million. And in any event, I do not regard the fact with any particular dismay, but rather as a challenge to us here to intensify and improve our promotion and our advertising, and above all the quality of our accommodation and services.

The United States of America, of course, is our principal market and according to surveys which command acceptance, of all the millions of vacation trips taken by U.S. travellers, only 6.3 per cent. are taken to countries outside

the continental United States. The American, in other words, has so much to see and so many places to explore in his own vast country that he has to be persuaded to come outside its boundaries for his holiday. Canada, by the nature of things, gets the lion's share of that 6.3 per cent of the business which goes outside the United States, and Ontario gets the lion's share of that quantity.

But you will see, and this is a point I wish to make very forcibly, we have only barely scratched the surface of the vast total potential. In my belief we can build up the business we now enjoy and which is so gratifying and lucrative, to almost any height; but as in every other business we must ensure that our product is uniformly good, that it is attractively packaged and that it is marketed at a fair and reasonable price considering the value received. In other words, the same business principles apply to the merchandising of travel and vacationing as apply to the marketing of any brand name product in any national market. We, in Ontario, certainly have the product, a product of many and varied attractions. It is the merchandising, advertising and promotion that we must all look to. This merchandising and promotion is going on right now on all levels from the Dominion Government down to the individual operator. Our great transportation systems, rail, air, bus and boat are, and have been, contributing with great weight to the total effort. I believe that each one of our provinces is undertaking in fair proportion its share of the campaign. But one of the greatest elements in this merchandising campaign is that represented by the regional organizations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade and the municipalities. I could quote you dozens of examples of fruitfulness of such effort, but I will content my self by naming only one, namely the county in which I was born, the County of Essex. Down there they have a set of men who for a good many years have been engaged in the promotion of Essex County from every point of view but very particularly from the point of view of vacation travel, and since their campaign first got into high

gear, they have never looked back, and I do not expect that their efforts will ever decrease because they have seen around them its very manifest benefits.

The promotion of travel and vacationing in Canada has not been spectacular, but it has been steady, and I am glad to say is continuing. For spectacular examples of what can be done, we might well look at the examples of Miami Beach and the State of California to name only two of dozens. It is not many years ago that a group of business men in California founded a body known as the "All-Year Club of California" and made up their minds that they would, by their own efforts, transform that state into an all-year round holiday mecca. I am sure you do not need any particular confirmation of the statement that they certainly succeeded. Then, again, Miami Beach 40 or 50 years ago was nothing but a windswept sandbar, with nothing particular to recommend it except what a few men of imagination could see as a future possibility. I am quite sure that many hon. members have a better knowledge of California and Miami than I have and that no elaboration is necessary of the fact that the tourist business in Florida, particularly, is an outstanding example of what can be done in that line of merchandising backed up by a good product.

I do not think I need point out, Mr. Chairman, that there is increasing competition for the patronage of the American vacationing family. Hon. members, I am quite sure, read the same magazines and newspapers that I do, and will not have failed to note the appeals made by such competing areas as Hawaii, Mexico, and the Caribbean as well as by all the States of the Union, by European countries and by our own sister provinces. However, it is a very friendly competition and those most experienced in the travel business believe that in general everybody wins, provided we can keep the travelling and vacationing habits of the people of this continent ingrained and still more expansive.

We have at our door a potential market that means travelling and vacationing expenditures of \$8 billion

annually. When I use the quantity \$8 billion, I am using the lowest and most conservative estimate made by any responsible authority as the sum spent in pleasure travel by American families each year. I have seen calculations and estimates that place the total very much higher, but I prefer to place the argument at a conservative level because that level is sufficiently impressive.

I will tell you where I got the figure and it was confirmed just the other day. I got it from the Research Department of the Curtis Publishing Company, who as you know publish 4 great magazines, *Holiday* magazine, *Saturday Evening Post*, *Ladies' Home Journal* and *Country Gentleman*.

MR. SALSBERG: That is just promotion.

HON. MR. CECILE: They have conducted this survey annually for 4 years. It is from these same research experts that I have accepted the figure which indicates that we vacation merchandisers here in Ontario are enjoying less than 5 per cent. of the grand total potential. This, as I said before, is to me a distinct challenge and I hope it will also appeal to the House that way. Our product rivals or surpasses that of any of our competitors, so it is up to us.

The consideration of this vast, barely tapped potential is a consideration which leads me to view the future of Ontario's tourist business with confidence. Since our principal market is in the United States, I read with necessary interest many of the financial and business journals published in that country, and I find in them a wide variety of future prophecies. I will sift out only two. In *U.S. News and World Report* magazine of January 29th, 1954, I read:

There is no positive evidence yet that any serious recession is in the making—just a slowdown from boom's peak.

Again I read in *Fortune* magazine for January:

This will be another year of mild re-adjustment for business. But it

could also be the second best year U.S. business has ever experienced.

The U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, in his *Bulletin of Commerce* of January 8th agrees with these journalistic views when he says:

Though 1954 may not equal the all-time record boom of 1953, known conditions and foreseeable prospects offer sound reasons for continued realistic optimism that it will be among the better years of economic history.

So again I say, I believe that everybody engaged in, and interested in Ontario's tourist business may view the prospects for this present year with greatest confidence. But there is one thing the importance of which I cannot overstress, namely that advertising and promotion must be continued vigorously not only on the government level but by communities, local organizations and individual operators. In the modern competitive world, any product whose advertising stops or slows down past a point, soon vanishes from the market. To say that our visitor industry would ever vanish would, of course, be a gross exaggeration, but we wish not only to maintain it at its present gratifying level, but to make further advances and secure further rewards for those thousands of people who depend on it for their living and those thousands more who benefit indirectly or in a secondary sense. And that, I repeat, means all of us.

I should mention here the successful inauguration of scheduled summer flights to Gravenhurst by Trans-Canada Airlines last summer. This proved a distinct advantage to Muskoka and neighbouring districts and I am informed that TCA regard it as a complete success and will continue it. The new scheduled service to Sudbury will undoubtedly have a like effect in the coming year.

Another further development that should bring benefit to the province tourist business was announced on February 9th by Governor Dewey of New York State. He proposed a new north-south express highway which

should bring much increased traffic into the St. Lawrence-Thousand Island area. The Trans-Canada Highway and the continued expansion and improvement of the province's own highway system in all sections are additional factors suggesting increased business.

Well now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps that has been a pretty long preamble. I will now get down to business.

I am asking the House for exactly the same sum as it voted to me last year for ordinary expenditures, namely \$885,000. We have no capital expenditures. That means a reduced request, for I have to absorb, within it, civil service salary increases, and also increased costs which have crept up in printing, newspaper and magazine advertising space, engraving, and in many other fields. Believe me, we have had to sharpen our lead-pencils in our calculations.

To deal with the smaller items first, members will note that salary items reflect the re-adjustment recently made in civil service schedules, and the absorption of \$300 per employee from the cost-of-living bonus.

Items covering travelling expenses are based on the experience of the past 8 years and I assure you are moderate. Travel officials have to travel. They have to attend and address meetings, both here and outside the province, take part in conferences, and so on, in addition to their regular duties on the road.

Maintenance items, of course, include supplies, rentals, equipment, and various services such as telephone and telegraph both of which we use freely where we think it will help the cause. None of these things are getting any cheaper.

Now, in general, Mr. Chairman, it will be noted that we have from the monies granted, been spending, roughly one-half on promotional activities and the other half on services.

The services part include our chain of reception centres of which we are very proud and which we try to keep at top-notch efficiency.

About 500,000 people call at these centres each year, many of them first-time visitors. My annual report, already

tabled and now in the printer's hands will give an interesting break-down. This service, I believe, well justifies its cost. We operate 14 such centres. Those at Point Edward, Windsor and Niagara Falls are open all year, the others for 4 or 5 month peak period bracketing mid-summer.

Thanks to the co-operation of our Highways Department, we are to acquire this year, very fine new premises at Niagara Falls of which I think our people will be proud. These premises are adjacent to the American Consular building.

Included in "services" comes also our inspectorate, set up under the authority of the Tourist Establishments Act. We have 10 district offices each in charge of a full-time inspector assisted in the summer by 1 or 2 temporary assistants. We endeavour, through this machinery, to spread the best modern information on operating methods to the industry and also, of course, our men scrutinize the various establishments as to their observance of regulations. Our field men are, in fact, coming into considerable demand from local bodies as, shall we say, counsellors. With that, I am very pleased.

Now for the largest single item in the request I am presenting—that of \$370,800 for advertising, publicity, and promotion.

By robbing Peter to pay Paul we have contrived to bump this up a little over last year (by \$2,600) and I ask you very earnestly to grant it.

The thing we call advertising, publicity and promotion is an integral necessity for all business as done today on the North American continent. Anyone who disputes that general principle is very much out of step. He would be arguing counter to all the successful producers, fabricators, and distributors, and to all the banks, all the commercial and all the financial houses, and I should add, to all our competing tourist areas. It is the essential vitamin in the economic body, as that economic body exists in 1954.

The backbone of travel promotion is paid advertising, and on that we propose

to spend over half the item. The balance will be applied to our printed booklets and folders, and to various forms of special promotion. We will also experiment with radio and television.

We mean to increase our advertising effort right here at home this year, and in the Province of Quebec. I have reason to believe that people from our sister-province are showing an increasing friendly interest in Ontario as a vacation-spot and we hope to develop that further. It was very evident in 1953.

Among the various kinds of special promotion we do, and I will only mention this one as typical, is our annual good-will tour of Ontario, conducted annually for groups of U.S. editors—about 30 on each tour. With the co-operation of the Hotel Association, the Dominion Government, the Railways, local organizations and others, we give these men the best view of Ontario that we can arrange in a 12-day tour. The results have been uniformly good, and we now have a group of some 300 U.S. editors who are pre-disposed to be friendly because they know at first-hand what we are like and what we have up here.

So, Mr. Chairman, as regards the large item I am speaking of, I hope that the House will regard it, as do all others engaged in big business on this continent, not as expense, but as investment.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation and thanks for the co-operation and support so freely given me by all officers and staff members of my department during the past year.

Vote 178, Main Office, \$71,800.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): I should like to ask the hon. Minister about item 4, which reads:

Northern Great Lakes Area Council—membership assessment and expenses of delegates attending meetings, \$7,000.

Would the hon. Minister care to explain that item, please?

HON. MR. CECILE: The Northern Ontario Great Lakes Area Council is composed of the Province of Ontario and the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan. We form part of it, and share expenses equally.

The council promotes interest in the area specially, provides maps and information, and deals generally with the local tourist advertising in the 3 states, and in the province. We think we benefit greatly by these activities, possibly more than the 3 American states, bearing in mind that we have to pay no more than they do, while our territory covers a much larger area.

MR. SALSBERG: I had not intended to intervene in this debate, but I wish to raise a few minor questions.

First, I suggest to the hon. Minister that while it is very important to extend our publicity to the United States, so as to attract tourists from the other side of the border, the home market should not be as neglected as it has been in the past. The task of this government, as I envisage it, is not merely to bring dollars into the province—though that is one of its functions, I imagine—but rather to educate our people to the beauties of the natural attractions which we have, so we in Canada may enjoy them. I think we are missing many opportunities to bring the benefits of our northern areas, and other regions of the province, to the attention of our own people. I suggest that more could be done by way of newspaper, radio and magazine advertising in Canada—using our own publications and our own radio—to encourage our people to travel, to learn, to explore and to enjoy all the fine things which we have to offer.

I feel every year, when the hon. Minister presents the report of his activities, that this aspect of the work is unduly neglected.

Just one item occurs to me, by way of example, which may illustrate the point. I have, for a number of years, in the debates in this House, raised the question of ragweed—usually on the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture—because I am a hayfever sufferer. I made an interesting discovery

last fall. One day, when the fever affected me very badly, I decided I would drive north as far as might be necessary, to get some relief. To my great surprise, I found that relief of this condition started after reaching Huntsville, and that, going a little farther north, the affliction eased off greatly. I do not know whether I happened to strike a narrow area which was free of ragweed, but my hay fever was certainly relieved. I stopped where I found the sneezing had eased off, and said: "I will call this a day." I remained there for a week.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: What brought you back?

MR. SALSBERG: This is not a laughing matter. It is a serious matter. I thought hon. members would miss me, and I did not want to disappoint them.

I suggest the department of Travel and Publicity ascertain the locations of these havens in the North, and make the information available to people in this country, as well as in others. The main thing I want to say is, that we should utilize our own channels of publicity to popularize what we have to offer, to our own people, and to encourage them to make use of these opportunities, not to set our sights on the American tourist.

I note, Mr. Chairman, the figures from Ottawa seem to indicate that, despite all the good work we do in Ontario and Quebec, as well as in other provinces, we are scarcely holding our own, and that Canadians spend more vacation money in the United States than Americans spend in Canada. That is another aspect which the hon. Minister might bear in mind when considering the feasibility of increasing publicity work among our own people.

Vote 178 agreed to.

Vote 179, Publicity Branch, Salaries, \$17,000.

On Vote 179, "Advertising, publicity and promotion, \$370,800," item No. 4.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): The hon. Minister correctly stated this is the greatest spending item

in his Estimates. I wonder if it would be possible to break that item down into several separate items. There are at least 15 separate items in the list as it is here, but the total has not been broken down into separate amounts. Would it not be possible, in future years, to break down this expenditure, so that hon. members will have a better idea as to where the money is going?

HON. MR. CECILE: I have here a few more detailed figures. For instance, in the United States magazines, we have spent \$135,000. That is for *Holiday* magazine, and others of that description. For space in United States newspapers on a national scale, we have spent \$40,000. For Canadian periodicals, newspapers and so on, \$53,000; for radio, \$10,000. That is the break-down.

MR. OLIVER: Can the hon. Minister tell me what advertising agencies are used by his department, and the amounts each received from the department?

HON. MR. CECILE: Last year, Mr. Chairman, we were dealing with three agencies — the Locke Agency, dealing with all the Canadian work; the work with the United States magazines was done through McKim's, and the United States newspaper work was handled by McConnell Eastman.

MR. OLIVER: I notice that one advertising agency last year received \$104,000. It looks as if we are channeling these amounts in one direction.

HON. MR. CECILE: Bookkeeping is the main item. I would be a very happy person if I had only one agency to deal with. It so happened we started with two or three, and although I am not sure, I may be "stuck" with another one this year. We are trying to spread this out as much as we can, but it is very difficult for the staff. I would much prefer to have one, but we set out to deal with a few, and have continued to do so.

MR. OLIVER: What proportion of the hon. Minister's budget is spent on advertisements in the United States?

HON. MR. CECILE: Here are the figures, as I gave them a few moments ago: For United States magazines, \$135,000; for newspapers, \$40,000 and for radio, \$10,000.

MR. OLIVER: How much would be spent in Ontario on advertising?

HON. MR. CECILE: I have not got the Ontario figures. But \$53,000 was spent, I think, on Canadian periodicals, mostly in Ontario and Quebec.

MR. OLIVER: The amount spent on advertising in Ontario would be quite small in comparison with the other figures?

HON. MR. CECILE: Yes. Although I might say here in Ontario my staff and I have been attending every possible social function. We have attended meetings of Chambers of Commerce, and other gatherings of that kind, and we have been doing more by word of mouth than by advertising in magazines and newspapers.

MR. OLIVER: I noticed, at their convention last month, the resort operators passed a resolution asking the government to reinstate the grade system for such premises. Is the hon. Minister entertaining the idea of doing that?

HON. MR. CECILE: We have continued our research into this matter. One or two of the associations — I do not think there is really more than one — are pressing the matter, but not too seriously. We have come to find out, from all we have heard in Ontario, that different establishments of all descriptions, hotels, motels and so on, are glad we are out of it.

We are entertaining no idea of going back to grading at the present time.

MR. OLIVER: You have no present idea of re-entering the field?

HON. MR. CECILE: No.

On Vote 180.

MR. OLIVER: On 180: Would the hon. Minister tell us how many of these reception centres he has now, and if any

new ones have been opened during the past year?

HON. MR. CECILE: We have 14 at the present time. We have not opened any for the last 3 or 4 years.

MR. OLIVER: Do you plan on opening any new ones this year?

HON. MR. CECILE: No.

Vote 180, Information Branch, \$150,100, agreed.

On Vote 181, Development Branch, \$154,300.

On item 181.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the fact that I have received a number of complaints from a great many people, and these complaints would seem to be legitimate. They are to the effect that hotels and motels in the province end their guest day at odd hours. In some hotels, the guests are told to get out by 12 o'clock or they will be charged an extra day. In some motels, so I have been told, the guests are notified that a day ends at 11 o'clock, and if they are not out by that time, they will have to pay for another day.

I suggest it is not very fair treatment to give to anyone who may come to a hotel or motel at midnight, register, pay for a day, and then be asked to pack up and leave at 11 o'clock in the morning.

I would suggest we amend the Tavern and Hotelkeepers Act to establish a universal time for guests to check out of hotels and motels, so that people will know the day ends at 5 o'clock, or 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock. I purposely leave out any mention of leaving at 11 o'clock in the morning, because I think it is unreasonable and unfair. I do not think it helps attract people to these places again. Generally, I think it is bad practice, and something should be done by the government to have this situation corrected.

HON. MR. CECILE: Mr. Chairman, all I can say about that is, that check-out times vary all over the con-

tinental; there is a wide variation in Canada, the United States, and in other places of which I know.

As far as we are concerned, we have received very few, if any, complaints on this score. However, hon. members must realize that some of these hotels and motels are not very largely staffed, and they need time to do their washing, cleaning, and what have you. I believe that the earliest I have noticed was 10.30 in the morning, in some motels and motor-courts.

MR. SALSBERG: 10.30 in the morning?

HON. MR. CECILE: Yes: In most places it is around 12 o'clock.

In the larger hotels, of course, it depends largely upon the train schedules. There are so many variations across the country, that I very much doubt if we could pass legislation which would serve any good purpose.

MR. SALSBERG: There is no question but what we "could" pass legislation, but the question is, "should we?"

If the government does not care to amend the Act, I would suggest the hon. Minister, who has a great deal of influence amongst the people in this field, should consult with them, and ask them to put it on their agenda for a conference at some future time, and let the matter be discussed there with a view of fixing uniform hours for checking out, which would put an end to this present situation. I certainly suggest that 10.30 o'clock in the morning or 11 o'clock, or even 12 o'clock, is altogether too early, for travellers, particularly motorists, who may arrive at a hotel at midnight, and it is unfair to ask them to leave at 10.30 in the morning.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): There is the other side of the picture, Mr. Chairman. People are waiting to get the accommodations.

Vote 181 agreed to.

Vote 182, Photography Branch, \$27,500, agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to hold one vote in order

that it may be dealt with when the budget is passed, if that eventuality occurs. However, should there be any discussion on that vote, it might be well to have it now.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the department has vacated the present premises previously occupied by the Rental Control Board on Lombard St. in Toronto.

HON. MR. CECILE: Mr. Chairman, the premises on Lombard St. which we occupied were federal premises, and by an arrangement between the Federal Government, the City of Toronto, and ourselves, we have now vacated it altogether.

HON. MR. FROST moves that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. D. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions, and moves for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 8

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Notice of Motion No. 8. Hon. Mr. Frost moves the following resolution:

That a Select Committee of the House be appointed to examine existing legislation and practice in relation to the registration of conditional sales contracts and similar documents of title and pledge, particularly in connection with motor vehicles, and to consider ways of providing for a central registry for the said documents, and for the issuance of certificates of title of ownership of motor vehicles.

And that the Select Committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons,

papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The said committee to consist of nine members, and to be composed as follows: Messrs. Macaulay (chairman), Warrander, Myers, Cathcart, Robarts, Letherby, Jolley, Grummett and Chartrand.

Resolution agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in referring to this motion, may I say that the changing conditions of business in the province is such that the old system of registering conditional sales is out-dated. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has given some consideration to the problem this year, and it was felt it was a matter which could very properly be referred to a Select Committee, and the matter of the registration of the instruments mentioned in this resolution could be the subject of consideration, tending toward a betterment of the situation, from that which exists at the present time.

In former days, documents of this sort were registered in local offices, which practice pretty well met the situation as it existed then. Now, the chattel which might be the subject matter of a conditional sale contract, might be in another part of the province 6 weeks hence. I am referring particularly to transactions concerning the sales of second-hand cars. A car might be purchased in Toronto, and be sold in Wingham, or some other place.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 9

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. Frost moves the following resolution:

That a Select Committee of the House be appointed to study all phases of the plan of organization and methods of operation in the Fort William

Division of the Department of Highways, and in any other divisions of the said department that the committee deems necessary, and to investigate any irregularities or irregular practices in such divisions, and to recommend such improvements in the organization and administrative practices of the Department of Highways which the committee considers necessary to meet the growing volume of work of the department throughout the province.

And that the Select Committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The said committee to consist of 11 members, and to be composed as follows: Messrs. Roberts (chairman), Porter, Beckett, Mapledoram, Collings, Janes, Herbert, Dent, Oliver, Wren and Grummett.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, this would seem to be an opportunity for the hon. Prime Minister to bring us up to date, as far as he can, in regard to this whole matter.

This motion is for the appointment of a committee which will sit after this session has concluded its work, and it may be some weeks after.

I would suggest, first of all, to the hon. Prime Minister, that the committee should meet as soon as possible after the session, and I do seriously say to the hon. Prime Minister that tonight he should be in a position to give us some information relative to the investigations carried on thus far, and he might be able to say, too, something concerning a matter which seems to be bothering the minds of the public, as well as my own in this regard, which has to do with the

list of contractors whose books have been seized by the government.

As I understand the situation, there were two contractors doing work in that particular area, whose books were not seized. It seems a rather unusual procedure to assume that the books of certain contractors should be seized, and the books of similar companies not to be so seized, and I think the hon. Prime Minister could well elaborate on that tonight.

I think, also, it might be said that one of these contractors had very large contracts in that area, and when it came to the question of inflating the amount of material—and I think there has been a great deal of that done—I think an investigation will show this one company was engaged in that type of work, just as much as the others were.

The only thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is this—and I think the hon. Prime Minister will perhaps follow me in this argument—that we have now had the books of these contractors under seizure for some weeks, and it would seem the ends of justice would be served if we expedited whatever we have against these particular companies, and if we brought the ones we considered guilty before the bar of justice, and re-instated those against whom there appears to be nothing of a substantial character.

The hon. Prime Minister will recognize we are holding back huge sums of money from these contractors, and it may well be that in the process of these procedures, some contractors may be very financially worried and embarrassed in this regard. I do not think that is the purpose of the investigation. If there are contractors who are guilty in this matter, then let us speed our cases against them, but let those who are not guilty get back to the business of contracting.

HON. MR. FROST: I am very glad to reply to the questions raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

This committee I quite agree should meet as soon as possible. I may say when the House met, the investigation

had been carried on for some months, going back to about the beginning of September. I will say quite frankly to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that I felt, when the House met on the 11th of February, we would be in a position to give to the Public Accounts Committee a statement of the situation, and the problems involved. At that time there were charges preferred against certain individuals, and I felt—as did my advisors, and the Provincial Auditor—that the matter would be in such a position that a statement could be made to the Public Accounts Committee without, of course, prejudicing the trials of those who were charged.

I can say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and to the other hon. members of the House, the investigation which has been conducted has been a tremendous affair, full of most unusual difficulties, and I can say that without any exaggeration whatsoever.

In one of the press statements, it was said it involved irregularities in engineering data, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) will see the problem which arises in checking into those matters, and particularly with some of the conditions which have had to be met, for instance, snow on the ground, which has meant there has been much greater time consumed than was felt would be necessary in the first place.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Prime Minister mind my asking this? He refers to the great amount of checking; is this firm checking in other than Fort William? It is it checking, for instance, in the Blind River division, or in any other division?

HON. MR. FROST: The investigation has not been confined to one division, though I will be quite frank with the House, in saying that the centre point of the difficulty is in the one division. Nevertheless, the investigation has not been confined to that one division, it has been an investigation which has been and will continue to be fully conducted.

In connection with search warrants:

it must be remembered the so-called "seizure of books," by the government, which the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, is not actually correct. These are search warrants which have been issued for reasonable and probable cause. I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will agree that is the right way to put it. A search warrant would not be issued by the courts simply as "fishing expeditions" which could cover every contractor in Ontario. They were issued because the magistrate was satisfied there was reasonable and probable cause for the issuance of such a warrant.

As far as expediting these proceedings is concerned I am quite in agreement with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. It is not the intention of the law enforcement officers, or anybody else connected with this matter, to hold out any books or records, or to hold up amounts which are payable to persons or corporations, where there does not appear to be any justification for so doing. I think the purpose is to get things moving along as quickly as possible.

To say the investigation has been completed would be incorrect, but I would say, sir, that great progress has been made in the past few weeks in connection with this matter, and we think the whole situation will be clarified for the committee and for others who are interested in the investigation of this matter, within the next couple of weeks.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister one further question, if he does not mind? He says the fact that warrants were issued for the seizure of books indicates that the feeling was there was something wrong with those particular companies' operations.

HON. MR. FROST: I would prefer to put it that there were reasonable and probable causes for making an investigation.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, that may be, but what I am trying to find out from the hon. Prime Minister is this: does the fact that warrants were not issued for the seizure of the books of these 2 par-

ticular companies, which were left out up there, indicate that they were tested and found to be all right? Are they "in the clear"?

HON. MR. FROST: Not necessarily. These warrants are not issued promiscuously. They are issued for reasonable and probable cause. I have no idea as to who the persons or corporations, which the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentions were not included, were, and I would not ask him. I do not think that would be fair. I would say, however, if there were not proceedings taken by way of search warrants, then there did not appear to be the reasonable and probable causes which would justify the issuance of such warrants.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the government? The last time I raised the question about the chief engineer of the department, I was told, and the House learned, that he was still out of the country, and that the department was very anxious to have him make himself available for questioning, and for co-operation in the investigation.

Since then, the newspapers have reported that he has returned, and, according to the statement of his counsel, Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., he is available, but no one has asked him to appear anywhere or to answer questions, or to be questioned. In fact, it sounded to me like a challenge from his counsel to the government to come and ask him whatever they want to ask him, and that the man is here.

I wonder if the government would care to enlighten the House on this.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I can enlighten the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) nor the House. I do not want to comment on newspaper statements here. I note the person mentioned is back here, and I think the matter had better be left there for the time being, and leave it to the law officers of the Crown, and others to deal with the matter.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I think that covers everything at the moment on the Order paper. Tomorrow, there will be third readings of the bills on the Order paper, following which will be addresses in relation to the budget, and I should hope, sir, that at about 3.30 o'clock tomorrow, we shall arrive at the point where a Vote on the budget may be taken.

I am sorry that tomorrow morning there is a meeting of the Lands and Forests Committee at 10 o'clock, but in order to complete the proceedings of the House, so that the Vote can be taken by 3.30 o'clock, and then the formalities of the Supply Bill, and the prorogation, it is imperative that tomorrow the House meet at 10.30. I think on this occasion, the House and the committee will have to sit concurrently for a time at least. I do not know whether the chairman of the Committee on Lands and Forests would care to call the committee a half an hour earlier, at 9.30, but in any event, sir, I should like to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when the House adjourns the present sittings thereof, it do stand adjourned to meet at 10.30 o'clock in the forenoon tomorrow, to rise for noon recess at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, and resume at 2 o'clock in the afternoon; and that the proceedings of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion.

MR. OLIVER: Is it understood that the Lands and Forests Committee will sit concurrently with the House?

HON. MR. FROST: I think that is the only way.

MR. OLIVER: I was under the impression we had to have a motion of some kind to that effect?

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we put this motion first, and then discuss the matter?

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been advised that the understanding as given to the chairman of the Committee on Lands and Forests was that, if the House wished to meet at 10.30 tomorrow

morning, the committee would not be called. However, if the House wishes to grant authority for the Lands and Forests Committee to meet concurrently with the sitting of the House, I think that would be in order.

HON. MR. FROST: I think, Mr. Speaker, that motion should be made. I move the Committee on Lands and Forests be authorized to sit tomorrow morning concurrently with the sitting of the House. That I think, will meet the situation, and if it wants to continue, it may do so, and if not, it might adjourn.

I am sorry; I should have added "at 10 o'clock."

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, the notice given

to hon. members states 10.30. Maybe the hon. Prime Minister misunderstood the notice.

HON. MR. FROST: I thought it was 10 o'clock.

MR. GRUMMETT: The notice of meeting stated 10.30.

HON. MR. FROST: Better leave the motion at 10.30.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is for 10.30 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.15 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Morning Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 6, 1954.

Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1256
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, third reading	1256
Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, bill respecting, third reading	1256
Theatres Act, 1953, bill to amend, third reading	1256
Legislative Assembly Act, bill to amend, third reading	1256
Election Act, 1951, bill to amend, third reading	1257
Voters' Lists Act, 1951, bill to amend, third reading	1257
Controverted Elections Act, bill to amend, third reading	1257
Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario, bill to promote, third reading	1257
Municipal Act, bill to amend, third reading	1257
Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Act, 1943, bill to amend, third reading	1257
Raising of Money on Credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund, bill to authorize, third reading	1257
Resumption of Debate on the Budget Address, Mr. Elliott, Mr. Arthur Frost, Mr. Sandercock, Mr. Beech	1257
Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Chartrand, agreed to	1269
Recess, 12 noon	1269

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1954.

10.30 O'CLOCK A.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, may I point out to the hon. members of the House that on each desk is a printed copy of the Budget Statement, including the schedules. This comprises some 93 pages. I think it is very interesting, as it contains important references to the affairs of Ontario.

We felt if it were possible this year to have the address and schedules printed and supplied to each hon. member, it would afford them an opportunity, at their leisure, to look over the figures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file answers to questions 47, 58 and 42.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he will have answers to the balance of the questions?

HON. MR. FROST: I hope so. There are some questions there, which, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition

knows, refer to certain proceedings which have been taken. I think some of these could be made Orders for Return, and referred to the Select Committee.

In the meantime, there will be further answers given this afternoon, and any which remain may be made Orders for Return.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I wish to rise to express my thanks to an anonymous, but evidently very public-spirited citizen who sent me a very nice attractive copy of *Alice in Wonderland*. I found it in my letter box this morning, and have since learned that some other hon. members of the House have also received copies. The sender is obviously not only public-spirited, but of a literary flair, who seems to be very close to the House, because my package had no postage stamps attached. It was obviously deposited in the post office below, on the understanding it would be distributed to the hon. members.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, the anonymous, public-spirited citizen had the book open at pages 24 and 25, and inserted a typewritten page which starts with a line from Milton's *Paradise Lost*, "Confusion Worse Confounded." That is followed by a line which reads: "Profound Study of the Present Session of the Legislature."

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): He must have been reading the speeches by the hon. member for St. Andrew.

MR. SALSBERG: Page 25 contains the dialogue between Fury and the Mouse, which reads as follows:

Such a trial, dear sir, with no jury or judge would be wasting our breath.

I'll be the judge, I'll be the jury, said cunning old Fury, I'll try the whole case, and condemn you to death.

I think it is a very valuable gift, and a very appropriate designation of the session now about to close. I did not want that action to go unnoticed, and I certainly want to extend to the anonymous sender, my very sincere thanks for a very nice copy of *Alice in Wonderland*.

HON. MR. PORTER: Perhaps it was the "fictitious Mrs. Smith."

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General is a patron of the arts, and should know something about it.

HON. MR. FROST: There is a resolution which must be dealt with. I move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

HON. MR. FROST: I beg to inform the House that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK:

Mr. Frost (Victoria): resolution that, (a) the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council be authorized to raise from time to time by way of loan such sum or sums of money as may be deemed expedient for any or all of the following purposes; for the public service, for works carried on by commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for discharging any indebtedness or obligation of Ontario, or for reimbursing the Consolidated Revenue Fund for

any moneys expended in discharging any such indebtedness or obligation, and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Legislature; provided that the principal amount of any securities issued and sold for the purpose of raising any loan authorized, together with the amount of any temporary loans raised, to the extent that such temporary loans are from time to time outstanding or have been paid from the proceeds of securities issued and sold for the purpose of such payment, shall not exceed in the whole \$100 million; and

(b) such sum or sums may be raised in any manner provided by The Provincial Loans Act or The Financial Administration Act, 1954, and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and shall be chargeable thereupon,

as provided by Bill No. 142, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

Resolution agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report a certain resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House reports it has come to a certain resolution.

Report adopted.

The following bills were read a third time, and passed as intituled in the motions:

Bill No. 5, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill No. 78, An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly.

Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Theatres Act, 1953.

Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Bill No. 136, An Act to amend The Election Act, 1951.

Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Voters' Lists Act, 1951.

Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.

Bill No. 139, An Act to promote Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario.

Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 141, An Act to amend The Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Act, 1943.

Bill No. 142, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

House in Committee of Supply.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. R. E. ELLIOTT (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, I am going to attempt to give you a picture today as chairman of the Travel and Publicity Committee, of some of the problems they have in the tourist industry in the Province of Ontario. We have now had 3 meetings with the different organizations in Ontario that are responsible for promoting the tourist business and caring for tourists while in Ontario.

The first submission was from the Northern Great Lakes Area Council, presented by Art Widnall, president. This group is composed of representatives from Michigan, Wisconsin, Province of Ontario and Minnesota. In other words, this group—through the department here in Toronto—have met with the 3 states named, and have pooled part of their advertising on an equal basis. As you know, people travelling are probably interested in visiting this province, and the ads promote travel within the 3 states and the Province of Ontario. In the past years each member has contributed \$5,000 apiece to the advertising matter. Michigan, Wisconsin and the Province of Ontario have agreed to increase the advertising to \$10,000 a year and they hope to get Minnesota to do likewise but—up to now—with no result.

I will give a picture of the advertising done by this group. This is a magazine called *Holiday* which is sold all over Canada and the United States, for 50c. a copy, and is solely issued for holidays, and the advertisements are distributed to promote holidays all over the world.

There is one here from the United States Airlines, which cost \$8,000. There is one from South America, for \$16,000, money spent in an endeavour to get people to go to South America.

There is one from the State of Oregon, for \$8,000. One from Europe, for \$8,000.

MR. SALSBERG: Who spent \$8,000?

MR. ELLIOTT: This is the ad by the Province of Ontario, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, for \$16,000, the share of the cost to the Province of Ontario amounting to \$5,000.

They are asking for an additional \$5,000, in order to increase the advertising in this magazine.

Mr. Widnall is president of the association and serves without remuneration.

The next brief we had was from F. W. Butler, Ontario Tourist Courts Association. They are principally the motel operators and have a very fine organization. They are very interested in the Legislative Committee of the Travel and Publicity Department establishing a liason with the Department of Highways so that co-operation can be increased between the 2 bodies.

This association has thought that the licencing of establishments should be carried out from a central authority and removed from the hands of sometimes disinterested and often, greedy municipalities making financial gain for their own coffers in their licencing powers.

Tourist operators' licences under the Tourist Establishments Act are issued at \$5 each and there is no change anywhere throughout the province. In unorganized townships and villages the licencing is done by inspectors from the Department of Travel and Publicity. In cities and towns the licencing is done

by municipal clerks. There can be no objection to this.

There is a little error there.

The tourist operating licences are, under the Act, established by the department, and each licence is distributed, at a cost of \$5. When it comes to the municipalities, where they are incorporated, and have tourist establishments, they come under the municipal clerk.

They are complaining about the business assessment which, as hon. members know, has nothing to do with the department in any way, shape or form.

They suggest a Select Committee should be appointed to look into the complaints to see if something cannot be done.

Mr. Butler in the brief from his association is referring to business licences which are issued by municipalities which come under the jurisdiction of the Municipal Board and the Department of Municipal Affairs. Business licencing in a municipality is not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Travel and Publicity, but a Select Committee on the tourist industry could look into the complaint of unequal municipal business licencing fees.

As you know, we had a three-star grading system and this organization—the Ontario Tourist Courts Association—is much pleased that the government grading has been finally shelved, and approve this action. They claim the developments of the year 1953 and at present are proving that the forces of free enterprise are solving the grading situation in a more relentless and thorough manner than any government body could have done, and at no cost to the taxpayers.

They do, however, wish government help. They highly commend the Department of Travel and Publicity in assisting tourist operators. For example, the short study courses operated by the department. They would like to see this practice continued and expanded. Education of operators in all phases of the business and the general public in the value of the industry can benefit everyone in the province. Two

such courses are scheduled in April at Niagara Falls and Kingston.

They believe that travel is beneficial to the promotion of goodwill between Canada and the United States. They believe that the tourist industry of Ontario should compete in a fair and healthy way, to persuade people of this province of the virtue of seeing their own province first and of establishing the habit of holidaying in Canada.

For the past year the department has enlarged their scope of operation and are doing a great deal to try and educate our people to use Ontario for holidaying. The Canadian Tourist Association have started pushing an inter-provincial theme in their advertising and this department is co-operating in every known way.

Two years ago the department prepared a French language colour advertising short with the hon. Mr. Cecile doing the invitation and narration and this is still running in Quebec theatres.

The Department of Highways—through Mr. Doucett—also has a French language short running in Quebec theatres, inviting them to use our highways and the various facilities connected therewith.

The next submission was from the Canadian Trailer Court Association.

The Canadian Trailer Association want trailer parks but are not recommending that the Department of Travel and Publicity go into the mobile home park business. They full appreciate the department's function as providing a promotional and publicity service to the province, but the mobile home travel industry is growing rapidly in the United States and Canada and the demand for new parking facilities is also growing rapidly.

They suggest there is one contribution which this committee could make which would improve the situation—and incidentally make better use of the expenditures of the Department of Travel and Publicity—and that would be to recommend that a Select Committee of the Ontario Legislature be appointed to investigate the mobile home

parking facilities of the Province and the potential revenue that could be derived from mobile home vacationists.

The experience of big municipalities in the past has been very bad in connection with Trailer Park situations and has ended up in some cases in a slum condition. What they are thinking about and what they have in mind is developing parks—not in the big or large municipalities—but in park establishments that would have water and full drainage supplied to these mobile homes so they could be run on a basis equal to the camps in the southern United States. They state there is no doubt but that this would bring tourist money to this province if properly organized.

The Department of Highways is at present operating—and has been operating for a number of years—70 parks where mobile homes may stop over night or for a longer period. In addition, there are several operated by the Department of Lands and Forests and referring to the remarks of hon. George Chaffies made in this House last week, no doubt there will be several more in the near future.

Granted, the Ontario Parks are not as elaborate as most in the southern part of the United States. As our season is much shorter a great deal of investigation would be necessary before authorizing expenditure of the considerable amount of money required for the unit type installation in any of our parks.

The next deputation was the Canadian Restaurant Association represented by Mrs. F. G. Montgomery.

The Canadian Restaurant Association has a membership of 1350 with 550 in the Province of Ontario and are most interested in anything to do with Travel and Publicity.

One of the things they suggested, was the relaxation of regulations regarding female help working after two o'clock in the morning. They find that in the United States, they are able to use female help right through the night and there doesn't seem to be too much complaint there. They feel that this would

help considerably in properly serving food from 11 o'clock at night to 7 in the morning.

The Restaurant Association are interested in a Canadian cuisine and the Department of Travel and Publicity have done all in their power over the last 8 years—to promote the use of a Canadian cuisine and have published and distributed a recipe book entitled "100 to Dinner," yet the restaurants themselves still list "Virginia Ham" and "Southern Fried Chicken."

Another thing they stress is an amendment to the Liquor Licence Act, permitting licencing privileges to towns and cities of 20,000 to 25,000 on the same basis as the present 50,000 population centres.

The restaurant owners claim that never in the history of the restaurant business has the common fly and mosquitoes been so well controlled as by the use of Lindane, until new regulations in 1954 prohibit the use of this very effective chemical. Our public health officials—so far—have not suggested anything to take its place. They claim that this chemical is injurious to the patrons and also the help, and that is why it has been outlawed. However, the Department of Health is working very hard on this and I am sure advice to the tourist operators and restaurant owners will be forthcoming very shortly.

The restaurant owners in the large cities where gasoline is not sold in service stations after 7 o'clock at night, claim it hurts the restaurant business. People frequently like to leave their cars at a gas station to get gas and have it serviced while they eat, and in these municipalities the restaurant business has been injured tremendously.

They feel a Select Committee should look into their problems.

The Association of Tourist Resorts of Ontario was represented by their president, Mr. Reg. Handscomb.

The main beef of this association is that they would like to see signs along the highways directing tourists to the tourist establishments. This is one of the points where they claim the Highway Department does not agree. The

Travel Department is working very closely with the Department of Highways, whether something can or will be done, we cannot say at the present time. The Department of Highways have stated that it is difficult to get all the various tourist associations to agree on regulations for direction signs on the highway.

The next brief we had was from the Hotel Association of the Province of Ontario presented by Mr. Roy Corbett, managing-director.

They claim that up to now, they have had the very best co-operation from the Department of Travel and Publicity, but they have so many problems that they feel a Select Committee of the House should be set up to look into the whole problem of the tourist industry and they would like to have discussions once a month with this committee.

This has now been asked for by all the interested Associations that are catering to the tourist trade in Ontario.

A brief was submitted to our Committee by Dorothy Drever, Chairman of the Museum's Committee of the Ontario Historical Society. This Society suggested that support should be given to groups and municipalities to assist in the improvement, extension and building of museums throughout Ontario. The Nature Museum at Algonquin Park, for example, in the first year of operation was visited by 52,000 tourists. Fort Henry rebuilt by the Department of Highways have over 150,000 paid admissions during a season.

Assistance in this matter could only be considered after investigation with Community Programmes Branch of the Department of Education and possibly Municipal Affairs so that there would not be any unnecessary overlapping. Again, I can only point out that a Select Committee would be the body to go into this type of investigation.

On March 5th in this House the honourable member from Woodbine referred to the great numbers of people that go to the southern United States on vacations during the winter. He pointed out that something should be done to en-

deavour to bring people to Collingwood and other Ontario ski centres and to also keep Ontario residents home in Ontario for a winter vacation rather than having them go out of the country.

The Department of Travel and Publicity has done much during the past 7 years toward the promotion of winter vacations in the province. Schools to train ski instructors were operated to provide a nucleus of instructors for the lodges and ski areas and to provide instruction at the many Ontario clubs to help create more and better skiers who could then consider a winter holiday.

Potential ski terrains have been inspected by department staff and decisions made whether ski installations would have a chance of success. Many of the ski tows operating in the province today have been designed or re-designed by department staff.

Part of the department expenditure for advertising has been directed toward potential winter tourists. The department knows that tourists to the south in an area roughly from Rochester on the east to Chicago on the west are as close to adequate skiing by coming to Ontario as travelling in any other direction. They also know that people in New York and Boston and other areas in the east would have to pass better skiing installations than we can offer in Ontario.

Many of the installations in the United States have been built in national parks and state parks with national and state funds. Consideration of the suggestion by the hon. member from Woodbine that the "Government promote," could be studied by a Select Committee of the Legislature. The extension of the tourist industry into the spring and fall and especially the winter would be a prime consideration with such a committee.

We have a bulletin also from the Royal Bank of Canada. It is most interesting and I just want to point out one small section:—"Children in all grades in school might be given as a composition exercise, the writing of letters to their opposite numbers in the United States and in other parts of Canada. These

would describe the attractions of the children's environment and features of tourist interest, such as exhibitions."

This has already been done by the department in 1953 and proved very successful. Children sent copies of their letters to the department in either French or English, they were judged and prizes were awarded to the children for the best letters.

The Royal Bank also suggests that if a similar movement was set up by the Department of Education the children of our schools would have a first hand knowledge of the tourist industry.

With the fast travel of today we are in competition in Ontario with all travel bureaux in the United States, Hawaii, Jamaica, Cuba, Mediterranean, Europe, Africa, Japan, the British Isles and on and on. Here are a few suggestions.

An educational programme to stress to the general public the value of the tourist industry should be expanded. A paper or pamphlet should be sent throughout the province requesting everyone to improve the appearance of their houses, buildings, fences, barns, stables, grounds, etc. This would greatly add to the show window of Ontario. The rural area should be stressed as these are the people who often benefit the most from the tourist dollars. The more they eat, the more the farmer will have to produce and each year we have many more tourists than we have residents.

The Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture might set up competitions for the most improved farm building, the best township or village beautifying programme, etc. This may sound like a tremendous project, but we should seriously consider anything that would help an industry that brings close to \$300 million a year to Ontario.

As for touring in Ontario or Canada, I believe the farming country has more to offer than any other part of our country. Our cities today are very congested, and parking facilities for the modern automobile are very poor. So the country, in my opinion, offers a great opportunity. Now, if we can get our farmers to develop their buildings, in such a way that they will be a modern showplace,

there are hundreds of thousands of children in the cities in Canada and the United States who would just love to see, for instance, baby chicks, ducklings, geese, even baby porkers, cows, lambs, etc. In breeding seasons in Canada our farms could be one of the modern showplaces of our country.

I have seen this to some extent in my travels in Europe. I have never seen any sign of it in Canada or the United States, but in France, Holland and Belgium—particularly in Holland—there will always be a farm included in the tour from Rotterdam, Amsterdam, and The Hague. I spent a week in that country in 1948, and in each tour out of those cities we had the pleasure of visiting a farm. There were always some of the things I have mentioned to be seen, and to my surprise and amazement they pleased the touring public more than anything they had seen in the cities.

That is somewhat of a new thought in touring and developing, and you could call it even promotion, but I believe through the Department of Agriculture or Education farms could be set up for this purpose in and near our cities, and could be made showplaces for our tourists and our own people. They would become very profitable not only to our farmers but also to the general tourist business in our country.

Another thing that is shown, particularly in the last few years, is that tourists are not spending quite as much money as they used to do a few years ago. For instance, here is the figure in Nassau, in 1951: 200,000 tourists spent \$20,548,000. Almost 300,000 tourists in 1952 spent less than \$20 million. Now in the case of Ontario we find that we not only have a tremendous increase in tourists coming to Ontario each year but the number of tourist dollars spent in Ontario is increasing. In order to bring people to see us and to hold them so that they will come back to see us again and again, we must attempt to show them something. The most important thing we have to show is, I believe, our farms, and our farm show window could be the young animals and young poultry, plus a side show of some of

the vegetables, grains and other products which are produced on our farms.

It has been suggested by others of the committees that have presented briefs to us this year that a Select Committee of this Legislature be set up to work on tourist promotion and showmanship work for the Province of Ontario. It has also been moved and seconded in a meeting of our committee that this committee be set up. Now, I leave it with you, Mr. Prime Minister and members of this House, whether you feel this committee could be of any real value to this province. I, for one, feel that it could, and I believe we can increase our tourist dollars tremendously.

There have been thousands of dollars spent in the United States and even coming into Canada to get our people to go south in the summer. Can you imagine anyone being stupid enough to go south in the summer with our beautiful climate, lovely beaches, and so on? Here are some of the things we are up against. Here is a paper published in Chicago, with a whole section devoted to promotion of going south in the summer. Ads from Europe, ads from Hawaii, ads from Jamaica, Cuba, and a four-page ad from Florida, including this. (Demonstration.) This promotion cost the State of Florida, or its promotion organizations, over \$4,000, and yet the promoters found that over 5,000 people left to visit Florida in the summer within one week after this ad appeared. That ad appeared in all the cities and towns in the United States and also in Toronto and Montreal, and there is no doubt Canadians travel south in the summer. The state of Kentucky, for example, spends a million and a half dollars annually to promote travel; we only spend \$850,000, yet ours is much better than theirs. These advertisements appear every weekend, promoting travel all over the world; therefore, I say the tourist industry is becoming very competitive, and we will have to get to work if we are going to attract tourists to our province. This shows what promotion in newspapers, etc., can do. With the tremendous competition for

the tourist dollar in the world today, we must smarten up and educate our people to use our facilities in our own country, at least in the summertime.

MR. ARTHUR FROST (Bacondale): Mr. Speaker: It is a pleasant duty to congratulate the hon. the Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer on the presentation of his eleventh successive budget. His record here constitutes, I think, one which breaks new ground in the annals of this House.

For the incoming fiscal year which commenced last week, our provincial revenue on current account is placed at \$354 million. This is a big sum, much larger than was the case just a few years ago. But generous though these revenues may appear, they come from very few sources. The main items are: gasoline tax, and vehicle licences, \$108 million; lands and forests, \$17 million; liquor profits, \$36 million, sorry to say; succession duties, \$16 million, and revenue under tax rental agreements, \$141 million. There is, of course, considerable miscellaneous revenue which I need not detail.

We have no sales tax in Ontario as have many of the other provinces. The only nuisance tax—if that is the proper designation—which we have here is the hospitals tax related to amusements. This amounts to \$6 million a year—and it is used with many other millions in a good cause—that of helping maintain our general hospitals.

On the other hand we might glance at the federal budget. Here under Ottawa management there is a yearly expenditure of close to \$5 billion—and of this about \$2½ billion comes out of the Ontario taxpayer.

From our \$354 million or thereabouts, spent provincially, what do we get? About \$50 million goes for health expenditures—the maintenance of nearly 20,000 patients in mental hospitals—grants of \$20 million and more to general hospitals.

We contribute about \$60 million to education which is very worthwhile. We congratulate our Minister of Education for his excellent work.

Then we have developed one of the finest systems of provincial highways in North America—some 10,000 miles of paved highways and secondary roads comprising our system of King's Highways. Then we contribute about \$30 million a year in municipal road grants; as a matter of fact the province pays about 50 per cent. of the cost of maintaining some 60,000 miles of municipal roads.

Our Department of Public Welfare contributes more than \$26 million a year toward the job of caring for those who require state aid in greater or less degree. It was this government which adopted the policy of absorbing one-half of all capital and maintenance costs related to homes for the aged. It was this government which adopted the policy of paying 25 per cent. of all costs related to Children's Aid Societies.

The same department established a system of pensions for unemployables.

There have been vast improvements in the operation of the Department of Reform Institutions. As the Report of the Select Committee on Reform Institutions was implemented we shall have a system of reform institutions second to none. Salvage is an important element in commerce and industry. And is it not much more important when dealing with human beings? I think you will agree with me when I say that it is a most important duty of society.

Now let us glance at the very great growth of Hydro. In the 10 years from December, 1943 to December, 1953, the dependable peak capacity of Hydro's generating plants has been increased from 1,565,400 h.p. to almost 4 million h.p.—an increase of 147 per cent. During 1953 alone, an additional 320,710 h.p. was made available. During the next 3 years the Niagara developments will have another 1.6 million h.p., giving a total available supply of 5½ million h.p. by the end of 1956.

The hon. the Prime Minister pointed out the other day, 28,000 new rural consumers were supplied with electrical current during 1953. Incidentally, nearly \$10 million was spent by the Ontario Treasury for bonusing rural

lines. The cost of these lines, as you are aware is borne to the extent of 50 per cent. by the province as distinct from Hydro.

Hydro is one of the very great factors in the growth, in the development, and the prosperity of Ontario. And let me say this. If Hydro is of the utmost importance to Ontario, then Ontario is of the utmost importance to Hydro. The province lends its support and its credit to the upbuilding of one of the world's greatest public utilities.

Now let us glance at the picture from another angle. It may safely be said that Ontario taxpayers contribute something approaching \$2½ billions—billions, not millions—to the federal treasury. The individual or the corporation making what we call fairly big money, and not so big at that, contributes about 50 cents out of every dollar earned, to the Dominion Government. Yet, I know that government pays old age pensions, and family allowances.

Our provincial and municipal governments probably provide a dozen services of the utmost importance for every one which is performed by Ottawa. Yet Ottawa gets more than 78 cents of the Canadian tax dollar, leaving less than 22 cents for the provinces and the municipalities.

What governments pay for education, for health and hospitalization measures, for water supplies, for sewage disposal, for roads, streets and highways, for aid to agriculture, for Hydro, for Workmen's Compensation, and for a hundred other items of the utmost importance in our daily lives? You know the answer as well as I do.

We need today a new distribution of duties and responsibilities. We need a new tax deal all around. In the meantime, I think we all realize that our municipal governments are those which are most in need of help. Provincially, we recognize their needs. As has been pointed out we are paying from our Provincial Treasury to the municipalities about \$130 million a year to say nothing of the per capita grants authorized at our last session. The most any

former government ever paid in this connection was about \$18 million a year. These comparisons speak for themselves.

Our provincial credit stands at an all time high. Our debt is well within proper bounds.

About 65 per cent. of incoming immigration comes to Ontario. Our population has passed the 5 million mark. Surely we can conclude that Ontario's horizon was never brighter than today.

I should like to commend the administration for one or two items that are of very real importance to this city and in fact the whole metropolitan area.

We have out on Queen Street a large mental hospital planned by, and built under direction of John Howard more than 100 years ago. Mr. Howard as you will recall, donated High Park to the City of Toronto, and his home and his grave in the same park are visited yearly by thousands of our people. Rebuilt in recent years, the hospital is still regarded as a sound institution, well designed, well built and serving well its purpose. It is all very well to build new institutions out in the country but they bring about transportation and housing problems, and are inconvenient from the standpoint of visitors. I am very glad to know that there will shortly be built at the Queen Street institution a modern, 100-bed unit for diagnostic and early treatment purposes. It will be a welcome addition to an institution which is continuing to render good service to the people of this city.

I should also mention with warm approval the declared intention of the Department of Highways to assist in the construction of a new bridge at the Humber. This most important entrance to the city of Toronto at present constitutes one of the worst bottlenecks in our highways and streets system. I hope the Metropolitan authority will soon have their plans advanced to the point where they will be able to take advantage of the fair and generous offer of our provincial administration.

I should also congratulate the hon. the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in pressing forward the work on the interceptor road or by-pass being constructed to the north of this city. This huge project which involves the purchase of much costly land and a major construction problem, will tend to remove through traffic from our crowded city streets. As for traffic destined to enter the city it will tend to route such traffic fairly directly to its ultimate destination, affording still further relief.

The terrific and increasing registration of motor vehicles in this whole huge, but congested area, will continue to pose many problems for our civic, our metropolitan and our provincial authorities. I am sure that their energy and co-operation will enable them to meet and solve these various problems without unnecessary delay.

I again congratulate the hon. the Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer on bringing down a constructive Budget in keeping with the times through which we are passing. I hope that his efforts and the efforts of the Prime Ministers of our other provinces, seconded by the efforts of our municipal governments, will in the near future bring about a new deal as to spheres of responsibility. Also, I hope that there may be an all round readjustment of taxation practices. I know of nothing better calculated to bring about a more prosperous Ontario and a greater Canada.

MR. E. SANDERCOCK (Hastings West): I should like to join with the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Frost), Mr. Deputy Speaker, in congratulating the hon. Prime Minister on bringing down so satisfactory a budget. I am sure that in my riding it was very popular. He captured the front page in connection with his announcement of further assistance to hospitals. Our hospital, like all others, was finding it a little hard to make ends meet, but this assistance brought it "out of the red," and all those concerned with its administration were very happy.

I represent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a riding of which we are all very proud. We have many things of which to be proud, but we have a few problems as well. I would say the major problem we have now is in connection with the completion of the by-pass road around Belleville. We are very happy when the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) decided to begin work on a by-pass, and we are looking forward to its completion in the not too distant future. The traffic problem in our district is very acute. The City of Belleville and the Town of Trenton are 10 miles apart, and the road connecting them is almost entirely built up. In addition, one of the largest air fields in the Dominion of Canada lies in between Belleville and Trenton. During rush hours, the roads are cluttered with miles of traffic, and it is almost impossible, apparently—according to what I am told—for some of the men who work in factories in the area to get out. They only have a limited time in which to go home for their noon meal, and the traffic is so heavy that they are often late in getting back to work. We are looking forward to the completion of the by-pass, because it will take traffic off this road, and relieve this congestion.

I should like to express my appreciation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the type of road which is being built. In the rocky section of the riding I represent, the road runs through solid high rock, and a great deal of credit is due the engineers and contractors who have carried out this work with such skill. They have done some remarkably good work, and great credit is due to all engaged in it.

Another question we face concerns accidents on the highways. In our district—and apparently it is the same all over the province—an alarming number of accidents have occurred at railroad crossings. We have had some very bad accidents at crossings in the riding I represent, and many of them occur at night. I think the Highways Department has done a marvellous job in protecting the main highways, but we have so many county and township

roads which are not protected, though now-a-days they carry a great deal of traffic. The danger is especially great at night. On foggy and rainy nights, when a motorist is driving with a low beam and following the white line—where there is a white line—it is easy to “sneak up” to a railway crossing. A train can be crossing there, and the motorist may strike it before he has a chance to stop his car. So many accidents have happened that way.

I have discussed this problem with the inspector of the provincial police, and he believes that effective use could be made of luminous paint, to help prevent these accidents on county and township roads. It only takes one train to kill you, and often the train is there. I believe, also, that the efforts of the Select Committee which has been set up to study this question, will do a great deal to ease this problem.

Belleville is a railroad town. I know almost all the railroad men, and they are all interested in the matter of protection which should be given to the public. I have often had the opportunity to ride to Belleville on the afternoon train. The distance is 115 miles, and they cover the distance in 1 hour and 58 minutes, and to see the cars come to a halt at the railroad crossings is, at times, a frightening experience. One would not think the train was going to stop in time. For the engineer it must be nerve-wracking, wondering whether the motor cars are going to stop in time or not. These railroad men at Belleville—most of them—have a most outstanding record of efficiency.

We have one man there who retired as an engineer last August after driving for 45 years up and down the main lines, and never had an accident. That is a record of which he is very proud, and I am sure citizens of this province should be proud of a man who can create a record of that kind.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like also to thank the Department of Education in connection with their school construction programme. In my own riding, since I have been a member of

this House, some 12 or 15 schools have been built, and they are a credit to the people of the communities, and to the province.

I was interested about two weeks ago when I came into the Chamber and saw a great many children, to whom the hon. Minister of Education was speaking, and he asked how many expected to be school teachers, and in one little group there were about 8 or 10 who held up their hands. I would certainly "go along" with him, in encouraging the young people to study for that profession. I, with a number of others, would be delighted, I am sure, to have more teachers, and I was very pleased at the step the department took in increasing the pension plan, and I am sure also, the teachers themselves are very happy about it. In fact, I have had several come to see me over the week-end, and they are giving the hon. Minister of Education of this province credit for a very forward step.

Another department of which we are very proud, and which a number of hon. members have mentioned, is the Department of Welfare. I listened very attentively when the hon. Minister of Welfare was speaking, and I have heard him speak at various places, and I agreed with him when he said he would advise the people to endeavour to help themselves, and not depend upon the government altogether. I think he is doing a wonderful piece of work in endeavouring to encourage organizations to co-operate with the Department of Welfare, such organizations as churches, lodges, service clubs, the Red Cross, and women's institutes, all of whom are doing a certain amount of welfare work. They are now, as they have been in the past, more welfare-minded, and such clubs as the Rotary have done a great deal to assist the children, and are doing a wonderful work in that connection.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is encouraging these clubs to do this work, and I think he is making a great contribution in advocating the necessity of these associations and organizations assisting, instead of

simply looking to the Department of Welfare for all assistance.

We have in the north the mining industry, which is going forward. We are very happy and proud of the development there.

In my riding, we have the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, and I have been very much interested in its programme, in the size of its operations, and the number of tons they expect to ship. When we look at the figures submitted by that company, we find they are really terrific. It is an open pit development, and the ore will be mined and processed there, raised to a higher grade, and shipped to Picton, where it will be loaded onto boats in pellet form, so it will lessen the danger of it freezing.

To give you some idea of the magnitude of the operations, they expect to spend over \$20 million before there is even one pound of ore shipped out.

In the Bancroft district, the uranium find there is a great boon to that district. I understand there are many claims being staked there, and the future looks very, very bright for mining uranium. Personally, I feel it is much better to see mine development where the ore is taken out of the ground, and only requires one hole to be dug in the ground, instead of having to keep cutting down trees, and lessening the natural resources in other ways. Mining is something which is undertaken in the ground, and does not deplete the resources nor destroy the surface of the surrounding country.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard references made to a number of members in the House, one of whom is the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I, for one, cannot see my way clear to ridicule him, and I hope he will carry on as the provincial Leader of the Opposition for many years to come.

The two hon. members of the CCF Party are very fine gentlemen. I have become very well acquainted with both of them.

In regard to the hon. member for St. Andrew; we have heard a great deal about his hay-fever, and listening to

him speaking this session, I had about come to the conclusion that he had forgotten it, but last night, he brought it up again.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): The hon. member was in the wrong department this year.

MR. SANDERCOCK: However, I hope he can secure some relief.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on the very efficient manner in which you conduct the affairs of this Legislature, and wish you well.

MR. W. G. BEECH (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all thank the hon. Prime Minister for his attendance at our function in York Township just recently, which occurred on a very stormy night, and on the night he was destined to leave for North Bay to attend the funeral of the late hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey). I think perhaps either one of those factors might have provided him with a good excuse, but he attended this function, and opened the auditorium for us, and I am very sure the people were deeply appreciative of his presence at that time.

I also want to thank the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) for introducing the amendment which will allow municipalities to grant some relief to those holding areas of municipal land, and I am certain it is the intention of the government to assist the municipalities in every way possible, consistent with the autonomy of those municipalities.

In rising to enter this Budget Debate may I first of all congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for again reporting to this House a substantial surplus. While there can be no doubt that the era of prosperity through which we are passing is in large measure responsible for these repeated surpluses, neither can it be disputed that good government has been a deciding factor in that prosperity.

The hon. Prime Minister is to be complimented on his happy faculty of

not allowing himself to be over optimistic and being stampeded into expenditures that could well reverse the fortunate position in which we now find ourselves.

It is always the unknown factors which upset the best of calculations, and that is why I was surprised when the member from Kenora (Mr. Wren) based his criticism of the Highways Department on the fact that some contracts had cost more than the original estimates. This often happens. The subway in Toronto, for instance, is a good example. The original Estimate was for \$29 million but the final figure will be closer to \$50 million but there has been no suggestion of wrongdoing in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed there has been no further report from the Committee on Provincial-Municipal relations. During the Budget Speech the hon. Prime Minister again mentioned the matter of a Dominion-Provincial Conference to discuss federal-provincial-municipal finances. We had hoped that such a conference would have been held last year. I sincerely hope that all this talk about an election this year will not prevent the hon. Prime Minister from pressing for this conference at the earliest opportunity. Certainly anything that can be done to bring it on this year will have the hearty support of every member of this House.

The hon. Prime Minister whilst speaking about redistribution mentioned the undesirability of disturbing historic ridings and associations of people. With this I heartily agree, and I am very much disturbed at the growing tendency of some municipalities to "gobble up" the best parts of other municipalities by annexation, and with the assistance of this Legislature. While there is no question of the authority, I wonder if we have the moral right to tell the people of Saltfleet Township they must live in Hamilton, or the people of London Township they must live in the City of London, regardless of whether they want to or not.

What would happen if the province of Quebec suddenly decided to annex

the rich mineral lands of Northern Ontario? Let us not forget that it was because Germany decided to annex her neighbours that we had World War II, and these annexations in our province are certainly causing disruption and bad feeling amongst the people of the municipalities affected.

There is little danger of annexations taking place amongst the provinces because their boundaries are defined and protected by the British North America Act and we must work out our destinies within the confines of those boundaries. Let us then place upon the Statute Books of this province an Act entitled the "Emancipation of Municipalities Act," define the boundaries of the municipalities and never let them be disturbed except by mutual agreement of the people concerned. Remember it is not size which will make a municipality great, but the united efforts of its happy and contented citizens.

I am sure all the municipalities appreciate very much the generous grants being paid by the province, but I wonder how many are satisfied, and if they will ever be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the day is not far distant when this province will give to the municipalities their charter of freedom. When it will no longer be necessary to have a Department of Municipal Affairs to watch over their every move. When the government shall say to them, "You are now on your own. You are a level of government the same as we, with your own responsibilities and the authority to raise money to carry out those responsibilities. From this day forward it will be your job to build roads and sidewalks, provide water and sewerage facilities, police and fire protection, hydro-electric and transportation services, and all those things which are strictly services to property."

The province in turn will supply those things that are strictly services to persons, such as education, health and welfare.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing original about this idea.

Every member in this House, regardless of Party, every newspaper regardless of politics, every municipal organization and every municipal council has asked for it. This year the province will pay between 45 and 50 per cent. of the total tax levy of the municipality. No one will dispute that roads are a municipal responsibility up to a size necessary to permit uninterrupted access to the properties facing on those roads, provide for delivery of goods, passage of fire-fighting equipment and to provide right of ways for water, sewers and other services. These roads are rightfully a charge against property and not directly against the owners of cars. Despite this we find the province making grants to maintain these roads. I suggest that the municipality should set the width of road necessary to provide the services to property and the province not pay towards the cost of these roads. However, if the width of the road needs to be increased to provide for traffic coming from provincial highways, then the province should pay the total cost of that extra width. Water supply can be made, as it already is in many municipalities self-sustaining, by charging rates against the users. Sewerage can also be made self-sustaining by charging the users either by a meter rate or a flat rate. Hydro is already self-sustaining, transportation should also be paid for by those who use it. I believe the municipalities should provide sufficient police and traffic officers to maintain law and order and to direct traffic on municipal roads, and this should be a charge against property, but I also believe that enforcement of the Criminal Code should be the responsibility of the province assisted by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Federal Government has no set-up for a Department of Municipal Affairs. Municipalities, it is recognized, are "a baby" of this province, and I think we must agree that those babies have now grown into pretty healthy children, and I think it is about time we cut off their allowance, set them up in business, and send them out to look after themselves,

with the government keeping a paternal eye on them.

In the matter of fire protection I had thought that the fire insurance companies should pay for the upkeep of local fire departments, but if the responsibility lay with them, the situation might develop when the department might only attend those fires where the property was insured.

I therefore suggest that tenants and owners alike be made to carry insurance and the proceeds from the premiums be used to cover losses and the cost of fire fighting and prevention.

It will be readily seen that if charges were made against property according to the cost of the services rendered to that property, it would do away with our vexatious assessment problems and the people who try to keep their places in good shape by an extra coat of paint would not find themselves penalized every time the assessor comes around.

The control of education rests now with the province and if we had the amount paid for municipal roads, fire and police, to what we are already paying for education, we will not be far off paying the full cost. Any additional help required for education, health and welfare of our people, should come from the Federal Government.

In the matter of health, it is a foregone conclusion that contributory insurance must be brought in and this if handled properly would help to eliminate the deficits in our hospitals. Let us, however, profit by the experience of the Unemployment Insurance which only collects from those liable to be unemployed. Have the health insurance paid for by everyone, and not only those who are likely to be sick or unable to pay.

The great work achieved by our Workmen's Compensation Act should be a good guide in setting up a plan of contributory health insurance.

Some criticism has been made of Bill 80 because of an anticipated increase in taxes across the Toronto area. In York

Township, it is anticipated there will be an increase of 25 per cent. because of the Metropolitan Council's spending. This is not a matter for Bill 80, but a matter for the members of the Toronto Metropolitan Council. There is a need for refinancing the cost of operating municipalities, until such time as the tax rate has been struck and the bills sent out, which adds very considerably to the tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that some steps be taken to allow municipalities to issue an interim tax bill based on a percentage of the anticipated tax levy. This should be done in January so that the municipalities could get some funds to carry on, instead of having to go to the banks to borrow money, at a decent rate of interest. I realize now there is some leeway allowed where the people can prepay their taxes, but I think we should have something more definite, so that the municipalities could get funds in time to enable them to carry on before the regular tax bills are sent out.

I do not wish to take up more of the time of this session, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate your patience while I harp upon this familiar theme. I have to differ from those who feel our government should all be centralized at Ottawa, and sincerely believe that Canada will progress according to the method in which the municipalities develop and prosper and this is only possibly by co-operation of all levels of government.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: I think the clock is a little slow.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 12 of the clock, I do now leave the Chair. The House will resume its sitting at 2 of the clock this afternoon.

The House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Fourth Legislature

Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Afternoon Session

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1954



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Resumption of Debate on the Budget, Mr. Morningstar, Mr. Chartrand, Mr. Dunbar	1273
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to	1288
Motion to Amend Budget Motion, Mr. Nixon, defeated	1288
Motion to Adopt Government Budget, agreed to	1289
Resolutions re Government Estimates, agreed to	1290
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Frost, agreed to ..	1295
Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums for Public Service, to March 31st, 1955, Mr. Frost, first, second, third readings	1295
Prorogation Speech, Lieutenant-Governor	1299
Prorogation	1302

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. M. C. DAVIES

Major Alex. C. Lewis, Q.C., Clerk

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1954.

2.00 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I ask you to revert to "Reports by committees" and then "Orders of the day"?

MR. SPEAKER: Reports by committees.

MR. ROBERT MACAULAY: I beg leave to present the minutes of the Standing Committee on Government Commissions and move they be printed as an appendix to the journal of the Legislature.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I desire to table answers to a number of questions: 33, 34, 44, 57, 10 and 45. Answers to questions 23, 26, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 39 refer to matters which are presently under investigation and should be referred to the Select Committee where they can be dealt with.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Prime Minister says they should be referred to the Select Committee. Does he mean there will be an Order for them to be referred?

HON. MR. FROST: I think that may be done.

MR. OLIVER: I think we should have an understanding on that.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): My question can hardly fall into that category.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, the hon. member has the floor.

MR. SALSBERG: My question stands on the Order paper as question 26 and can hardly be considered as coming in the category of which the hon. Prime Minister spoke. He speaks of things in the past which should be a matter of record, rather than things under advisement or currently in operation.

HON. MR. FROST: What question was that?

MR. SALSBERG: Question No. 26.

HON. MR. FROST: That is one of the answers just tabled.

MR. SALSBERG: It is tabled?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: I thought the hon. Prime Minister listed it with the group to be referred to the Select Committee a moment ago.

HON. MR. FROST: I must admit on casually looking over the question here, I do not see any reason why it should not be answered, but there will be an Order for Return in any event, and it will be taken care of in that way. I do not see any particular reason why it should not be answered.

MR. SALSBERG: That is the way I felt about it.

HON. MR. FROST: There is an Order for Return in any event, and the hon. member can get it that way.

MR. OLIVER: Am I correct in saying the questions which are on the Order paper have either been answered today or there will be an Order for Return made for the remaining ones, which will be made available before the Highways Committee when it convenes. Is that right?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. Before the Orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a matter to which the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) intended to refer. He is absent from the House today due to the fact that he is travelling by air, and was grounded because of weather conditions, and is therefore prevented from being here this afternoon, unless, in the meantime, the weather improves, and he is able to get here.

I should like to refer to this week, April 4th to 10th which is National Wildlife Week. This week is widely recognized in Canada; as a matter of fact, it is the subject of special programmes this week, and it is a week which is directed to arousing the conscience of the people to the desirability of preserving the wildlife of the country.

I think perhaps this matter comes primarily from those who are interested in the work of Jack Miner, who died, I think, in 1944. Mr. Miner was a great conservationist and a great citizen, and one whose work has lived after him. Coupling his name with that of Wildlife Week, I think that was the origin of setting aside the week. I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Miner and his family, and also to commend the week which has been set aside, not only to commemorate his work, but to emphasize the desirability of preserving and conserving our great wildlife assets.

While I am speaking, at the close of the session, as I will not have the privilege or pleasure of speaking to the House at the end of the session—because that is to be taken over by others—may

I say a word which I do not think will be out of place, and thank the hon. members of this House for the great work they have done in the last approximately 8 weeks.

I have been here for 17 years, and I do not know in that period of time how many sessions, regular and special, I have attended. I do not know of any Parliament which has been more devoted to its work, than has this one. In saying that, I include all hon. members, including the official Opposition. I might say, in going back over those 17 years, I can see very little difference in the appearance of both the hon. Leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). They both look about the same. Neither of them seem to have any gray hairs on their heads, which may be because of the life they lead. In the days when I sat over there, I had no gray hairs either. Now my hair has become white. Whether that comes about, according to the expression used by our great Indian citizens who are getting the right to vote by action of this Legislature, "Because of the snows of many winters," or some other things; I do not know. Certainly I have been dealt with differently by nature than have the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Brant.

I would like to pay tribute to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) who is always so very careful. I was not going to refer to his hair, although he is stroking it. As I said, he is always a careful member of this House. I am sorry one of his bills was rushed through, but I would like to say that was quite unintentional, and when I saw it, I telephoned, telling him we would refer it back to the committee, if he desired, but he had obtained the answer he required in the meantime.

The hon. member for St. Andrew is more meticulous than ever in collecting great volumes of clippings from newspapers and other periodicals to which he refers in the House. I would say to the hon. members of the House they have shown a devotion to work which has been unexcelled in any session of any Parliament with which I have ever been

connected. I should like to pay tribute to the hon. members of the House for that.

Our work here has increased very much. I remember the days as do some of the hon. members here, when it was difficult to complete the 30 days, which was then statutory. That was in the days of Whitney, but it was changed afterwards. Now it is with the greatest difficulty we are able to complete our work in 8 full weeks.

I think at this time, it is proper to refer to the work of all hon. members of the government and Opposition in the people's business, to which I think they have devoted themselves in a very commendable way.

MR. SALSBERG: Now that the hon. Prime Minister has said such nice things about all hon. members—and almost said farewell—I would like to ask him whether he intends to call a special session before the election, or whether he has no such intention.

HON. MR. FROST: Both those questions are purely hypothetical. I do not think they require any answer.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the House, to welcome the students from the Clinton Street Public School. They are, indeed, very fortunate to be here today, the day of prorogation. If they are here when the House prorogues, they should not be alarmed by what, in accordance with the usual custom, emanates from the Press Gallery. That does not take place every day, but only once during the year when the House prorogues. We welcome you here today.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. E. P. MORNINGSTAR (Welland): Mr. Speaker and hon. members, at this time I feel I should mention the very good work that this government is doing and especially our Minister of Health, the hon. Mackinnon Phillips, regarding the health of our people.

Firstly, I would like to point out the work that is being done in the Welland and District Health Unit, which was made possible by the grants from this government.

This was the fourth health unit formed in the province and was made up of the municipalities of the City of Welland and the Township of Crowland. It was formed through the efforts of the late Harry Lewis, MPP, and Dr. Kirk Colbeck, Medical Officer of Health for the City of Welland and the Township of Crowland at that time.

The first board consisted of Mr. Hugh Henderson and Mr. J. C. MacIver who were members of the Board of Health for the City of Welland previous to the formation of the unit. Mr. Henry J. Foster, representing the Province of Ontario and myself, at that time Reeve of the Township of Crowland.

The first staff consisted of the Medical Officer of Health, Dr. A. R. Doane, who was loaned for the formation by our government's Department of Health, 4 nurses and a supervisor. In addition there was Mr. Frank Dawdy, who had been sanitary inspector for the City of Welland, who continued in the job. Subsequently a secretary was employed, Mrs. Ida Munkittrick, who is still a member of the staff, in charge of records and statistics.

A generalized programme was started at the outset but the staff was handicapped by the lack of transportation and because they had to assume the responsibility for the total public health programme in the area, taking over the duties of medical services to the schools, carrying on a tuberculosis prevention programme, which had previously been under the supervision of the Niagara Peninsula Sanatorium and doing all the other tasks associated with a generalized programme, such as home visiting for maternal and infant hygiene and the school programme. In addition the sanitary inspector did all the inspections as regards food and milk control and general sanitation. The medical officer of health did all of the medical work for the area including school health services, tuberculosis control programme, venereal

disease programme and in general supervised the activities of other members of the staff.

In the period, since that time, many changes have taken place in the basic organization and in the size of the territory served. Dr. Doane returned to the provincial Department of Health on the 1st of December, 1945, 5 months after the formation of the health unit. He was replaced by Dr. L. W. C. Sturgeon on his discharge from the RCAF. Dr. Sturgeon is considered to be one of the best, if not the best, directors in Ontario. It would be interesting to point out that Mrs. Geneva Lewis, wife of the late Harry Lewis, MPP, joined the staff shortly after Mr. Lewis's death and now is supervisor of public health nursing. In 1947 there was particular attention given to the supervision of production, processing and distribution of food products, particularly milk and milk products.

During the next 5 years the quality of milk produced on the farms and many milk houses and electric coolers became a monument to these efforts. During this period the very fine regulations established for the control of eating places were promulgated by the Government of Ontario and the improvement in the restaurants in the health unit area is a tribute to our Department of Health.

The Township of Wainfleet joined the health unit in 1946 and was followed by the Town of Thorold and the Township of Willoughby in 1947, the Township of Thorold and the Village of Fonthill also joined in 1947 and the Township of Stamford in 1949.

In August 1947, a unique programme was instituted in the health unit area. This was the first dental public health programme in the province. It was started because of the interest of the medical profession and a committee thereof in charge of dental public health, seeing what could be done to improve the dental situation across the province. This programme was under the supervision of Dr. S. Lee Honey and was financed for the first 3 years by the Ontario division of the Canadian Red Cross Society and

then by the provincial Department of Health.

Last year, in the Township of Crowland, we had the unique distinction of having a class graduate from public school where all of the children were completely free from dental defects. It is hoped that more and more schools will show this fine example.

For many years there has been a programme of medical public health which over the years has taken in research, diagnosis and especially the prevention of disease. But this is not true regarding the dental profession, and I know that the Minister of Health will agree with me when I say that not nearly enough has been carried out in the last few years by either the dental or medical profession in the prevention of those conditions in the mouth related to the teeth and gums.

It is now being carried out in 5 or 6 other health units as well as many individual urban and suburban municipalities. Your provincial Department of Health pays a subsidy toward this very important work in dental public health.

The following information should demonstrate what has been accomplished through the efforts of the municipalities working with the provincial Department of Health in the Welland and District Health Unit.

In 1946 the population was 26,711 with 622 births. In 1953 the population was 72,928 with 2,243 births. In the same period, the number of infants dying in the first year have been reduced from 54 per 1,000 live births to 17 per 1,000 live births.

To demonstrate the new advances in the treatment of tuberculosis, in 1946, with a population of 26,711, there were 21 new cases of tuberculosis. In 1953 with a population of 72,928, there were 60 cases which shows that tuberculosis is still a large problem, however, the ratio of deaths is interesting. With a population of 26,711 in 1946 there were 4 deaths from tuberculosis and in 1953 with a population of 72,928, there were only 2 deaths. This is a good tribute to the division of tuberculosis prevention of the Department of Health and the

efforts of the staffs of the local sanatoria. The amount of work done by the nursing staff is also of interest. In 1946 they made 4,000 home visits; in 1953 they made 20,118. In 1946, 800 school procedures were carried out, and in 1953—37,763.

Another important part of the programme is the child health conferences which are operated to supplement the efforts of the practicing physicians in the area. These are held in 20 different locations in the health unit and advice is given by nurses as to what the mother should do to avoid trouble. In 1946 there were 1,954 attendances at child health conferences and in 1953 there were 8,936. The school population in 1946 was approximately 5,000 and in 1953 it was 16,400. In 1953 Dr. Honey made 12,922 examinations of school children and pre-school children for the dental health programme.

I feel that the Welland and District Health Unit has demonstrated the ability of municipalities to work together in matters of health. In this they have been very generously supported by grants of money from this government to help them out in enlarging and improving their programmes. We feel that the health unit idea will eventually take in the whole of the Province of Ontario, and should do so. The difficulty of establishing this principle up to date, of course, has been the lack of staff, but this has been helped by the training programmes for nurses, doctors, veterinarians and others which have been established by this government.

In 1948 this government instituted a mental health programme in the Counties of Welland and Lincoln under the direction of Dr. H. D. Mitchell and then in 1952 this government, through the Department of Health, set up a plan of granting public hospitals the sum of \$8,500 a bed. The beds to be used for early diagnosis and treatment of mental illness. The St. Catharines General Hospital immediately applied for a psychiatric unit with an out-patient department in order that they might serve better our great densely populated metropolitan area, and may I say in the future we are going to be able to treat and cure many,

many of our people who become emotionally and mentally unstable in the early stages of their illness and not allow them to go on to the stage where they have to be committed to an Ontario Hospital. The *American Medical Journal* states that the Ontario programme for the prevention and early diagnosis and treatment of mental illness is second to none in the world.

There have been 26 health units established in this province since 1943. Also, our province has the lowest death rate, due to tuberculosis, of all the provinces—probably less than 6.5 per 100,000 population in 1953. This has been achieved by the clinics, operated from the various sanatoria in the province, and also the mobile clinics from the provincial Department of Health. The result of this is that some of the sanatoria in the province now have empty beds. In other words, no one suffering from the disease needs to go untreated as is the case in some of the other countries in the world.

I want to congratulate the Prime Minister of this province and his government for their financial aid and their co-operation with the Ontario cancer treatment and research foundation in the setting up of 8 centres in Ontario for the early diagnosis and treatment of cancer.

Let me pay tribute to our Cancer Foundation in the establishment of a Cobalt Bomb at London, Ont., in the fall of 1951, and the second in Toronto in the fall of 1953, and now the third being installed at the present time at Hamilton; and further Cobalt Bombs will be established within the next year at Windsor, Kingston, Ottawa and the Head of the Lakes.

At this time may I pay tribute to the great work being done by the Ontario Cancer Society. Their work is primarily that of education, which is done through the press, radio, television and pamphlets to inform people of early signs and symptoms of cancer, etc. Secondly they do welfare work, which consists chiefly of providing transportation to and from hospitals for patients suffering from cancer, providing boarding and rooming houses, etc. Thirdly, they

collect voluntary funds which are largely used for research.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East) : Mr. Speaker, in making my contribution to the Budget Debate, I wish to add some general comments, and to deal with particular aspects of the hon. Provincial Treasurer's address, which I feel have not been given the attention due them.

I congratulate the hon. Treasurer on his great restraint in avoiding any reference to this year's budget as a "sunshine one," for there is little sunshine for the people of Ontario as a whole, in the current budget. In fact, after hearing the statement made in the House, and closely studying the budget itself, I believe one can detect evidence of gloom, if not actual foreboding. The fact that the hon. Prime Minister, who is also the hon. Provincial Treasurer, can no longer speak with great exultation about the budget he prepares, is deeply significant. I believe it is an admission that he has reached the point where he realizes there is a limit to the amount of radiation of super confidence, so to speak, he can impart in his effort to make things appear brighter than they are. He did affect a certain amount of optimism, it is true, but it was the sort of optimism which made me feel he was trying to fortify his own courage, and that of his colleagues on the government benches. I am sure it was an optimism he did not actually feel at the time.

One does not have to examine the budget figures too closely to understand why the hon. Treasurer may have some qualms about the road ahead. His own remarks were enlightening enough, I am sure. It was characteristic of him that he introduced the budget with a reference to something he said 10 years ago.

In 1944, he was bringing down his first budget, and he said :

We are planning for a greater population, for industrial expansion, for prosperous farms and for a happy and prosperous people. We are laying the sure foundation for a greater and stronger Ontario.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, with what the hon. Treasurer said on that occasion. It was a time for optimism, although the war still had another year or more to run before the complete capitulation of the enemy. But there was sound reason for thinking, in view of Canada's great war-time industrial effort, this province was headed for post-war expansion, and it was a matter of good business sense to plan for it.

But, I submit, the hon. Treasurer was only dealing at that time with one side of the picture. No thought was given to the other side, either then or since. This government has been planning only for the good times, the happy times, the times of sunshine. Now, when there are indications of another side to the picture, there is a glaring lack of any preparation for it.

I am not an "apostle of gloom," but I maintain, in the interests of the people of this province, it is the primary duty of any government to look far enough ahead so as to plan for any eventuality. Human experience has taught us that those who indulge in spending sprees always have to face, sooner or later, a day of reckoning. History has shown us that every period of good times has been followed by one of depression. We cannot go on indefinitely living in a fool's paradise. Any government which operates on that theory, is only piling up difficulties for itself, and hardship for the people whose affairs it is administering.

It is quite true that since the end of World War II, our population has increased by nearly one million. But it should be noted there is a tremendous increase in the older-group brackets, and in the newly born. The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is that, in the days ahead, we will be faced with an increasing number of those dependent upon the wages, toils and production of our labour force. In short, we may expect a greater amount of check-off at the source of income, and the take-home pay will have to be partitioned amongst a greater number of dependents. This is another illustration of the fact that if an increased population

is a great boon to Ontario, we should be willing to accept the bitter with the sweet. Yet, both the Department of Education and Public Welfare are even now given to a policy of reluctance, if not of fierce resistance, towards these objectives. I am afraid, in the future, there will have to be more flexibility and adaptability from these departments, as the hon. Treasurer of this province is wont to say.

We have witnessed a spectacular and most dynamic expansion in our industrial economy during World War II, and the post-war era. Our economy has responded splendidly to demands for war production, the rehabilitation of devastated countries of Europe in the following years, and, at the same time, overtaking the back-log in the home markets. Yet the "soft spots" in our economy, to which the Budget Speech refers, may be an indication that our industrial expansion is levelling off, and the next few years may have to be devoted to a consolidation of our gains. We should never lose sight, in any event of the fact that, whereas the United States is dependent upon 6 per cent. of her national production for export to balance its imports, we in Canada must export about 25 per cent. of our production to balance our importations.

Of necessity, we must, therefore, rely heavily upon foreign-market consumers to keep our political economy on an even keel as it is highly vulnerable, and exceedingly sensitive to any changing conditions in the world.

Our farmers have enjoyed a relative prosperity for a number of years, but their income is now declining due, no doubt, to the high costs of production and, as an incidence, their inability to meet the competition of foreign markets. A slump on the farming front, Mr. Speaker, is usually the forerunner of slumps in other sectors. The condition of agriculture has always been considered the best barometer of changes which lie ahead in the whole economic atmosphere of any country at any time. If there are "soft spots" in the farming communities, you and I cannot help but look at the

future with a great deal of misgiving and foreboding.

A very pious hope has been expressed for the happiness and good health of our people, in the opening sentences of the Budget Statement. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the government that, as yet, we have no comprehensive plan for a health-insurance programme to meet the demands and requirements of our population. As to happiness, I would ask the hon. members of this House to look at the lot of the old-age pensioners, those who are destitute, and the plight of that portion of our population in the lower-income brackets, and listen to the comments of the people in their respective ridings.

Ten years ago, the hon. Treasurer of this province was informing the House that the government was "laying a sure foundation for a greater and stronger Ontario."

Mr. Speaker, these ideals and ambitions are commendable. But, in good conscience, and with a true sense of realism, the hon. Treasurer of Ontario should also have informed the people of this province that his endeavours were confined within very definite and strict limits without leaving it to the speculation of the minds of those amongst us who knew better.

The whole scope of our best expectancy in this day and age has been very well summed up, to my way of thinking, by Mr. F. A. Fox, in the *Queen's Quarterly Review* when he states that,

The standard of living of Canadians has always been determined by their success in the low cost, large scale production, transportation and sale in world markets of a few basic commodities such as fish, furs, wheat, forest and mineral products. During the 20th century, it is true, there has been a vast growth in population and in the volume of goods manufactured for this expanding domestic market. Though the fortunes of an increasing proportion of Canadians may seem thus to have been cut loose from dependence upon selling their goods

abroad, it is still true that Canadians will prosper as does their export trade. Their response to changes in world markets may be slower, but the Canadian economy remains a very "open" one, indeed.

I think, from the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister in his Budget Address, we can detect a twinge of conscience on his part, and a feeling that the path ahead is not as smooth, as rosy and as bright as he found it in the immediate post-war period of his earlier budgets. He referred to "soft spots" among our chief economic factors. There can be two widely different interpretations put on the words, "soft spots." I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Treasurer was referring to the "soft spots" of huge surpluses, and free spending in which the present government has been indulging for so long. It is the other kind, the "soft spots" in the road ahead, which mean trouble, and require careful and judicious steering if they are to be overcome safely, and without grief. So I cannot help wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Treasurer is aware of these "soft spots," why he did not include something in his address to indicate what the government plans to do about them. His failure to do so, can result in only one conclusion—the government has no plan to deal with them.

These "soft spots," as the hon. Treasurer chooses to call them, are the downward trend in farm incomes, slackness in certain branches of industry, creating unemployment, and the plight of the gold-mining industry. The hon. Treasurer acknowledges they are serious dislocations in our economy and I think we can all agree on that. I think, too, we must recognize them for what they are, not temporary disturbances, but fore-runners of depression, warning signs we must heed and with which to be prepared to deal.

Yet the hon. Treasurer assures us that an attitude of confidence is justified because of vigorous elements in our economy, which engenders confidence.

And what are these elements? Because our population is increasing at

at rate of 150,000 a year, the hon. Treasurer claims our domestic market is expanding. I really wonder what the farmers, whose income is declining, think about that. I am sure the cheese producers in this province last year would be hard to convince. When the domestic market and this provincial government failed them, they would have been in a sorry plight today, had it not been for the Federal Government's aid in price support and a last-minute contract from the United Kingdom, as the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) pointed out in his address in this House recently.

The hon. Treasurer also claims the value of capital investment in Ontario will increase this year, from 22 per cent. of all private and public spending, to 26 per cent. Personal income and public spending will advance, and excesses which foreshadowed economic slumps in the past have been avoided. Another abstract idea of his is that any slack in employment will be taken up by such construction projects as the natural gas-pipe line from Alberta to central Canada, and the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. Just another instance of "wishful thinking" in the mind of the hon. Treasurer, to allay his twinge of conscience. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is reasonable doubt as to whether these projects, in themselves, will be sufficient to take up any widespread slackness in industry. Undoubtedly, they will help. But these things are still in the planning stage. In the case of the gas-pipe line, the major part of the work will be done outside this province.

I submit we have to get away from this kind of hypothetical reasoning, and get down to concrete proposals in dealing with the dark side of the picture which the hon. Treasurer has given us, whether intentionally or not. The right kind of confidence is that which is based on proper planning and definite measures designed to do the greatest good to the largest number in times when our economic structure is revealing so-called "soft spots."

Another significant factor which points to the roughness of the road ahead

can be detected in the hon. Treasurer's announcement, made the day before he presented his Budget Address. I refer, of course, to what the newspapers have been pleased to call the "province's fiscal brain trust," which is provided for in Bill No. 91, "an Act for the Financial Administration of the Government of Ontario and for the Organization of the Treasury Department." I had hoped this might be the set-up needed to steer the government into saner and surer channels of financial administration. But, after studying the budget, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but feel it is a vain hope. I am wondering if we are not running away from responsible government, and if this is not an organization set up to bear the responsibility for past mistakes; the "whipping boys" upon whom will be foisted the follies and foibles of the government's financial structure.

The more one looks at the budget, crosswise and lengthwise, the more one is struck by its concern for "Big Business." It is, indeed, Mr. Speaker, "Big Business" in its inspiration. "Big Business" it is, in its endeavour and "Big Business" it will remain, when the full cycle is complete.

We are reminded, for instance, that the ordinary and capital Estimates this coming year will amount to over \$509 million, without taking into account the supplementary Estimates. This colossal sum is to be underwritten by direct taxation and by borrowing, which is, in the end, but one form of deferred taxation.

In coming to a true understanding of this budget, and for the purpose of passing judgment on it in an objective, realistic and dispassionate manner, it is essential we should look at its sources of income, and explore its avenues of expenditure. In doing so, I believe we should be guided by two principles which have acquired such general acceptance as to be classified as unassailable criterions and unfailing truisms of political economy. The first is that taxation should be looked upon somewhat as partial confiscation by the state of corporation and private incomes, with due regard for their ability to shoulder the burden, for

the double purpose of administering the business of the political body, and also creating a redistribution of wealth among the underprivileged classes. The second principle is that the social, political and economical health of a country—or a province—should be measured by the enterprise, the welfare and the living conditions of its people in the lower-income brackets of society.

The hon. Treasurer boasts that the people of Ontario enjoy about the lowest rate of taxation in Canada. In my opinion, that means only one thing: the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. It is an established fact that a low rate of taxation is of much greater benefit to the rich than to the poor and, under it, the privileged classes derive more opportunities to amass greater wealth, than do those in the underprivileged ranks.

To illustrate the point I have in mind, may I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what is there in the whole length and breadth of this budget, at which the average breadwinner in this province can look, and truthfully say with joy in his heart: "This is for me"? Little or nothing, I am sorry to say. Can he view with delight the mounting expenditures every year, to figures which now have passed the \$500 million mark? Can he look with tranquility on the soaring net debt of this province, which now has reached the staggering sum of over \$600 million, and a gross debt of over \$1 billion, which the hon. Treasurer informed this House would be \$1½ billion by 1958 or 1959? Can the average taxpayer take any comfort from the huge sums the government is "salting away" in the Highway Reserve Fund, and other accounts, over which the members of this House have no voting power nor voice as to its expenditure? If the people of Ontario are not already beginning to doubt the wisdom of the financial administration of this government, I say it is high time they should. In any event, I am sure it will not be long before it is impressed upon them in a way that will be plain to all.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I submit the "juggling" of provincial finances has

reached a point where the juggler, no matter how nimble and clever he has been in the past, has found it necessary to bring in 5 assistants. But I doubt if even they can extricate him from the perilous position in which he now finds himself.

I note there is a chapter in the hon. Treasurer's Budget Statement devoted to "Housing." How this government can take any credit for relieving the housing situation in Ontario, is beyond the realm of my imagination. As everyone knows, the housing situation is still one of our most troublesome problems. If, as the hon. Treasurer says, more than a quarter of a million housing units have been built in Ontario since 1944, providing accommodation for a million people, he should give credit where credit is due—to the Liberal Government at Ottawa.

The Ontario Government should hide its head in shame for its failure to take full advantage of the partnership agreement with the Federal Government under the National Housing Act. For 3 or 4 years it did little or nothing about the most acute housing shortage this province has ever experienced, and it tried to "pull the wool" over the people's eyes by foisting the blame for its own shortcomings on to the government at Ottawa. Its efforts in respect to housing have been tangled in planning regulations, and various other limitations, to the point of exasperation. It further aggravated the situation by tossing rent controls out, and placing a new responsibility on the congested and burdened municipalities. Just another instance, I submit, Mr. Speaker, of the government catering to "big business" at the expense of the little fellow.

Now we find further evidence of this sort in the Ontario Government's failure to deal successfully with the serviced land problem. Only a few days ago, the president of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Ottawa Government's housing authority, told the Metropolitan Home Builders' Association at a meeting here in Toronto, the greatest danger facing an increased volume of residential building is the high price of land, particularly in the

Toronto district. It is clear from that statement, land speculators are endeavouring to reap a harvest of dollars by asking absurdly high prices for lots, taking advantage of the housing needs of the people of this metropolitan area.

This could have been prevented to a great extent, had this government shown any real concern about the housing situation, and made any worthwhile effort to aid and encourage municipalities to obtain sites for low-cost housing units.

So today, in the thickly populated areas, there is little prospect for low-cost housing and reasonable rents, and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will be forced to refuse recognition of land prices above a certain figure. This, of course, will slow down the building of housing units. Its effect can be seen already in the building rate figures supplied by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which show the building rate in the Toronto area is only 10 for every 1,000 increase in population, whereas, in Edmonton, it is 23 for each 1,000 and in Calgary 21.

The failure of Ontario to join with the Federal Government in providing serviced land for residential construction, has cost home purchasers in the Toronto area alone at least \$36 million since 1949, the federal member for Toronto Davenport declared in the House of Commons in January. The people of Ontario will get no crumbs of satisfaction out of the hon. Treasurer's budget reference to Housing, because there are none.

And what of the old-age pensioners? They, too, will look in vain for any supplementary aid from the provincial budget, such as is provided in two other provinces. The hon. Treasurer makes no mention of this in the Budget Statement, of course, but he committed himself in the House on this subject, under pressure of Opposition criticism. His reasons for not supplementing pensions are interesting, if not convincing. He said the government will not consider supplementary allowances for old-age pensioners, because they would be difficult to administer, and might force this

province to impose a sales tax to pay for them.

Yet the government will receive \$6 million more this year from the tax-rental agreement, millions of dollars in profits from liquor, succession duties and other sources, but it cannot spare even a pittance from this wealth to relieve the plight of thousands of our elderly people who are barely existing under the burden of today's living costs.

Oh, I know, the hon. Treasurer, in his bland way, will say that Ottawa has taken on the responsibility of these old-age pensioners, and that it is a federal matter. But that does not relieve this government's responsibility toward those in this province by one iota, and I challenge the hon. Prime Minister, and his political cohorts, to go out on the hustings in the next election campaign, and make such flimsy excuses as he did in this House on March 18th last, and see what the reaction of the people of this province will be. I do not think he can "get away with it," and no one knows that better than the hon. Prime Minister himself.

This thing the hon. Treasurer has given us is a "preferred class budget." This government is spending millions on hospitals, yet hospital costs are rising so fast only the well-to-do can afford to enter them for treatment. Millions of dollars are going into education, yet school costs are soaring, and our teachers are worried over the increasing numbers of pupils of high school age who fail to finish their courses. Millions of dollars are being spent on super highways, yet motoring costs are reaching the luxury stage, where soon only the rich can afford them. It is no wonder we can detect gloom and foreboding in the hon. Treasurer's presentation of Ontario's financial situation, so he finds it necessary to draw attention to the "soft spots." I say to him that Ontario's financial administration is definitely "on the spot," and, if he does not realize it now, sooner or later he is going to find it out the "hard way."

I could carry the probe into the municipal field, education and other social agencies, but the picture would always

be the same. I do not wish to prolong this address beyond the point of its merit. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind, but that the government of the day, with a massive majority at its command, can win the day at any moment of its choosing, thus securing for its members the approval of this budget—"hook, line and sinker."

As a Liberal member of this House, however, I wish to register my vote as a conscientious objector to this kind of budget. I have examined it from its zenith to its nadir. I have weighed it, and found it wanting in humanitarian values and social virtues. My colleagues and myself may appear to be as "a voice crying in the wilderness" at the moment, but there is always the future ahead of us. When the day of reckoning comes in the days that lie ahead, I wish the people of Ontario to remember that at the critical, crucial and psychological moment, I was on their side, and not amongst the missing and/or the absentees. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, after these remarks, I intend to cast my vote for the amendment, in opposition to the main motion.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the budget, I do so with a great deal of pleasure, because I have enjoyed myself with our own hon. members, and those in Opposition during this session.

The hon. Prime Minister mentioned something about attentiveness to duty, by the hon. members, and I would like to say that the Whip has kept record of the figures, and he has handed me the statistics which show that this session totalled 2,700 man hours, the total absenteeism was only 320 man hours, which indicates an 88.2 per cent. attendance at the sittings. I really believe that Ottawa could take a page out of that book, as regards hon. members attending sittings.

I tried to follow the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) when he referred to housing, and I was quite interested in hearing him give all the credit to the Federal Government. He

said they had been doing such a wonderful job in regard to housing, and then, almost in the next breath, he said it was "in a worse mess than it ever was." Who fell down?

MR. CHARTRAND: Yes, who?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Not this government, because we have not turned down a single offer to co-operate with Ottawa in any way, and when we made a suggestion, we were quietly told to "get out" of the field of advancing funds on mortgages; that they would get the initial payments, and it would not be necessary for Ontario to enter into the field of second mortgages and that conditions were quite satisfactory to encourage housing.

The hon. member (Mr. Chartrand) criticized the hon. Prime Minister for his budget, presented in his capacity of hon. Provincial Treasurer. Some years ago, this is exactly what the then hon. Prime Minister said:

I am laying the foundation for great industrial expansion.

Were not those great words? Has that prophecy not come true? Have we not had a great industrial expansion in Ontario? If not, how is it that our assessments have risen from \$3 billion in 1943, to \$6 billion in 1953?

One hon. member said, during this session, something to the effect that it would be better if we went back to the one-mill subsidy to assist municipalities. It would be a wonderful thing for the government because our grants to municipalities of \$134 million this year will equal 22 mills on the municipal assessments of Ontario municipalities. We are paying 22 mills to the municipalities, instead of only one. And if we had figured the mill rate on the assessment of 1943, we would have been paying 44 mills, so that some of the municipalities would be paying a dividend to their taxpayers.

That is the sort of government we have, and what we have been doing to assist the "little people"—and those

are the "little people" in the municipalities.

Now, may we consider the different departments for a moment. First, let us consider the Department of Welfare. It has been said that nothing is being done. I have had requests made to me, and I know the hon. Minister of Welfare has had requests made to him during the last year concerning various localities where there were large homes, where the family has been broken up, which would be very adaptable for the old people, where they could be looked after well, and they would probably be better off, at least in some respects, than in the homes for the aged which we have today. The department has agreed to share in the expense for keeping these aged people in private homes, to the extent of 50 per cent., that is, the provincial government will pay \$30 and the municipality will pay a like amount of \$30, but this apparently is something for which the hon. member does not give us credit. We are willing to assist the people in these private homes to the extent of \$60 a month, not \$40.

I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Welfare on that step. I think that is affording wonderful relief, not only in the towns and cities, but in the country places.

If you go into smaller villages, you will find homes which, on account of their size, do not seem to fit into the conditions which are required, and you will find people living in smaller homes today than formerly, many of them of the ranch type, and they could easily be used to great advantage, and afford a saving of money to the municipalities, as well as a saving to the government.

Also, I want to compliment the hon. Minister on increasing the grant for charitable institutions from \$1,000 per bed to \$2,000. That will be of great assistance to the charitable institutions. I know it will be of great assistance to the people in Ottawa. There is one Old People's Home, in Ottawa, in particular, which will find this of wonderful assistance, as they will now be getting \$2,000 per bed. I think it is a wonderful thing.

Now, let me turn to our Health Department. I think if there is any hon. member or Minister who deserves a star it should go to the hon. Minister of Health. Public Health has been his hobby ever since he was a country doctor in his home town and has continued since he entered this House and became the hon. Minister of Health. He has always felt that something should be done for people who are mentally ill, but not sufficiently to require to be transferred to one of the senior institutions, and he has made provision for accommodation for such people in the general hospitals throughout this province, and has provided places where men and women who are mentally ill, may be treated, almost the same as if they were suffering from pneumonia or some other similar disease. In that way, there is no stigma attached either to the patient or his family. The patients may be taken into hospitals and treated there before being admitted to a senior hospital, if that should become necessary. My own personal feeling is that 75 per cent. of them will never go any further, but will be cured in the general hospitals.

That has been going on all over the province. We have one example of that in my own city of Ottawa, where we have a psychiatric unit in the General Hospital which has 30 beds, and they have received a grant of \$255,000, which is \$8,500 per bed, for these special units.

Is that not providing a wonderful encouragement for people who are looking after those who are unfortunately mentally ill?

When I was Minister of Reform Institutions, I knew—and the hon. Prime Minister knew—there were people placed in the county or city jails who should never have been there, but there was no place to put them, to see if they could be assisted and perhaps cured, and be sent happily back to their homes.

I was the Ottawa General Hospital of which I was speaking. Also, in the Civic Hospital at Ottawa, we have a unit under construction, which will provide 40 beds, and we have an approved grant of \$340,000.

Those two amounts, do not represent simply a small sum of money—\$255,000, and \$340,000. Again may I ask the hon. members if that is not helping the “little people?” Are we taking money from the poor people, and giving it to the rich? I say not. I believe that more of that should be carried on in this province.

In London, Ontario, at St. Joseph's Hospital, they are providing 33 beds; in Victoria Hospital they have 48 under construction; in St. Catharines, 22; in Toronto 38 at the Western Hospital and 30 at St. Michael's Hospital, and in the Kingston General Hospital, 40 beds.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the hon. members that Ontario is the first province in the world to carry out a scheme of this kind; not the first in the Dominion of Canada, but the first in the world. Therefore, I say that if the hon. Minister of Health does not get a star on this earth, he certainly will have one later on.

MR. OLIVER: Better given it to him here, and not take any chances.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Under the able administration of the hon. Minister of Health, we are “going places” and that progress is going to continue.

The hon. member said we were not preparing at all for the future. I noticed some very black clouds on the faces on the opposite side of the Chamber, when the hon. member was speaking. I cannot see that they are justified at all. I see everything bright and rosy. When I go to Ottawa, or to different towns, and meet people, they say to me, “You are making a great job of it.” That does not mean that I, personally, am making a great job of it, but they are referring to the wonderful hon. Prime Minister we have, and to the great Cabinet he has behind him. And, Mr. Speaker, they are not only speaking that way, but they are voting that way when given the opportunity.

The hon. member for Ottawa East advised us to be fearful, and to be very careful if another election is called. The

hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) warned the House last night that he had some inside information—

MR. SALSBERG: I did not "warn" the House, I "informed" it.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That is right, the hon. member informed the House that he had some inside information about a snap election.

MR. SALSBERG: I said it would be "in the fall." I said nothing about a "snap" election.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for Ottawa East also said that this was an election budget. Mr. Speaker, may I ask hon. members if they have ever known one of the 12 budgets the hon. Provincial Treasurer has prepared, which was not an election budget?

MR. SALSBERG: Politics all the time.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for Ottawa East mentioned a statement by the then hon. Prime Minister, in 1944. Very well. But what did the people say in 1945? They said, "We believe in Frost; we believe in the hon. members at that time; we believe in the Cabinet; and we believe every hon. member of the House is sincere, and we will send them back." I was asked recently, "Is there any talk about an election in Toronto?" and I said, "I do not think so," and this gentleman said, "I do not see why you should have one for another ten years, the people are so satisfied."

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word regarding highways. When the hon. member for Ottawa East—

MR. OLIVER: The best part of Ottawa.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: —was expressing his criticisms but not offering any solution, it reminded me of a story, concerning an American soldier who was being punished, and his officer said to him, "Dig several holes, and throw

the dirt out." The officer came along a little later, and said, "What are you throwing the dirt up here for?" and the soldier said, "There is no other place to throw it, sir," and the officer said, "Well, dig another hole and throw it in there." I was reminded of that, when the hon. member was speaking, and it occurred to me that he might have to "dig another hole."

The hon. member spoke about money spent by the Department of Highways, and said the House had nothing to say about it. If the hon. member was in the House when the Department of Highways' Estimates were passed, he would realize that there was no money in the Highways Department Estimates which was not voted upon.

A few years ago, that was not the case. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) brought it up at the time when I was the Acting Minister of Highways, during the unfortunate absence of the hon. Minister. That situation has been changed, and now every dollar spent by the Highways Department is passed by this House. I may also say that we have considerable money this year, as the budget provides \$148 million for highways throughout the Province of Ontario and we must not forget there is a little something in reserve, but we do not want to "blow" about all the money we have, because we are going to have some good places to use it during the year. I can assure the hon. members we are going to spend it for the benefit of the "little people," who have shown their appreciation of what has been done for them by sending this government back year after year.

As regards the influx of tourists from outside Ontario; a great number of them are from the United States, and whether the hon. member for St. Andrew does like the Americans or not, the government likes them, is pleased to have them come here, and leave their money. Let me just remind the hon. members that this year, the influx of tourists was 117 per cent. higher than it was in 1945, and I ask the hon. members to consider the value of the dollars they left in this

province, to be distributed amongst all the people, in the north, in the south, in the east, and we must not forget the Ottawa River Valley, because they do go down there, too.

MR. SALSBERG: Most of them come to see Niagara Falls and the Park anyway. They would come without any advertising.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: There are two people the hon. member for St. Andrew does not like.

MR. SALSBERG: I beg your pardon?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: There are two people the hon. member does not like; the Americans and the police.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh. I would not say that.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: You do not like them. I do not know why.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh yes, I do. I really like them both.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Now, may we give a few minutes consideration to the question of "Education," and to the work of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) and how he has been handling the Department, as well he might, with the experience he has had. I do not know whether I offended any person or not on one occasion, when I was speaking at the opening of a school in Carleton County. The hon. Minister of Education was not there, unfortunately, but the hon. Mr. Drew happened to be there, when I said it was the first time in my experience, since I have been a member of the House—even when I was in Opposition—when we had a real educationalist as Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario.

Education is a difficult problem, and made more difficult by the growth of this province up to the present time. For instance, there are about 60,000 new students each year in the schools. That demonstrates clearly the growth

of the population of the Province of Ontario, and it is not something which occurs just for one year and then drops off, but it is a steady increase, going on all the time.

During this present session, the hon. Minister has done a very worth-while piece of work in changing the number of years for calculation of superannuation for teachers, from 15 years down to 10 years. I do not know whether the teachers are "taking it out on me," but I have a stack of letters that high (indicating) congratulating the government on this move by the hon. Minister of Education, in reducing the number of years from 15 to 10.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Good old "Uncle George."

HON. MR. DUNBAR: As a clear indication of the growth of the province, may I say we have applications from 220 municipalities in the province of Ontario to date, claiming their population has increased over 7 per cent. That is since the census of 1951. We may receive applications from others, but at least 220 municipalities have claimed the increase of over 7 per cent.

MR. SALSBERG: Is that because of the government?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: All because of the good government we are giving. When we go outside, I, personally, have been talking to people, and they ask you, "What is wrong with the government?" and I invariably answer, "What are you talking about?" I feel that this province is one in which we should believe. Sometimes, to get an argument started, I have to say something, taking the opposite view, but they do not last very long, because as a rule I am stopped pretty short.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Minister was to speak of municipal affairs, he would soon find out.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I gave you the figure a while ago about the growth, that is, the increase in assessment, from

\$3 billion to \$6 billion, that is from 1943 to 1953. That is, indeed, a wonderful growth. When you figure out from this chart, you will find in your copy of the municipal directory, it starts back with 1941, when we had a population of 3,509,341, with an assessment of \$2,986,105,000. Then, in 1946, people had begun to realize they had a really good government in Ontario, and it began to climb. In 1947, the population was 3,854,496, and the assessment also increased until now it stands at \$6,056,808,000. That is as it stood at the end of last year, and as you will notice in the directory, the population is now 4,647,777. I think that represents a wonderful increase.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): How did it start?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I not not know, unless it was because the people had confidence in this government. The municipal picture of the province of Ontario, of course, has increased, quite naturally. One good reason why the municipal picture would increase, is a recovery from the backlog of work which had been held over during the war years, because manpower was so scarce, and after the end of the war, the backlog had to be looked after.

The gross debenture debt was 9.19 per cent. of the taxable assessment in 1943, and with all these huge increases, that figure has only risen to 10.3 per cent., so you can see our municipalities throughout the Province of Ontario were never in a more sound position financially than they are today. And, with the Lord's help, our hon. Prime Minister will be spared, and his good health will continue, until Ontario is in even a better financial position.

The financial picture of the province is reflected in the financial prosperity of the municipalities, in the tax sections, and that is always a pretty good yardstick by which to go, that is, if the taxes are being collected.

In regard to tax collection; in the cities, 99 per cent. of the municipal cur-

rent levy was collected last year; in towns and villages, it amounted to 98.9 per cent. of the municipal current levy, and in townships, 97.7 per cent., so hon. members can see, so far as municipalities are concerned, we have nothing to fear.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in closing, to the hon. members, that, in my opinion, one of the main reasons for the development of the Province of Ontario is because of the sound financing by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him, and the officials of his department for the able budget presented, and for the excellent manner in which the financial affairs of the Province of Ontario have been conducted for the past eleven years, during which the province has always ended the year with a surplus, and has budgeted for a surplus next year, regardless of all expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I have forgotten to mention. May I say to the hon. members opposite, that they probably are aware of the condition of the roads in the back concessions, and it is a poor time for an election, and if I may give them a word of advice, I would suggest that they vote with the government.

MR. OLIVER: I think we will take a long chance.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frost moved that I do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) moved an amendment in the following words:

But this House does not approve the policy of the government in borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars in the United States, repayable as to principal and interest in United States funds.

The Vote will be on the amendment.
Call in the members.

The House divided.

The amendment was negatived on division as follows:

YEAS	NAYS
Chartrand	Allan (Haldimand-
Gordon	Norfolk)
Grummett	Allen (Middlesex
Manley	South)
Nixon	Beckett
Oliver	Beech
Salsberg	Brandon
Thomas (Ontario)	Cathcart
Wren	Cecile
—9	Challies
	Child
	Collings
	Daley
	Dempsey
	Dent
	Doucett
	Downer
	Dunbar
	Dunlop
	Edwards
	Elliott
	Fishleigh
	Foote
	Frost (Bracondale)
	Frost (Victoria)
	Gemmell
	Goodfellow
	Griesinger
	Hall
	Hamilton
	Hanna
	Herbert
	Hunt
	Janes
	Johnston (Parry
	Sound)
	Johnston (Simcoe
	Centre)
	Johnstone (Bruce)
	Jolley
	Kelly
	Kennedy
	Kerr
	Leavine
	Letherby
	Lyons
	Macaulay
	Mackenzie
	Mapledoram
	Morningstar
	Murdoch
	Nickle

NAYS—*Continued*

Noden
Parry
Patrick
Phillips
Porter
Pringle
Pryde
Robarts
Roberts
Robson
Sandercock
Scott
Stewart
Villeneuve
Ward
Wardrope
Warrender
Weaver
Welsh
Whitney
Yaremko
—69

MR. SPEAKER: The vote now is on the main motion, that I do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

The House divided.

The motion agreed to on division, as follows:

YEAS	NAYS
Allan (Haldimand-	Chartrand
Norfolk)	Gordon
Allen (Middlesex	Grummett
South)	Manley
Beckett	Nixon
Beech	Oliver
Brandon	Salsberg
Cathcart	Thomas (Ontario)
Cecile	Wren
Challies	—9
Child	
Collings	
Daley	
Dempsey	
Dent	
Doucett	
Downer	
Dunbar	
Dunlop	
Edwards	

YEAS—*Continued*

Elliott
 Fishleigh
 Foote
 Frost (Bracondale)
 Frost (Victoria)
 Gemmell
 Goodfellow
 Griesinger
 Hall
 Hamilton
 Hanna
 Herbert
 Hunt
 Janes
 Johnston (Parry
 Sound)
 Johnston (Simcoe
 Centre)
 Johnstone (Bruce)
 Jolley
 Kelly
 Kennedy
 Kerr
 Leavine
 Letherby
 Lyons
 Macaulay
 Mackenzie
 Mapledoram
 Morningstar
 Murdoch
 Nickle
 Noden
 Parry
 Patrick
 Phillips
 Porter
 Pringle
 Pryde
 Robarts

YEAS—*Continued*

Roberts
 Robson
 Sandercock
 Scott
 Stewart
 Villeneuve
 Ward
 Wardrope
 Warrender
 Weaver
 Welsh
 Whitney
 Yaremko

—69

House in Committee of Supply; Mr.
 Dent in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF
TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 92,
 Department of Travel and Publicity,
 Vote 183, Public Information Division,
 \$885,000, agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves the com-
 mittee rise and report it has come to a
 certain resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in
 the Chair.

MR. DENT: Mr. Speaker, the Com-
 mittee of Supply begs to report it has
 come to a certain resolution.

Report agreed to.

Mr. T. R. Dent, from the Committee of Supply, reported the following
 Resolutions:

Resolved, That Supply in the following supplementary amounts and to defray
 the expenses of the government departments named, be granted to Her Majesty
 for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954:

Department of Education	\$ 4,350,000.00
Department of Health	8,000,000.00
Department of Highways	17,500,000.00
Department of Provincial Treasurer	1,000,000.00

—and—

Resolved, That Supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the government departments named, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE:

Main Office	\$456,400.00
Branches	
Agricultural and Horticultural Societies	593,400.00
Agricultural Representative	989,400.00
Co-operation and Markets	97,300.00
Dairy	270,300.00
Farm Economics	122,600.00
Farm Labour Service	35,000.00
Field Crops	154,600.00
Fruit	337,000.00
Live Stock	612,800.00
Milk Control Board of Ontario	108,900.00
Northern Ontario	245,000.00
Statistics and Publications	86,500.00
Women's Institute Branch and Home Economics Service	239,900.00
Demonstration Farm, New Liskeard	34,100.00
Horticultural Experiment Station, Vineland	226,200.00
Kemptville Agricultural School	292,700.00
Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph	3,060,000.00
Macdonald Institute, Guelph	161,700.00
Ontario Veterinary College, Guelph	824,200.00
Western Ontario Agricultural School and Experimental Farm, Ridgetown	167,000.00
Fruit Branch	250,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

Main Office	484,500.00
Branches	
Legislative Counsel	41,000.00
Registrar of Regulations	25,000.00
Supreme Court of Ontario	205,000.00
Supreme Court Reporters	114,000.00
Master of Titles	101,000.00
Criminal Justice Accounts	2,519,500.00
Public Trustee	449,000.00
Official Guardian	190,000.00
Accountant—Supreme Court of Ontario	32,000.00
Fire Marshal	271,000.00
Inspector of Legal Offices	1,343,500.00
Law Enforcement—(Ontario Provincial Police)	5,842,000.00
Ontario Securities Commission	187,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:

Main Office and General Departmental Expenses	624,200.00
Branches	
Elementary Education Branch	1,353,600.00
Secondary Education Branch	2,188,300.00
Professional Training Branch	1,203,800.00
Special Services	1,174,000.00
Departmental Examinations Branch	445,600.00

Public Libraries Branch	\$76,100.00
Legislative Library	36,800.00
Public Records and Archives	48,600.00
Text-Books Branch	13,300.00
Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford	271,600.00
Ontario School for the Deaf, Belleville	492,000.00
Scholarships, Bursaries, etc.	335,000.00
Legislative Grants, etc.	62,542,000.00
Miscellaneous Grants	201,100.00
Grants to Provincial and other Universities, etc.	6,764,000.00
Teachers' Superannuation, etc.	5,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH:

Main Office	2,167,300.00
Branches	
Health Units	674,100.00
Public Health Nursing	49,500.00
Maternal and Child Hygiene	332,400.00
Dental Service	58,700.00
Nursing	149,600.00
Epidemiological	921,000.00
Venereal Diseases Control	93,900.00
Tuberculosis Prevention	6,879,000.00
Industrial Hygiene	343,400.00
Sanitary Engineering	239,000.00
Laboratory Branch	1,201,900.00
Associated Laboratories	55,000.00
Public and Private Hospitals	14,435,400.00
Mental Health—General Expenses	963,600.00
—Ontario Hospitals	20,209,200.00

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS:

Main Office	2,525,800.00
Division Offices	59,456,200.00
Municipal Roads Branch	18,584,000.00
Gasoline Tax Branch	269,000.00
Motor Vehicles Branch	1,490,000.00
Division Offices	12,965,000.00
Municipal Roads Branch	16,035,000.00
Motor Vehicles Branch	200,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE	190,000.00
-------------------------------	------------

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR:

Main Office	346,100.00
Branches	
Industry and Labour Board	195,400.00
Apprenticeship Branch	413,400.00
Boiler Inspection Branch	175,000.00
Factory Inspection Branch	23,000.00
Board of Examiners of Operating Engineers	54,400.00
Minimum Wage Branch	25,700.00
Composite Inspection Branch	302,900.00
Labour Relations Board	91,500.00
Fair Employment Practices Branch	8,000.00

Office of Athletics Commissioner	\$28,600.00
Elevator Inspection Branch	65,000.00
Industry and Labour Board	10,500,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS:

Main Office	1,726,400.00
Surveys Branch	201,000.00
Research Branch	340,000.00
Basic Organization—District Offices	8,715,000.00
Extra Fire Fighting	800,000.00
Public Information on (1) Fire Prevention (2) Fish and Wildlife (3) Reforestation, and (4) Timber Management	108,000.00
Air Service Branch	776,000.00
Grants	13,600.00
Wolf Bounty	60,000.00
Bear Bounty	10,000.00
Timber Management Branch	300,000.00

OFFICE OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR	20,000.00
-------------------------------------	-----------

DEPARTMENT OF MINES:

Main Office	367,500.00
Branches	
Geological	250,200.00
Mines Inspection	131,400.00
Laboratories	156,700.00
Natural Gas Commissioner	34,000.00
Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator	10,000.00
Mining Lands	173,100.00
Main Office	1,000,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS:

Main Office	2,489,000.00
Ontario Municipal Board	183,000.00
Registrar-General's Branch	572,500.00

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT:

Main Office	65,500.00
Community Planning Branch	120,500.00
Conservation Branch	263,000.00
Immigration Branch	28,500.00
Ontario House	200,000.00
Research Council of Ontario	370,000.00
Trade and Industry Branch	136,500.00

OFFICE OF PRIME MINISTER:

Main Office	53,000.00
Cabinet Office	52,000.00

OFFICE OF PROVINCIAL AUDITOR	272,700.00
------------------------------------	------------

DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY:

Main Office	251,200.00
Office of the Speaker	24,100.00
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and Chief Election Officer ..	53,700.00

Sessional Requirements	\$499,700.00
Queen's Printer	110,200.00
Civil Defence Committee	240,400.00
Miscellaneous Requirements	16,000.00
Civil Service Commission	119,600.00
Administration—	
Public Service Superannuation Fund	40,100.00

DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL TREASURER:

Main Office	387,500.00
Branches	
Bureau of Statistics and Research	63,500.00
Comptroller of Revenue	1,023,000.00
Ontario Racing Commission	188,000.00
Post Office	369,000.00
Provincial Economist	80,400.00
Tabulating	82,000.00
Theatres	114,400.00
Main Office	2,500,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE:

Main Office	394,100.00
Branches	
Child Welfare	2,455,300.00
Day Nurseries	324,500.00
Mothers' Allowances	7,003,400.00
Old Age Assistance	7,066,300.00
Field Services	580,300.00
Homes for the Aged	1,359,300.00
Disabled Persons' Allowances	2,840,500.00
Old Age Assistance Branch	5,903,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS:

Main Office	900,200.00
General Superintendence	210,000.00
Lieutenant-Governor's Apartment	7,800.00
Legislative and Departmental Buildings	2,022,500.00
Osgoode Hall	132,000.00
Government Buildings	1,100,000.00
Ontario Government Branch Office Building	507,500.00
Maintenance of Locks, Bridges, Dams and Docks, etc.	100,000.00
Aid to Drainage	30,000.00
Miscellaneous	30,000.00
Public Buildings	27,525,000.00
Dams, Docks and Drainage Works	320,000.00
Miscellaneous	2,155,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS:

Main Office	756,000.00
Board of Parole	75,000.00
Ontario Reformatory, Guelph	2,905,000.00
Ontario Reformatory, Mimico	742,000.00
Ontario Reformatory, Brampton	326,000.00
Mercer Reformatory, Toronto	470,000.00
Industrial Farm, Burwash	1,571,000.00

Industrial Farm	\$304,000.00
Rideau Industrial Farm, Burritt's Rapids	300,000.00
Burtch Industrial Farm, Brantford	352,000.00
Industrial Farm, Fort William	155,000.00
Ontario Training School for Boys—Bowmanville	363,000.00
Ontario Training School for Boys—Cobourg	361,000.00
Ontario Training School for Girls—Galt	287,000.00
DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY:	
Main Office	71,800.00
Travel Division	
Publicity Branch	392,800.00
Information Branch	150,100.00
Development Branch	154,300.00
Photography Branch	27,500.00
Public Information Division	88,500.00
MISCELLANEOUS	100,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS	150,000.00

Resolution agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Ways and Means; Mr. Dent in the Chair.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolved, That there be granted out of The Consolidated Revenue Fund of this province, a sum not exceeding four hundred and one million, seven hundred and forty-two thousand, one hundred dollars, to meet the supply to that extent granted to Her Majesty.

Resolution agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman. I move the committee rise and report a certain resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means reports it has come to a certain resolution:

Resolution agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST moves first reading of bill intituled, "An Act for granting to Her Majesty, certain sums of

money for the public service for the fiscal year ended the 31st day of March, 1954, and for the public service for the fiscal year ended the 31st day of March, 1955.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST moves second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST moves third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to proceed, with the Clerk of the House, to escort His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor to prorogue the session.

—The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber of the Legislative Assembly, and took his seat upon the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has, at its present sittings,

passed certain bills to which on behalf and in the name of the said Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK: The following are the titles of the Bills to which Your Honour's Assent is prayed:

Bill No. 1, An Act respecting The Frontenac High School District.

Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the Toronto East General and Orthopedic Hospital.

Bill No. 3, An Act respecting The Sudbury Community Young Men's, Young Women's Christian Association.

Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Town of Fergus.

Bill No. 5, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill No. 6, An Act respecting the Town of Mimico.

Bill No. 7, An Act respecting The Home of the Friendless and Infants' Home.

Bill No. 9, An Act respecting the Township of Toronto.

Bill No. 10, An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill No. 12, An Act respecting Royal Botanical Gardens.

Bill No. 13, An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. 14, An Act respecting the Town of St. Marys.

Bill No. 15, An Act respecting Sao Paulo Light and Power Company, Limited.

Bill No. 16, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Bill No. 17, An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital.

Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Bill No. 19, An Act to incorporate The Hamilton Foundation.

Bill No. 20, An Act respecting St. Michael's College.

Bill No. 21, An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough.

Bill No. 22, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 1).

Bill No. 23, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough (No. 2).

Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Bill No. 25, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill No. 26, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Bill No. 27, An Act to incorporate The London Foundation.

Bill No. 29, An Act respecting the Town of Palmerston.

Bill No. 30, An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie.

Bill No. 31, An Act respecting the Town of Oakville.

Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Territorial Division.

Bill No. 33, The Department of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Expenses Act.

Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act, 1952.

Bill No. 46, An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act.

Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Warehouse Receipts Act.

Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

Bill No. 51, The Telephone Act, 1954.

Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Operating Engineers Act, 1953.

Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 58, The Parents' Maintenance Act, 1954.

Bill No. 59, The Bees Act, 1954.

Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.

Bill No. 61, The Plant Diseases Act, 1954.

Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act.

Bill No. 63, The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Corporations Act, 1953.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Corporations Information Act, 1953.

Bill No. 67, An Act to amend The Unemployment Relief Act.

Bill No. 68, An Act respecting the Milk Industry.

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Professional Engineers Act.

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act.

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act.

Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Infants Act.

Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act, 1953.

Bill No. 75, The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, 1954.

Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Bill No. 77, The Child Welfare Act, 1954.

Bill No. 78, An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly.

Bill No. 79, The Provincial Parks Act, 1954.

Bill No. 80, The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954.

Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Trees Act.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill No. 84, The Schools Administration Act, 1954.

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 86, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Wolf and Bear Bounty Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act, 1952.

Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Bill No. 91, The Financial Administration Act, 1954.

Bill No. 92, The Mental Health Act, 1954.

Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 94, An Act to establish the Ontario Fuel Board.

Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act.

Bill No. 97, An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Lines Act, 1951.

Bill No. 98, An Act respecting Persons Who Bore or Drill Wells for Water.

Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Petty Trespass Act.

Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Ontario School Trustees' Council Act, 1953.

Bill No. 102, An Act to Provide Protection for Persons Working in Trenches.

Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Elevators and Lifts Act, 1953.

Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act.

Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952.

Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Public Parks Act.

Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Magistrates Act, 1952.

Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill No. 118, An Act to amend The Security Transfer Tax Act.

Bill No. 119, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953.

Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act.

Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Grand River Conservation Act, 1938.

Bill No. 123, An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act.

Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Theatres Act, 1953.

Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act, 1952.

Bill No. 126, An Act to amend The Community Centres Act.

Bill No. 127, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Fire Marshal's Act.

Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Bill No. 130, An Act respecting Certain Lands in the City of Port Arthur Occupied by the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur.

Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Public Service Act.

Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Bill No. 133, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act, 1953.

Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Travelling Shows Act.

Bill No. 135, An Act respecting the Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto.

Bill No. 136, An Act to amend The Election Act, 1951.

Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Voters' Lists Act, 1951.

Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.

Bill No. 139, An Act to Promote Fair Accommodation Practices in Ontario.

Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 141, An Act to amend The Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Act, 1943.

Bill No. 142, An Act to Authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth consent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful

and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government, and humbly beg to present for Your Honour's acceptance, a bill intituled, "An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ended the 31st day of March, 1954, and for the public service for the fiscal year ended the 31st day of March, 1955.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accept their benevolence and assent to this bill in Her Majesty's name.

PROROGATION SPEECH, LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR

His Honour was then pleased to deliver the following gracious speech:

HON. LOUIS O. BREITHAUPT
(Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario):

**Mr. Speaker and Members of the
Legislative Assembly:**

Before proroguing this fourth session of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Province of Ontario, I wish, in the name of Her Majesty, to thank you for your consideration of the many measures that have been introduced and your faithful attention to the requirements of this rapidly expanding economy.

During this session many enactments have been passed. All of them are designed in some measure to promote the province's development, to increase production and income, to assist the municipalities, to improve our educational system, to strengthen the freedoms of our democratic heritage, to extend human welfare and, in short, to make Ontario a better place in which to live.

The government has been concerned not only with promoting an environment conducive to industrial expansion

and the creation of employment opportunities, but also with endeavouring always to assure the constant advance of human betterment in all sectors of the province.

A notable advance was made when you approved The Fair Accommodation Practices Act. This is one of several measures that has been adopted in this Legislature in the last 10 years to make Ontario a home of free men, where the peoples of different racial origins and religious faiths may live and work in harmony. By these acts, you have declared your opposition to discrimination. The first act in this series, The Racial Discrimination Act, was passed in 1944. In 1950, The Conveyancing and Law Property Act was amended, rendering covenants void that restrict the sale, ownership, occupation or use of land because of race or creed. In that year, The Labour Relations Act was also passed, invalidating any collective agreement between labour and management that discriminates against any person because of his race or religious faith. In 1951, you gave your approval to The Fair Employment Practices Act, and now you have endorsed The Fair Accommodation Practices Act.

The Select Committee on Indian Affairs has submitted its report containing many recommendations, one of which finds fruition in The Election Act passed at this session. Henceforth, Indians in Ontario—numbering 35,000—will have full voting rights in provincial elections, while at the same time their treaty rights will continue to be respected and preserved for them. The recommendations of the committee will do much to improve the status and living conditions of these people.

The feeling of tension and insecurity that exists throughout the world today underscores the need for a clear recognition of human rights and fundamental freedoms. By these measures you have given unmistakable evidence that the inherent dignity of mankind and the inalienable, and equal, rights of all members of the human family, which are the very foundation of a democratic society, are to be treasured and respected in this province.

In the field of welfare, you have given your approval to the enactment of several new measures. The capital construction grant for charitable institutions has been doubled. Measures have been adopted for increasing the number of homes for the aged. There has been a consolidation into one Act of The Children's Protection Act, The Adoption Act and The Children of Unmarried Parents Act, bringing this legislation into conformity with the most modern practice.

You have approved various Acts providing for new advances in the field of health. Among them is an Act designed to promote community mental health by providing advice and assistance in this respect to hospitals and local public health agencies. You have also authorized public hospitals to extent treatment services in respect of patients suffering from psychiatric disorders.

In education, there has been a consolidation into 3 Acts of various provisions, which were scattered through a considerable number of Statutes. You have also approved an amendment to The Teacher's Superannuation Act which will result in higher pensions for school teachers. To assist in the maintenance of our educational system, increased capital and maintenance grants have been provided for school boards and universities.

Of almost universal benefit to the people of this province is the new enactment providing for an expansion of the provincial parks system. With the growth in our population and the increase in urban development, park lands have become increasingly important for the enjoyment and recreation of our people. The new policy provides for both an improvement of existing parks and for the acquisition of new park areas which will preserve the beauties of the countryside and be reflected in the health and happiness of the people.

The improvement to Ontario's rural telephone service, which was started under The Rural Telephone Systems Act of 1951, will now receive fresh impetus under the bill passed at this

session, providing for the creation of The Ontario Telephone Authority. Funds have also been provided to continue the extension of hydro-electric power in the rural parts of Ontario.

With the continuing increase in motor vehicle traffic, another extensive programme of highway construction will be undertaken during the present fiscal year. The Select Committee on Highways will be provided with every opportunity and facility for an examination of highway administration. Another Select Committee will examine into the great problem of highway safety.

To make provision for an extraordinary expansion in the market for natural gas in Ontario, you have authorized the establishment of the Ontario Fuel Board to control and regulate the production and distribution of natural gas and to maintain adequate coal and other fuel supplies in the province in emergencies.

You have approved the setting up of a Committee of Inquiry into the Economics of the Gold Mining Industry.

The work of the Select Committees on Indian Affairs, Reform Institutions, Cemeteries, Companies, Lake Levels, Election and Voters' Lists and Redistribution has been concluded, and the chairmen and members of these committees are to be highly commended for their conscientious and able endeavours.

The Committee on Reform Institutions has submitted its report to the Legislature and it is being studied, and will continue to be studied, with utmost care in the implementation of a long-range programme of prisoner reform and rehabilitation.

The Committee on Cemeteries has made valuable recommendations which have been translated into amendments to The Cemeteries Act, dealing with administration, perpetual care funds and the sale of cemetery lots.

The Committee on Lands and Forests has been giving consideration to the White Paper on Forestry. This White Paper sets out the province's long-term aims for the elimination of indiscriminate cutting, the integration of operations to

secure the maximum value from timber resources, the provision of access roads and the strengthening of the forest and game protection and conservation services. At this session, The Crown Timber Act was amended, requiring timber licencees to adopt measures to assure the regeneration of cut-over areas.

Special mention should be made of the Committee on Agriculture. This committee has been considering a bill for the consolidation of The Milk Control Act, The Dairy Products Act, The Milk and Cream Act and provisions of The Farm Products Marketing Act and The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act dealing with dairy products. The object of this legislation has been to provide better over-all management and co-ordination of all activities relating to dairy producers and the orderly marketing of their products. Such a wide area of agreement was reached in the discussions that the committee has been able to report back to the Legislature with the result that you have passed The Milk Industry Act, 1954, bringing this programme into effect.

Several other agricultural Acts, such as The Plant Diseases Act, The Live-stock and Livestock Products Act, The Bees Act and The Agricultural Societies Act, have been amended and revised.

The work of the Committee on Redistribution has made rapid progress, and on the basis of its recommendations an enactment has been approved, increasing the number of constituencies and members in the Legislature to 98. The effect of this act is to provide additional representation for areas of the province in which large increases in population have been experienced.

The activities of other committees of the House, including the Private Bills Committee, the Committee on Election Laws and the Committees on Companies and Mines, have been carried forward in a diligent and capable manner, and I congratulate all the members of these committees for the contribution they have made to the study and solution of these important problems.

You have amended The Labour Relations Act to clarify and improve the

administration and associated powers for dealing with collective bargaining. Another Act provides protection for persons working in trenches by assuring that these be shored and timbered in accordance with appropriate standards.

You have made amendments to The Municipal Act and The Assessment Act, The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953, has been amended in order to provide that a municipality will not receive less under The Unconditional Grants Act, The Fire Departments Act and The Police Act than it received in 1953 in respect of the maintenance and operation of its fire department and police force and the 1-mill subsidy.

You have approved an amendment to The Theatres Act, 1953, providing that no drive-in theatre may be constructed in a township without the approval of the council of the township. An amendment to The Fire Marshal's Act has been passed, putting into statutory form the standards for fire hose couplings and requiring that they be maintained. Amendments have been made to The Corporations Act, 1953, and The Corporations Information Act, 1953. The Juvenile and Family Courts Act and The Parents' Maintenance Act have been revised.

During the present session, you have also passed an Act strengthening the financial administration of the Government of Ontario and providing improved financial control of departmental expenditures.

The large developmental programme of the government has been financed without the necessity of imposing any new forms of taxation or of raising rates of existing taxes. Indeed, amendments have been enacted providing for certain minor tax reductions.

To assist the municipalities to finance their services, the province has provided another increase in its grants to local governments, school boards and public general hospitals. Large capital and maintenance grants have again been authorized for municipal roads and health, welfare and educational services.

Housing also continues to be a subject of active interest and support by the

government, and financial provisions are being made to carry on the various programmes available under federal-provincial partnership arrangements.

I thank the hon. members for the appropriation of public funds to carry on the essential services of the government.

I pray that Divine Providence will continue to bless this province and that the legislative programme adopted at this session will enhance the well-being, happiness and security of our people.

HON. A. G. WELSH (Provincial Secretary) : Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly; it is the will and pleasure of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued, and this Legislative Assembly is, accordingly, prorogued.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

The House prorogued at 4.18 of the clock, p.m.

ERRATA

of the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY- FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, FEBRUARY 11th-APRIL 6th, 1954

<i>Page</i>	<i>Col.</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
1	1	19	Change "Charles" to "George."
17	2	after 28	Insert "ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE EXPENSES ACT."
17	2	51	Insert "BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT."
39	2	55	Insert "the people, but she fought as she"—after "good of."
40	1	50	Delete entire line.
45	1	4 and 5	Change "Deputy" to "Acting."
	2	29	Change "Deputy" to "Acting."
46	2	40	Change "Deputy" to "Acting."
50	1	3	Change "he said" to "MR. A. C. JOLLEY (Niagara Falls)."
125	1	43	Change "Mr. R. G. Lewis" to "Major Alex C. Lewis, Q.C."
128	2	47	Delete "Hon. Mr. Frost."
130	2	17	Change "Hon. Mr. Frost" to "Hon. Mr. Porter."
147	1	29	Change "Dept. of Welfare" to "Dept. of Labour."
174	2	after 13	Insert "On Amendment to the Reply to."
202	2	after 17	Insert "On Amendment to the Reply to."
340	2	10	Change "Warrender (Hamilton)" to "Hon. Mr. Warrender (Minister of Planning and Development)."
381	2	19	Delete "of parents."
421	2	32	Change "Act" to "Bill."
	2	after 25	Insert, "Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill."
436	2	37	Change "Les. Frost" to "hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)."
459	1	40	Change "invoice" to "concession."
473	2	38	Change "His Excellency" to "His Honour."
473	2	46	Change "His Excellency" to "His Honour."
513	1	18	Insert "No. 75" after "Bill."
513	2	46	Insert "No. 76" after "Bill."
517	2	19	Insert "No. 89" after "Bill."
559	2	1 to 5 incl.	Change title to read "An Act to provide protection for persons working in trenches."
578	2	54	Change "or" to "he is."

<i>Page</i>	<i>Col.</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
578	2	55	Insert "and" after "detention."
675	1	30	Change "Hon. Mr. Goodfellow" to "hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow)."
693	1	above 1	Insert "Bill No. 73, An Act respecting the Sudbury Community Young Men's and Young Women's Association."
693	1	1	Change "18" to "80."
694	2	47	Change "admit" to "ask."
695	2	before 1	Insert "THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT." "Hon. Mr. Frost moves second reading of Bill No. 91, 'The Financial Administration Act, 1954.' "Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill."
741	2	14	Change "Collings" to "Cowling."
749	2	19	Change "Mr. Alfred Cowling" to "hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling)."
749	2	20 and 21	Change "hon. Mr. Dunbar" to "hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar)."
749	2	32	Change "hon. Mr. Dunbar" to "hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar)."
751	1	23	After "Mr. Speaker," change semicolon to comma.
755	1	20	After "gold" insert "Mining."
772	1	37	Change "alcoholism" to "alcoholic."
782	1	38	Change "for" to "of."
811	1	40 and 41	Change "you gentlemen" to "hon. members of this House."
851	2	6	Change "Budget" to "Estimates."
989	1	23	Insert "12th and final" between "the" and "report."
990	2	3	Insert "4th and final" between "the" and "report."
1068	2	42	Change "67" to "64."
1113	1	12	Change "proposes" to "moves."
1123	2	27	Insert "whom" between "Treasurer" and "I."
1146	2	3	Insert "68" between "Bill" and "as."
1159	1	20	Change "who" to "to."
1160	1	4	Delete entire line.
1162	2	42	Change "128" to "123."
1164	2	17 and 18	Delete both lines.
1188	2	39	Insert "House in Committee" before "Bill No. 124."
1192	1	10	Change "possessive" to "possessed."
1201	2	49	Change "offence" to "offences."
1205	2	33	Insert "House in Committee" before "Bill No. 129."
1227	2	7	Insert "not" after "he is."
1229	1	43	Insert "not" after "it is."
1285	1	49	Change "I" to "it."

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCÉDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

